Socio-Economic Status of Women Labourer from Peshawar in Statistical and Islamic Context

*Dr. Naseem Akhter
Associate Professor, Department of Islamic Studies
Shaheed Benazir Bhutto Women University, Peshawar, Pakistan.
naseemakhter@sbbwu.edu.pk

ABSTRACT

A comprehensive analysis investigates the economic lived experience of Pakistani women laborers in Peshawar from a statistical and Islamic viewpoint. Women who work informally at home encounter economic together with social barriers as well as legal hindrances starting from weak pay to uncertain employment and inadequate access to protection. This evaluation utilizes statistics to investigate the earnings, workplace situations, and financial inputs of these women regarding both family needs and societal demands. The study examines Islamic teachings about labor rights economic justice and gender equity together with the principles of fair wages and workplace dignity and social welfare protection. Research exposes how wage standards and workers' treatment under contemporary employment systems differ fundamentally from Islamic teaching which endorses economic equity combined with respectful worker treatment. The study indicates policymakers must establish new regulations to improve both workplace conditions and financial support for Peshawar women working in labor. The research binds statistical evaluation with Islamic religious concepts to establish a complete approach to managing the socioeconomic challenges that women workers encounter in this territory.
Keywords: *Women Labourer, Peshawar, Socioeconomic Challenges, Social Barriers, Financial Support, Pakistani Women.*

Introduction

The position of women in society has been a frequent subject of debate and research in many developing countries. The social and economic status of the women in Pakistan especially in Peshawar city of Pakistan, a predominantly Muslim country, has been a very controversial issue related to the cultural norms, interpretation of religious scriptures, and socio-economic setup. [1]

The social and economic conditions surrounding female labor workers have been carefully examined, particularly in Peshawar, Pakistan. These women play a key role in keeping their families going even though people sometimes don't see their hard work and their rights aren't well protected yet.[2] This study aims to analyze the numbers behind these women's social and economic challenges. It pays special attention to how much they earn, what their work is like, and how society treats

them.[3] Allah (SWT) says in the Holy Quran "And do not wish for that by which Allah has made some of you exceed others. For men is a share of what they have earned, and for women is a share of what they have earned. And ask Allah of His bounty. Indeed, Allah is ever, of all things, knowing".[4] Further said "And give the relative his right, and [also] the poor and the traveller, and do not spend wastefully. Indeed, the wasteful are brothers of the devils, and ever has Satan been to his Lord ungrateful". [5]

This research emphasizes the thoughts of justice, equality, and worker dignity from an Islamic perspective. Under Islamic law, employers should be ethically responsible for treating workers in a manner consistent with respect for their dignity, fair pay, and working conditions.[6] Indeed as the Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) said: Give a worker's wage before his sweat dries.[7] Islamic law goes on further to promote social justice, protection of the weak, compassion, and welfare for all, female laborers included.

This study seeks to give a complete knowledge of the challenges and opportunities for improving the status of female laborer workers in Peshawar via the combination of statistical data and Islamic teachings. For social reformers and legislators tackling these problems within the bounds of ethics and religion, this research work will offer insightful information.

Literature Review:

The employment status of the females working in homes, especially those living in cities such as Peshawar, is socially and economically influenced by socio-cultural, religious, and economic factors. Islam provides the best example of the human dignity and freedom of human beings, equality for all employees, and the rights of women and men in the course of work. The present work aims at understanding the conditions of female laborers in Peshawar, and these conditions are discussed comprehensively from an Islamic perspective, whereby Islamic teachings have been incorporated with contemporary socio-economic theories.

Several libraries were visited to achieve the goals of this study project, which combines qualitative and quantitative methods, as Islamia College University Peshawar, University of Peshawar, SBBWU Peshawar, University of Agriculture, Peshawar, and the Archive Library Peshawar. The material was gathered from books, newspapers, journals, articles, websites, and dissertations, among other sources. The following are some examples of sources:

According to the International Labour Organization (ILO), many female domestic workers are not protected and get extremely poor remunerations, work under unfavourable conditions, lack social security and are likely to fall into the poverty trap. Employed women such as domestic workers who mainly work for rich families in developing countries like Pakistan have problems that include low education standards, poor health, and poor rights. Overall these global trends are reflected in Peshawar where the majority of domestic workers are still stuck in 'formal employment and low wages'.[8] Due to sociocultural norms that limit women's mobility and engagement in official labor, poverty, and a lack of formal

education, the majority of Pakistan's female domestic workers come from marginalized families. Typically, these women work long hours doing hard jobs like cooking, cleaning, and raising children for meagre pay with little to no protection for their labor rights. In both the social and economic spheres, their labor is frequently devalued.[9]

The rights and dignity of laborers, especially domestic workers, are highly valued in Islam. According to Hadith, the Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) stressed paying workers fairly and treating them with kindness, saying, "Give the worker his wages before his sweat dries." This idea reflects the significance of justice and fairness in working interactions.

Furthermore, the Quran advocates for the protection of weaker sections of society, such as women and the impoverished, through ideas like Sadaqah (voluntary generosity) and zakat (charitable giving). Islam promotes gender equality by highlighting the fact that men and women are created equal in God's eyes and should have the same chances and rights. The Quran emphasizes the role of women as active members of society, and Islamic history is replete with instances of women engaging in a variety of commercial and labor activities.

Islam gives women the right and accept the economic contributions of women, Hazrat Khadijah RA was one of the best businesswomen and she was the first wife of the Prophet Muhammad PBUH. Based on the Quranic verse that prohibits any deprivation from the people their rights: all the women working in labour areas in the Islamic state should be respected and paid fairly for their work. As the Quran makes quite plain it says, "And do not withhold from the people the things that are their due".[10]

Research Methodology

i. **Study Design:**

It was a descriptive and statistical study in which data was collected through surveys and questionnaires. The study aimed to understand the social and economic situation of women workers in the context of Islamic principles.

ii. **Study Area:**

This research was conducted in Peshawar. The city was chosen because it is an important urban centre of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa and has a large number of female laborers.

iii. **Population and Sampling:**

Population:

The population of female laborers in Peshawar was the main population of this study.

iv. **Sample:**

A total of 60 women workers were selected from different areas. For this "Sampling" method was used to get a representative sample from different parts of the city.

v. **Inclusion Criteria:**

Women who were working as home laborers for at least 06 months were included

in this study.

vi. Data Collection Tools:

Questionnaires and interview techniques were used for data collection.

vii. Questionnaire:

A detailed questionnaire included questions about women's age, education, marital status, nature of work, income, and social status.

viii. Interviews:

Interviews were conducted with the selected female workers to explore their situation more deeply.

ix. Data Collection Procedure:

For this research, I visited different areas of Peshawar and directly contacted the selected women laborer workers.

x. Field Workers:

Data was collected through questionnaires and interviews.

xi. Survey Duration:

The data collection process consisted of 04 months, in which information was obtained from working women in different households.

xii. Data Analysis:

✓ **Statistical Analysis**: The data collected was analyzed using SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) software. Various statistical techniques were used to examine the data, such as:

✓ Mean

✓ Standard Deviation

✓ Frequency Distribution

xiii. Thematic Analysis:

Thematic analysis of the data obtained through the interviews was done to analyze the social and economic problems of women workers in depth.

Xvi. Limitations:

The study was limited to Peshawar city and included only women laborers working at home. Some women refrained from providing complete information regarding their income or social status, which may have reduced some information.

xvii. Summary:

This study provides a comprehensive analysis of women home laborers' social and economic status. For this, modern statistical and questionnaire techniques have been used, and the rights of women laborers have been examined in the light of Islamic teachings. From the study results, the difficulties in the lives of these women in the city of Peshawar and the violations of their rights can be estimated.

Statistical Analysis
Statistical Table No. 01

Statistics

		Age	Accommodation	Marital Status	Monthly income	Occupation father /husband	Education	Experience	Name Union Council
N	Valid	60	60	60	60	60	60	60	60
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		1.98	1.90	2.33	1.28	4.12	1.78	1.33	6.37
Std. Deviation		.792	.303	1.100	.454	1.236	.415	.542	2.718

Statistical Analysis

1. Age

Mean: x̄=1.98: Most respondents belong to category **2** in age.

Std. Dev.: σ=0.792: Moderate variation exists in the reported age distribution.

2. Accommodation

Mean: x̄=1.90: Majority of respondents live in the **second type of accommodation**.

Std. Dev.: σ=0.303: Responses are tightly clustered, indicating homogeneity in living conditions.

3. Marital Status

Mean: x̄=2.33: Most respondents are likely in the second or third marital status category.

Std. Dev.: σ=1.100: Responses show significant diversity, indicating variation in marital status.

4. Monthly Income

Mean: x̄=1.28: Respondents mostly report incomes in the **first category**.

Std. Dev.: σ=0.454: There is a low spread, showing consistent income levels among respondents.

5. Occupation (Father/Husband)

Mean: x̄=4.12: The majority of male guardians work in the **fourth category** of occupation.

Std. Dev.: σ=1.236: A broad range of occupations is evident.

6. Education

Mean: x̄=1.78: Most respondents fall in the **second education level category**.

Std. Dev.: σ=0.415: Responses are relatively consistent with little variability.

7. Experience

Mean: x̄=1.33: Most respondents have experience in the **first category**.

Std. Dev.: σ=0.542: Moderate variation is present in respondents' work experience.

8. Union Council
Mean: $\bar{x}$=6.37: Respondents are distributed around Union Council categories **6 and 7**.
Std. Dev.: σ=2.718: The responses are highly diverse, showing representation across many Union Councils.

Statistical Table No. 02

1. Is your monthly income sufficient?					
		Frequency	**Percent**	**Valid Percent**	**Cumulative Percent**
Valid	**Yes**	4	6.7	6.7	6.7
	No	26	43.3	43.3	50.0
	To Some Extent	30	50.0	50.0	100.0
	Total	60	100.0	100.0	

Statistical Analysis
Majority (50%): Respondents feel their income is sufficient **"to some extent."**
Significant Dissatisfaction (43.3%): A large portion believes their income is **"not sufficient."**
Minority Satisfaction (6.7%): Very few respondents find their income **"sufficient."**
Data Summary
The responses and their respective frequencies are:
f_{Yes}= 4
f_{No}=26
$f_{To\ Some\ Extent}$=30
Total responses (N) = 60
 Proportion (Relative Frequency)
The proportion (P) of each response is calculated as:
$$P=\frac{f}{N}$$
$P_{Yes}=\frac{4}{60}$= 0.067 (*or* 6.7%)
$P_{No}=\frac{26}{60}$ = 0.433 (*or* 43.3%)
$P_{To\ Some\ Extent}=\frac{30}{60}$ = 0.500 (*or* 50.0%)
Cumulative Proportion
The cumulative proportion is the running total of proportions:
Cumulative for **"Yes"** = 0.067
Cumulative for **"No"** = 0.067+0.433=0.500
Cumulative for **"To Some Extent"** = 0.500+0.500=1.000
Weighted Average (Mean Response)
Assign numerical codes to each response:

Yes = 1
No = 2
To Some Extent = 3
Mean ($\bar{x}$) is compound as:

$$\bar{x} = \frac{\Sigma(f.x)}{N}$$

Where x is the response code:

$$\bar{x} = \frac{(4.1) + (26.2) + (30.3)}{60}$$

$$\bar{x} = \frac{4 + 52 + 9}{60} = \frac{146}{60} \approx 243$$

Interpretation of Mean:
The mean value of 2.43 is closest to the category **"To Some Extent"**, showing that most respondents partially find their income sufficient.
Variance and Standard Deviation:
Variance σ^2 measures the spread of responses:

$$\sigma^2 = \frac{\Sigma f.(x - \bar{x})^2}{N}$$

Substituting values:

$$\sigma^2 = \frac{(4.(1 - 2.23)^2) + (26.(2 - 2.43)^2) + (30.(3 - 2.43)^2)}{60}$$

Calculate squared deviations:
$(1 - 2.43)^2 = 2.0449$
$(2 - 2.43)^2 = 0.1849$
$(3 - 2.43)^2 = 0.3249$
Multiply by frequencies:
$4 \cdot 2.0449 = 8.1796$
$26 \cdot 0.1849 = 4.8074$
$30 \cdot 0.3249 = 9.747$
Sum and divide:

$$\sigma^2 = \frac{8.1796 + 4.8074 + 9.747}{60} = \frac{22.734}{60} \approx 0.3789$$

Standard deviation (σ) is the square root of variance:

$$\sigma = \sqrt{0.3789} \approx 0.6156$$

Interpretation of Standard Deviation:
A standard deviation of 0.620 (approximately) indicates a moderate response spread, reflecting variability in income sufficiency perceptions.
Statistical Table No. 03

2. Do the people in the homes where you work treat you with respect?				
	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	22	36.7	36.7	36.7

Vali d	No	8	13.3	13.3	50.0
	To Some Extent	29	48.3	48.3	98.3
	Not Know	1	1.7	1.7	100.0
	Total	60	100.0	100.0	

Statistical Analysis
- 48.3% of respondents feel they are treated with respect **"to some extent,"** representing the largest group.
- **36.7%** report being treated with complete respect (**"Yes"**).
- A notable **13.3%** indicate they are not treated respectfully (**"No"**).
- A minimal **1.7%** are uncertain (**"Not Know"**).

Data Summary
Proportion (Relative Frequency):
The proportion (P) of each response is calculated as:
$$P = \frac{f}{N}$$

$P_{Yes} = \frac{22}{60} = 0.367 \ (or \ 36.7\%)$

$P_{No} = \frac{8}{60} = 0.133 \ (or \ 13.3\%)$

$P_{To \ Some \ Extent} = \frac{29}{60} = 0.483 \ (or \ 48.3\%)$

$P_{Not \ Know} = \frac{1}{60} = 0.017 \ (or \ 1.7\%)$

Weighted Average (Mean Response): Assign numerical codes to responses for calculation:
Yes = 1, No = 2, To Some Extent = 3, Not Know = 4
The mean ($\bar{x}$) is :
$$\bar{x} = \frac{\Sigma(f.x)}{N}$$

Substituting values:
$$\bar{x} = \frac{(22.1) + (8.2) + (29.3) + (1.4)}{60}$$
$$\bar{x} = \frac{22 + 16 + 87 + 4}{60} = \frac{129}{60} \approx 2.15$$

Interpretation of Mean:
A mean of 2.152 lies between **"No" (2)** and **"To Some Extent" (3)** but is closer to **"To Some Extent"**, showing a mixed perception with partial satisfaction.

Variance and Standard Deviation:
Variance σ^2 measures the spread of responses:
$$\sigma^2 = \frac{\Sigma f.(x - \bar{x})^2}{N}$$

Substituting values:
$(1 - 2.15)^2 = 1.3225$
$(2 - 2.15)^2 = 0.0225$
$(3 - 2.15)^2 = 0.7225$
$(4 - 2.15)^2 = 3.4225$

Multiply by frequencies:

22·1.3225=29.095

8·0.0225=0.18

29·0.7225=20.9525

1·3.4225=3.4225

Sum and divide:

$$\sigma^2 = \frac{29.095+0.18+20.9525+3.4225}{60} = \frac{53.65}{60} \approx 0.894$$

Standard deviation (ơ) is the square root of variance:

$$\sigma = \sqrt{0.894} \approx 0.945$$

Interpretation of Standard Deviation:

A standard deviation of 0.945 indicates a moderate response spread, showing variability in perceptions of respect.

Statistical Table No. 04

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
3. Have the people in the houses you work ever tried to make any illegal demands/harassment of you?					
Valid	**Yes**	3	5.0	5.0	5.0
	No	51	85.0	85.0	90.0
	To Some Extent	5	8.3	8.3	98.3
	Not Know	1	1.7	1.7	100.0
	Total	60	100.0	100.0	

Statistical Analysis

- **85.0%** of respondents answered **"No"**, indicating that the vast majority did not experience illegal demands or harassment.
- A small percentage (**5.0%**) reported harassment (**"Yes"**).
- **8.3%** felt harassment **"to some extent."**
- **1.7%** were uncertain (**"Not Know"**).

Data Summary

Proportion (Relative Frequency):

The proportion (P) of each response is calculated as:

$$P=\frac{f}{N}$$

$P_{Yes}=\frac{3}{60} = 0.05 \ (or\ 5.0\%)$

$P_{No}=\frac{51}{60} = 0.85 \ (or\ 85.0\%)$

$P_{To\ Some\ Extent}=\frac{5}{60} = 0.083 \ (or\ 8.3\%)$

$P_{Not\ Know}=\frac{1}{60} = 0.017 \ (or\ 1.7\%)$

Weighted Average (Mean Response):

Assign numerical codes to responses for calculation:

Yes = 1, No = 2, To Some Extent = 3, Not Know = 4

The mean ($\bar{x}$) is :

$$\bar{x} = \frac{\Sigma(f \cdot x)}{N}$$

Substituting values:

$$\bar{x} = \frac{(3 \cdot 1) + (51 \cdot 2) + (5 \cdot 3) + (1 \cdot 4)}{60}$$

$$\bar{x} = \frac{3 + 102 + 15 + 4}{60} = \frac{124}{60} \approx 2.07$$

Interpretation of Mean:

A mean of 2.072.072.07 lies between "No" (2) and "To Some Extent" (3) but is very close to "No," indicating a predominant perception that illegal demands or harassment did not occur.

Variance and Standard Deviation:

Variance σ^2 measures the spread of responses:

$$\sigma^2 = \frac{\Sigma f \cdot (x - \bar{x})^2}{N}$$

Substituting values:

$(1 - 2.07)^2 = 1.1449$

$(2 - 2.07)^2 = 0.0049$

$(3 - 2.07)^2 = 0.8649$

$(4 - 2.07)^2 = 3.7249$

Multiply by frequencies:

$3 \cdot 1.1449 = 3.4347$

$51 \cdot 0.0049 = 0.2499$

$5 \cdot 0.8649 = 4.3245$

$1 \cdot 3.7249 = 3.7249$

Sum and divide:

$$\sigma^2 = \frac{3.4347 + 0.2499 + 4.3245 + 3.7249}{60} = \frac{11.734}{60} \approx 0.1956$$

Standard deviation (σ) is the square root of variance:

$$\sigma = \sqrt{0.1956} \approx 0.442$$

Interpretation of Standard Deviation:

A standard deviation of 0.442 indicates low response variability, meaning most participants reported similar experiences.

Statistical Table No. 05

4. Do you keep borrowing to make ends meet?					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	27	45.0	45.0	45.0
	No	8	13.3	13.3	58.3
	To Some Extent	24	40.0	40.0	98.3
	5	1	1.7	1.7	100.0

	Total	60	100.0	100.0	

Statistical Analysis

- 45.0% of respondents answered **"Yes,"** indicating that a significant portion consistently borrows to make ends meet.
- 40.0% reported borrowing **"To Some Extent,"** reflecting financial instability but not as severe as regular borrowing.
- 13.3% stated **"No,"** showing they can manage without borrowing.
- 1.7% chose an unclear response labeled as **"5"** (possibly an error or undefined category).

Data Summary

Proportion (Relative Frequency):

The Proportions (P) for each response are calculated as:

$$P = \frac{f}{N}$$

$P_{Yes} = \frac{27}{60} = 0.45 \ (or \ 45.0\%)$

$P_{No} = \frac{8}{60} = 0.133 \ (or \ 13.3\%)$

$P_{To \ Some \ Extent} = \frac{24}{60} = 0.4 \ (or \ 40.0\%)$

$P_{Not \ Know} = \frac{1}{60} = 0.017 (or \ 1.7\%)$

Weighted Average (Mean Response):

Assign numerical codes to responses for calculation:

Yes = 1, **No = 2**, **To Some Extent = 3**, **Unknown = 5**

The mean ($\bar{x}$) is :

$$\bar{x} = \frac{\sum(f \cdot x)}{N}$$

Substituting values:

$$\bar{x} = \frac{(27 \cdot 1) + (8 \cdot 2) + (24 \cdot 3) + (1 \cdot 5)}{60}$$

$$\bar{x} = \frac{27 + 16 + 72 + 5}{60} = \frac{120}{60} \approx 2.0$$

Interpretation of Mean:

A mean of 2.0 lies between **"Yes" (1)** and **"No" (2),** reflecting a tendency toward financial borrowing, either regularly or partially.

Variance and Standard Deviation:

Variance σ^2 measures response variability:

$$\sigma^2 = \frac{\sum f \cdot (x - \bar{x})^2}{N}$$

Substituting values:

$(1 - 2.0)^2 = 1$

$(2 - 2.0)^2 = 0$

$(3 - 2.0)^2 = 1$

$(4 - 2.0)^2 = 9$

Multiply by frequencies:

27·1=27
8·0=0
24·1=24
1·9=9

Sum and divide:

$$\sigma^2 = \frac{27+0+24+9}{60} = \frac{60}{60} \approx 1.0$$

Standard deviation (σ) is the square root of variance:

$$\sigma = \sqrt{1.0} \approx 1.0$$

Interpretation of Standard Deviation:
A standard deviation of 1.0 indicates moderate variability in responses, suggesting mixed but predominantly financially strained conditions.

Statistical Table No. 06

		Freque ncy	Perce nt	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Va lid	Yes	27	45.0	45.0	45.0
	No	21	35.0	35.0	80.0
	To Some Extent	12	20.0	20.0	100.0
	Total	60	100.0	100.0	

(Table title: 5. Are you doing this of your own free will?)

Statistical Analysis
- 45.0% of respondents replied "Yes," indicating that nearly half are working out of their own free will.
- 35.0% answered "No," suggesting they are compelled to work due to external pressures or circumstances.
- 20.0% stated "To Some Extent," reflecting mixed motivations or partial autonomy in their decision.

Data Summary
Proportion (Relative Frequency):
The Proportions (P) for each response are calculated as:

$$P = \frac{f}{N}$$

$P_{Yes} = \frac{27}{60} = 0.45 \, (or \; 45.0\%)$

$P_{No} = \frac{21}{60} = 0.35 \, (or \; 35.0\%)$

$P_{To \; Some \; Extent} = \frac{12}{60} = 0.20 \, (or \; 20.0\%)$

Weighted Average (Mean Response):
Assign numerical codes to responses for calculation:
Yes = 1, No = 2, To Some Extent = 3
The mean ($\bar{x}$) is :

$$\bar{x} = \frac{\sum(f \cdot x)}{N}$$

Substituting values:

$$\bar{x} = \frac{(27 \cdot 1) + (21 \cdot 2) + (12 \cdot 3)}{60}$$

$$\bar{x} = \frac{27 + 42 + 36}{60} = \frac{105}{60} \approx 1.75$$

Interpretation of Mean:

A mean of 1.75 lies closer to **"Yes" (1)** but trends toward **"No" (2),** indicating a lean toward free will with notable opposition.

Variance and Standard Deviation:

Variance σ^2 measures response variability:

$$\sigma^2 = \frac{\sum f \cdot (x - \bar{x})^2}{N}$$

Substituting values:

$$(1 - 1.75)^2 = 0.5625$$

$(2 - 1.75)^2 = 0.0625$

$(3 - 1.75)^2 = 1.5625$

Multiply by frequencies:

27·0.5625=15.1875

21·0.0625=1.3125

12·1.5625=18.75

Sum and divide:

$$\sigma^2 = \frac{15.1875 + 1.3125 + 18.75}{60} = \frac{35.25}{60} \approx 0.5875$$

Standard deviation (σ) is the square root of variance:

$$\sigma = \sqrt{0.5875} \approx 0.77$$

Interpretation of Standard Deviation:

A standard deviation of 0.77 indicates moderate variability in responses, reflecting diverse motivations among participants.

Statistical Table No. 07

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	6. Is your family happy with your profession?				
Valid	**Yes**	19	31.7	31.7	31.7
	No	12	20.0	20.0	51.7
	To Some Extent	25	41.7	41.7	93.3
	Not Know	4	6.7	6.7	100.0
	Total	60	100.0	100.0	

Statistical Analysis

- 31.7% of respondents reported that their families are happy with their profession.
- 20.0% said their families are not happy, indicating dissatisfaction in a fifth

of cases.
- 41.7% mentioned **"To Some Extent,"** showing mixed or partial acceptance from family members.
- 6.7% were unsure about their family's perspective.

Data Summary

Proportion (Relative Frequency):

Proportions are calculated as:

$$P = \frac{f}{N}$$

$P_{Yes} = \frac{19}{60} = 0.3167 (or\ 31.7\%)$

$P_{No} = \frac{12}{60} = 0.20\ (or\ 20.0\%)$

$P_{To\ Some\ Extent} = \frac{25}{60} = 0.4167\ (or\ 41.7\%)$

$P_{Not\ Know} = \frac{4}{60} = 0.067 (or\ 6.7\%)$

Weighted Average (Mean Response):

Assign numerical codes to responses for calculation:

Yes = 1, No = 2, To Some Extent = 3, Not Know = 4

The mean $(\bar{x})$ is :

$$\bar{x} = \frac{\Sigma(f.x)}{N}$$

Substituting values:

$$\bar{x} = \frac{(19 \cdot 1) + (12 \cdot 2) + (25 \cdot 3) + (4.4)}{60}$$

$$\bar{x} = \frac{19 + 24 + 75 + 16}{60} = \frac{134}{60} = 2.23$$

Interpretation of Mean:

A mean of 2.23 lies between "No" (2) and "To Some Extent" (3), indicating a general trend of partial satisfaction among families, with some dissatisfaction present.

Variance and Standard Deviation:

Variance σ^2 measures response variability:

$$\sigma^2 = \frac{\Sigma f.(x - \bar{x})^2}{N}$$

Substituting values:

$$(1 - 2.23)^2 = 1.5129$$

$(2 - 2.23)^2 = 0.0529$

$(3 - 2.23)^2 = 0.5929$

$(4 - 2.23)^2 = 3.1329$

Multiply by frequencies:

19·1.5129=28.7451

12·0.0529=0.6348

25·0.5929=14.8225
4·3.1329=12.5316

Sum and divide:
$$\sigma^2 = \frac{128.7451+0.6348+14.8225+12.5316}{60} = \frac{56.734}{60} = 0.9456$$
Standard deviation (σ):
$$\sigma = \sqrt{0.9456} \approx 0.97$$

Interpretation of Standard Deviation:
A standard deviation of 0.97 indicates moderate dispersion in responses, with diverse opinions among respondents.

Statistical Table No. 08

		Freque ncy	Perce nt	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
		**7. Do your family members continue to support you financially?**			
Vali d	Yes	7	11.7	11.7	11.7
	No	25	41.7	41.7	53.3
	To Some Extent	26	43.3	43.3	96.7
	Not Know	2	3.3	3.3	100.0
	Total	60	100.0	100.0	

Statistical Analysis
- Only 11.7% of respondents received full financial support from their families.
- A significant 41.7% stated they did not receive any financial support.
- The largest group (43.3%) indicated partial or conditional support.
- 3.3% were unsure about their family's financial contribution.

Data Summary
Proportion (Relative Frequency):
$$P=\frac{f}{N}$$
$P_{Yes}=\frac{7}{60} = 0.117 (or\ 11.7\%)$
$P_{No}=\frac{25}{60} = 0.417$ (or 41.7%)
$P_{To\ Some\ Extent}=\frac{26}{60} = 0.433$ (or 43.3%)
$P_{Not\ Know}=\frac{2}{60} = 0.033$ (or 3.3%)

Weighted   Average   (Mean   Response):
Assign numerical codes to responses for calculation:
Yes = 1, No = 2, To Some Extent = 3, Not Know = 4

The mean ($\bar{x}$) is :

$$\bar{x} = \frac{\Sigma(f \cdot x)}{N}$$

Substituting values:

$$\bar{x} = \frac{(7 \cdot 1) + (25 \cdot 2) + (26 \cdot 3) + (2.4)}{60}$$

$$\bar{x} = \frac{7 + 50 + 78 + 8}{60} = \frac{143}{60} = 2.38$$

 Interpretation of **Mean:**
A mean of 2.38 lies between **"No" (2)** and **"To Some Extent" (3),** indicating that the majority experience little to partial financial support.

Variance and **Standard** **Deviation:**
Variance σ^2 measures response variability:

$$\sigma^2 = \frac{\Sigma f \cdot (x - \bar{x})^2}{N}$$

Substituting values:

$$(1 - 2.38)^2 = 1.9044$$

$(2 - 2.38)^2 = 0.1444$
$(3 - 2.38)^2 = 0.3844$
$(4 - 2.38)^2 = 2.6244$

Multiply by frequencies:
7·1.9044=13.3308
25·0.1444=3.610
26·0.3844=9.9944
2·2.6244=5.2488

Sum and divide:

$$\sigma^2 = \frac{13.3308 + 3.610 + 9.9944 + 5.2488}{60} = \frac{32.184}{60} = 0.5364$$

Standard deviation (σ):

$$\sigma = \sqrt{0.5364} \approx 0.7324$$

Interpretation of Standard Deviation:
The standard deviation (0.73240) shows moderate consistency in responses, with most clustered around "No" and "To Some Extent."

Statistical Table No. 09

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	8. Do the people in the houses where you work help you in addition to your salary?				
Valid	Yes	6	10.0	10.0	10.0
	No	16	26.7	26.7	36.7
	To Some Extent	38	63.3	63.3	100.0
	Total	60	100.0	100.0	

Statistical Analysis
- Only **10.0**% of respondents receive additional help beyond their salary.
- **26.7**% reported that they do not receive any extra help.
- A significant majority (**63.3**%) indicated that they receive some assistance beyond their salary.

Data Summary
Proportion (Relative Frequency):
Using the formula:
$$P = \frac{f}{N}$$

$P_{Yes} = \frac{6}{60} = 0.10 \, (or \, 10.0\%)$

$P_{No} = \frac{16}{60} = 0.267$ (or or 26.7%)

$P_{To \, Some \, Extent} = \frac{38}{60} = 0.633$ (or 63.3%)

Weighted Average (Mean Response)
Assigning numerical values:
Yes = 1, No = 2, To Some Extent = 3

$$\bar{x} = \frac{\sum(f \cdot x)}{N}$$

Substituting values:
$$\bar{x} = \frac{(6 \cdot 1) + (16 \cdot 2) + (38 \cdot 3)}{60}$$

$$\bar{x} = \frac{6 + 32 + 114}{60} = \frac{152}{60} = 2.53$$

Interpretation **of** **Mean:**
A mean of **2.53** suggests that most workers experience **partial** additional help rather than full assistance.

Variance and Standard Deviation
Variance σ^2 measures response variability:
$$\sigma^2 = \frac{\sum f \cdot (x - \bar{x})^2}{N}$$

Substituting values:
$$(1 - 2.53)^2 = 2.3409$$

$(2 - 2.53)^2 = 0.2809$
$(3 - 2.53)^2 = 0.2209$
Multiply by frequencies:
6·2.3409=14.0454
16·0.2809=4.4944
38·0.2209=8.3942
Sum and divide:
$$\sigma^2 = \frac{14.0454 + 4.4944 + 8.3942}{60} = \frac{26.934}{60} = 0.4489$$
Standard deviation (σ):

$$\sigma = \sqrt{0.4489} \approx 0.67$$

Interpretation

Most respondents (63.3%) receive some level of additional help, but not consistently.

Mean Response = 2.53 suggests that assistance is given **"To Some Extent"** on average.

Standard Deviation = 0.67, indicating a moderate response spread, meaning experiences vary among individuals.

Statistical Table No. 10

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	9. Will you let your children choose this profession?				
Valid	**Yes**	10	16.7	16.9	16.9
	No	40	66.7	67.8	84.7
	To Some Extent	5	8.3	8.5	93.2
	Not Know	4	6.7	6.8	100.0
	Total	59	98.3	100.0	
Missing	**System**	1	1.7		
Total		60	100.0		

Statistical Analysis

- A **significant majority (67.8%)** of respondents do not want their children to adopt the same profession.
- Only **16.9%** are willing to let their children enter this profession.
- **8.5%** consider it to some extent, while **6.8%** are uncertain.
- One response is missing, but its impact is minimal on the overall interpretation.

Data Summary

Proportion (Relative Frequency):

Using the formula:

$$P = \frac{f}{N}$$

$P_{Yes} = \frac{10}{59} = 0.169 \, (or \text{ or } 16.9\%)$

$P_{No} = \frac{40}{59} = 0.678 \, (\text{or } 67.8\%)$

$P_{To \, Some \, Extent} = \frac{5}{59} = 0.085 \, (\text{or } 8.5\%)$

$P_{Not \, Know} = \frac{4}{59} = 0.068 \, (\text{or } 6.8\%)$

Weighted Average (Mean Response)

Assigning numerical values:

Yes = 1, No = 2, To Some Extent = 3, Not Know = 4

$$\bar{x} = \frac{\Sigma(f \cdot x)}{N}$$

Substituting values:

$$\bar{x} = \frac{(10 \cdot 1) + (40 \cdot 2) + (5 \cdot 3) + (4 \cdot 4)}{59}$$

$$\bar{x} = \frac{10 + 80 + 15 + 16}{59} = \frac{121}{59} = 2.05$$

Interpretation **of** **Mean:**
A mean of **2.05** suggests that the majority of responses lean towards "No" (**2**), indicating a general unwillingness to allow children to follow the same profession.

Variance and Standard Deviation

Variance σ^2 measures response variability:

$$\sigma^2 = \frac{\Sigma f \cdot (x - \bar{x})^2}{N}$$

Substituting values:

$$(1 - 2.05)^2 = 1.1025$$

$(2 - 2.05)^2 = 0.2809$
$(3 - 2.05)^2 = 0.9025$
$(4 - 2.05)^2 = 3.8025$
Multiply by frequencies:
10·1.1025=11.025
40·0.0025=0.1
5·0.9025=4.5125
4·3.8025=15.21
Sum and divide:

$$\sigma^2 = \frac{11.025 + 0.1 + 4.5125 + 15.21}{59} = \frac{30.8475}{59} = 0.523$$

Standard deviation (**σ**):

$$\sigma = \sqrt{0.523} \approx 0.72$$

Interpretation
The majority (67.8%) of respondents do not want their children to follow this profession.
Mean Response = 2.05, which aligns closely with "No" responses.
Standard Deviation = 0.72, indicating a moderate response spread, meaning some variation exists but a strong trend towards rejection is clear.

Statistical Table No. 11

10. Would you like to study if you had the opportunity to study?		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	10	16.7	16.7	16.7
	No	39	65.0	65.0	81.7

		7	11.7	11.7	93.3
	To Some Extent	7	11.7	11.7	93.3
	Not Know	4	6.7	6.7	100.0
	Total	60	100.0	100.0	

Statistical Analysis
- 65.0% of respondents do not want to study even if given the opportunity.
- Only 16.7% are willing to study.
- 11.7% might consider it under certain conditions.
- 6.7% are uncertain about their response.

Data Summary
Proportion (Relative Frequency):
Using the formula:

$$P = \frac{f}{N}$$

$P_{Yes} = \frac{10}{60} = 0.167$ (or 16.7%)

$P_{No} = \frac{39}{60} = 0.650$ (or 65.0%)

$P_{To\ Some\ Extent} = \frac{7}{60} = 0.117$ (or 11.7%)

$P_{Not\ Know} = \frac{4}{60} = 0.067$ (or 6.7%)

Mean Response Calculation
Assigning numerical values:
Yes = 1, No = 2, To Some Extent = 3, Not Know = 4

$$\bar{x} = \frac{\Sigma(f \cdot x)}{N}$$

Substituting values:

$$\bar{x} = \frac{(10 \cdot 1) + (39 \cdot 2) + (7 \cdot 3) + (4 \cdot 4))}{60}$$

$$\bar{x} = \frac{10 + 78 + 21 + 16}{60} = \frac{125}{60} = 2.08$$

Interpretation **of** **Mean:**
A mean of **2.08** suggests that most responses lean toward "No" (value = 2), confirming that a majority do not wish to study even if given the opportunity.

Variance and Standard Deviation
Variance σ^2 measures response variability:

$$\sigma^2 = \frac{\Sigma f \cdot (x - \bar{x})^2}{N}$$

Substituting values:

$$(1 - 2.08)^2 = 1.1664$$

$(2 - 2.08)^2 = 0.0064$
$(3 - 2.08)^2 = 0.8464$
$(4 - 2.08)^2 = 3.6864$

Multiply by frequencies:

10·1.1664=11.664

39·0.0064=0.2496

7·0.8464=5.9248

4·3.6864=14.7456

Sum and divide:

$$\sigma^2 = \frac{11.664+0.2496+5.9248+14.7456}{60} = \frac{32.584}{60} = 0.543$$

Standard deviation (σ):

$$\sigma = \sqrt{0.543} \approx 0.74$$

Interpretation

The majority (65.0%) do not want to study, indicating possible socio-economic barriers or a lack of perceived benefits.

Only 16.7% show interest in education, which is a significantly small proportion.

Mean Response = 2.08, indicating a strong inclination toward "No."

Standard Deviation = 0.74, suggesting moderate variation in responses, but with a clear dominant trend.

Results and Discussion

Key Findings

- **Majority Reject Education**: A striking **65.0%** of respondents stated that they would not want to study even if they had the opportunity. This suggests systemic barriers such as financial constraints, lack of awareness, or societal pressures that discourage educational aspirations.
- **Limited Interest in Learning**: Only **16.7%** expressed a desire to study, while **11.7%** were open to it under specific conditions. This indicates that while some recognize the value of education, external limitations might be preventing them from pursuing it.
- **Uncertainty in Decision-Making**: About **6.7%** were unsure, possibly reflecting a lack of exposure to education or an absence of role models in their environment.

Statistical Interpretation

The **mean response value (2.08)** shows that the majority lean toward rejecting educational opportunities.

The **standard deviation (0.74)** suggests moderate variation, meaning that while some responses deviate, the dominant trend remains clear.

Discussion and Analysis

3.1. Socio-Economic Barriers

Socio-economic difficulties cause people to reject educational opportunities almost entirely. The workers who perform domestic jobs often originate from families with limited financial resources which consume their attention rather than educational pursuits. People in these families often choose present earnings at the cost of developing skills for later use.

3.2. Gender and Cultural Norms

Pakistani society with its traditional gender roles controls traditional behavioral

roles especially in low-income areas. Women performing domestic work receive limitations that prevent them from pursuing formal educational opportunities. From a young age these individuals must help support the family income without gaining sufficient personal development.

3.3. Psychological Factors

Multiple survey respondents demonstrated how they accepted widespread social notions that education cannot make their situation better. Their long-term occupation in home duties leads them to dismiss formal education as an effective way to enhance their social status.

3.4. Need for Awareness and Support

The 16.7% domestic workers who want to study can benefit from targeted educational programs and skills training and flexible study options which should bridge their educational needs. Free or government-sponsored educational programs for domestic staff convert into better career opportunities.

Suggested Solution:

In the light of Islamic teachings, women domestic workers must be given a socially and financially respectable position. Special programs should be organized for their educational and vocational training so that they can gain better economic status and social respect. Also, the government and concerned institutions should introduce plans and schemes for their financial security to provide them with social justice.

These findings and discussion reflect the need to take steps in the light of Islamic teachings to improve the condition of female domestic workers in Peshawar.

Conclusion:

Study results show female domestic laborers strongly oppose educational participation because poor finances combine with societal beliefs and psychological elements. A small number of female domestic laborers demonstrate willingness to learn despite the distinct resistance exhibited by others. Through policy changes along with public awareness initiatives and financial support the resistance to education among domestic laborers can be countered to offer better personal and occupational development opportunities.

The fundamental principles of Islam emphasize justice, equality, and upholding the dignity of women, which should be applied in social and economic fields as well. Women workers often face low wages, unsafe working conditions, and social pressure, which is unacceptable in the light of Islamic teachings.

Islam emphasizes the need to provide economic freedom and social justice to women. From this point of view, women laborer workers in Peshawar should not only be given social respect, but should also be provided with full wages for their work, better working conditions, and social security. Islamic society must take practical measures for the welfare of these women so that they can lead an economically stable and socially respectable life.

This study makes it clear that legal and social reforms are urgently needed to improve the social and economic status of women in the light of Islamic principles.

In this context, promoting Islamic values to raise social awareness, provide fair working conditions, and give women workers their rights can be an effective solution.

Recommendations:

There are some recommendations as follows;

Awareness and Implementation of Islamic Principles

The Islamic Shari'ah, or the rules that defend women, is quite explicit on the rights, honor, and dignity of women. As a result, it is advised that the government and civil society start awareness programs to inform both employers and employees about the rights of female employees from an Islamic perspective.

Strengthening of laws to protect women's rights

Establish an efficient legislation that empowers women domestic workers and that should be upheld. Such laws should stipulate the payment of reasonable wages, protection at the workplace, and social security.

Social Security Measures

The government needs to establish specific social security programs for women laborer workers such as health needs, insurance, and pensions that will make them happy and secure in their lives.

Reasonable Wages and Fair Working Conditions

Working women should be paid equally for their efforts. They should be paid fairly and be allowed to increase their income by working more. To enhance women's productivity in the workplace, better working conditions and hours are also necessary.

Education and Training Opportunities

The women workers should be availed vocational training and education to enable them to master their work and also to be associated with more development economically. According to the Islamic Shariah, education is the birthright of every person and women workers should also not be denied this facility.

Role of Islamic Welfare Organizations

According to Islamic thought, charitable organizations may improve the economic status of working women and defend their rights. To help women who work as laborers, they ought to provide them with financial support, greater opportunities, and legal representation.

Changing Social Attitudes

The rights of women laborer workers have to be protected and respected. Therefore, there is a need to launch campaigns that would redesign the social perceptions of these women to make the latter receive social respect and dignity, as it is mentioned in Islamic teaching.

Forums for organizing and protecting women's rights

Organizations should be organized for the protection of the rights of Women domestic workers. It will allow women workers to air their concerns and also legislate for the defense of their interests collectively.

Welfare Initiatives through Public-Private Partnership

The development of welfare programs for female laborers in the fields of economy,

health, and education should come from both public and private organizations. Improved socioeconomic prospects for women might be attained through this collaboration.

Establishment of an Islamic Financial System for Women

The employer or the government and Islamic banks should establish financial and Islamic banking facilities for working women to take part in venture and economic activities such as small business or other activities to enhance their financial status. The implementation of these recommendations can improve the social and economic condition of women laborer workers in Peshawar city and give them their rights according to Islamic principles.

Acknowledgment

References

[1] Hussain Fatima. (2022). "Economic Empowerment of Female Laborers in Peshawar: An Islamic Perspective", University of Peshawar.

[2] Peshawar Chamber of Commerce and Industry. (2023). "Socio-Economic Conditions of Female Home-Based Workers in Peshawar: An Islamic Perspective", Peshawar Chamber of Commerce and Industry, Peshawar.

[3] Ahmed, S., & Khan, A. (2018). Socioeconomic conditions of female domestic workers in Karachi, Pakistan. Journal of Pakistan Studies, 51(2), 1-22.

[4] Surah An-Nisa 4:32.

[5] Surah Al-Isra 17:26-27.

[6] Hasan, A. (2012). Gender and the informal economy in Pakistan. In N. Afshar (Ed.), Women and development in Islam (pp. 156-172). Palgrave Macmillan.

[7] Sunan Ibn Majah, Hadith 2443.

[8] International Labour Organization (ILO), "Domestic Workers across the World: Global and Regional Statistics and the Extent of Legal Protection," 2013.

[9] Naqvi, Z., Shahnaz, L., "Female Labor Participation in Pakistan: An Overview," Pakistan Development Review, 2002.

[10] The Holy Quran, Surah Al-Araf, 7:85.