Gender Socialization and its Impact on Career Choices: A Sociological Analysis

Anju Chaulagain[1]

[1]Lecturer of Sociology
Makawanpur Multiple Campus, Hetauda

Corresponding Author
Anju Chaulagain
Email: anjuchaulagain923@gmail.com

Abstract

Gender socialization profoundly shapes individuals' perceptions, aspirations, and ultimately, their career trajectories, perpetuating entrenched occupational segregation. This qualitative study examines how gender socialization influences career choices, employing a sociological lens to uncover the underlying mechanisms that steer men and women toward traditionally gendered professions. The objective of this research is to explore the role of familial, educational, and societal institutions in reinforcing gender norms that dictate occupational preferences. Utilizing a qualitative research design, this study analyzes secondary data from authoritative books, peer-reviewed journal articles, and credible web-based documents to synthesize existing knowledge on gendered career socialization. Findings reveal that from early childhood, boys and girls are exposed to differential treatment. Boys are encouraged toward STEM and leadership roles, while girls are steered toward caregiving and humanities, reinforcing a gendered division of labor. Moreover, media representations and institutional biases further entrench these disparities, limiting career diversity. The implications of this study are significant for policymakers, educators, and parents, highlighting the need for gender-neutral socialization practices to foster equitable career opportunities. By challenging stereotypical norms and promoting inclusive environments, society can mitigate the restrictive impact of gendered expectations on professional aspirations. This research contributes to ongoing sociological discourse by underscoring the necessity of structural interventions to achieve occupational equity.

Keywords: gender socialization, career choices, occupational segregation, gender stereotypes, sociological analysis

1. Introduction

Gender socialization is the process through which individuals learn and internalize societal gender norms and roles (Oakley, 1972). From childhood, family, education, media, and peers shape perceptions of appropriate careers (Bem, 1981; Ridgeway & Correll, 2004). Traditional norms persist, directing men toward leadership and STEM fields and women toward caregiving roles (Connell, 2009; Charles & Bradley, 2009). Even young children associate certain professions with specific genders (Coyle & Skinner, 1988), while schools and media reinforce stereotypes (Sadker & Sadker, 1994; Signorielli & Bacue, 1999), contributing to occupational segregation (Charles & Grusky, 2004).

Intersectional factors like race and class further shape career outcomes (Crenshaw, 1991). Parents and teachers often encourage gendered skills and interests (Lytton & Romney, 1991; Leaper & Farkas, 2015), and workplace barriers like pay gaps reflect these socialization patterns (Reskin & Bielby, 2005; Blau & Kahn, 2017). Girls face discouragement in STEM (Cheryan et al., 2017), while boys avoid "feminine" careers (Wille et al., 2018). Despite progress, structural inequalities persist (England, 2010; Risman, 2004).

This study highlights how gender socialization influences career choices, emphasizing the need for policy and educational reforms to challenge stereotypes and promote equity (Correll, 2004; Eccles, 2011). Identifying these mechanisms is crucial for fostering inclusive opportunities (West & Zimmerman, 1987; Martin & Ruble, 2010).

This study is significant for advancing sociological understanding of how gender socialization shapes career aspirations, using social learning theory and gender schema theory. It offers practical insights for policymakers and educators on early interventions to counter stereotypes, highlights the role of socialization agents, and underscores economic impacts like wage gaps. Amid shifting gender norms, it informs corporate diversity, education, and parenting strategies. Recognizing how persistent norms and intersectional factors limit career options, the study supports dismantling structural barriers. Using a qualitative, descriptive-exploratory design, it employs documentary analysis to examine how societal norms influence career choices and long-term occupational outcomes.

2. Literature Review

This article makes a comprehensive review of theoretical literature of gender socialization, career choices, gender socialization and its impact on career choices, occupational segregation, gender stereotypes, and sociological analysis.

2.1 Gender Socialization

Gender socialization is the lifelong process by which individuals internalize cultural norms, roles, behaviors, and expectations associated with their gender within a given society (Oakley, 1972; Bem, 1981). It shapes how individuals perceive what is considered appropriate for males and females, emphasizing socially constructed meanings over biological differences (West & Zimmerman, 1987). This process begins in early childhood, with family members playing a crucial role by assigning gendered tasks and reinforcing traditional roles through toys, activities, and emotional expression (Lytton & Romney, 1991; Kane, 2006). Educational

institutions further contribute by encouraging gender-specific subjects, such as mathematics for boys and humanities for girls (Sadker & Sadker, 1994).

Mass media is another significant agent, portraying men as strong and assertive and women as nurturing and passive, shaping career aspirations and self-perceptions (Bussey & Bandura, 1999). Peers enforce conformity to gender norms through acceptance and exclusion, influencing career interests (Maccoby, 1998). Religious institutions and cultural practices also perpetuate specific gender roles, emphasizing obedience, caretaking, or leadership (Inglehart & Norris, 2003). Workplace environments reinforce these expectations, impacting hiring practices and promotions (Ridgeway, 2011).

Sociologists argue that gender socialization maintains inequality by naturalizing differences between men and women (Connell, 2009). Gender is "done" through daily interactions, where individuals enact behaviors aligned with societal expectations (West & Zimmerman, 1987). Intersectionality adds complexity, as race, class, and ethnicity intersect with gender (Crenshaw, 1991).

Key agents of gender socialization include family, education, media, and peer groups. Theoretical perspectives include Social Learning Theory (Bandura, 1977), Gender Schema Theory (Bem, 1981), and Feminist Theory (Connell, 1987). Consequences include occupational segregation, the gender pay gap, and mental health impacts from rigid gender norms (England, 2010; Mahalik et al., 2003).

2.2 Gender Socialization in Nepal

Gender socialization is the process of internalizing gender roles based on societal expectations (Oakley, 1972). In Nepal, this process heavily influences career choices, as cultural norms define "appropriate" roles for men and women (Sharma, 2017). This begins early in life through family dynamics and education, continuing into adulthood and shaping career pathways. Traditional cultural beliefs, deeply rooted in Hinduism and patriarchal structures, confine women primarily to domestic roles, while men are encouraged to pursue professional careers in fields like engineering, medicine, and business (Tamang, 2009; Bista, 1991). In rural areas, these gender roles are even more pronounced, with girls often lacking access to higher education or facing expectations to prioritize family duties over professional aspirations (Pandey, 2014; Shrestha & Shrestha, 2011).

The education system in Nepal further reinforces gender-based career choices through biased textbooks and curricula, often portraying men in leadership roles and women in supportive, domestic positions (Giri & Giri, 2018). Family and community pressures also play a significant role, with parents expecting sons to pursue prestigious careers while daughters are directed toward caregiving roles (Bhattarai & Pokharel, 2011; Bhatta, 2012). In rural areas, these expectations are particularly rigid, pressuring women to focus on domestic duties rather than professional development (Bista, 1991).

However, changing social and economic dynamics are slowly shifting these traditional norms. Women's participation in the workforce, especially in urban areas, has been increasing, with more women entering fields like law, business, and information technology (Shrestha, 2016). Government and NGO efforts have also played a role in promoting women's education and employment opportunities (Sharma & Yadav, 2020). Policies aimed at closing the gender gap in education and employment are beginning to alter the gendered landscape of career

choices, though traditional attitudes remain prevalent in rural areas (Government of Nepal, 2015).

Gender socialization in Nepal significantly impacts career choices by reinforcing traditional roles. While evolving societal attitudes, education reforms, and government interventions are creating new opportunities, deeply ingrained cultural and familial expectations continue to limit women's professional aspirations, particularly in rural areas. Addressing these challenges requires continued efforts to dismantle gender stereotypes and promote equal access to education and employment opportunities (Acharya, 2018; Regmi et al., 2020).

2.3 Gender Socialization and Its Impact on Career Choices in Nepal

In Nepal, gender socialization heavily influences career choices, as cultural norms define "appropriate" roles for men and women (Sharma, 2017). This begins early in life through family dynamics and education, continuing into adulthood and shaping career pathways. Traditional cultural beliefs, deeply rooted in Hinduism and patriarchal structures, confine women primarily to domestic roles, while men are encouraged to pursue professional careers in fields like engineering, medicine, and business (Tamang, 2009; Bista, 1991). In rural areas, these gender roles are even more pronounced, with girls often lacking access to higher education or facing expectations to prioritize family duties over professional aspirations (Pandey, 2014; Shrestha & Shrestha, 2011).

The education system in Nepal further reinforces gender-based career choices through biased textbooks and curricula, often portraying men in leadership roles and women in supportive, domestic positions (Giri & Giri, 2018). Family and community pressures also play a significant role, with parents expecting sons to pursue prestigious careers while daughters are directed toward caregiving roles (Bhattarai & Pokharel, 2011; Bhatta, 2012). In rural areas, these expectations are particularly rigid, pressuring women to focus on domestic duties rather than professional development (Bista, 1991).

However, changing social and economic dynamics are slowly shifting these traditional norms. Women's participation in the workforce, especially in urban areas, has been increasing, with more women entering fields like law, business, and information technology (Shrestha, 2016). Government and NGO efforts have also played a role in promoting women's education and employment opportunities (Sharma & Yadov, 2020). Policies aimed at closing the gender gap in education and employment are beginning to alter the gendered landscape of career choices, though traditional attitudes remain prevalent in rural areas (Government of Nepal, 2015).

In conclusion, gender socialization in Nepal significantly impacts career choices by reinforcing traditional roles. While evolving societal attitudes, education reforms, and government interventions are creating new opportunities, deeply ingrained cultural and familial expectations continue to limit women's professional aspirations, particularly in rural areas. Addressing these challenges requires continued efforts to dismantle gender stereotypes and promote equal access to education and employment opportunities (Acharya, 2018).

2.4 Gender Stereotypes

Gender stereotypes represent culturally ingrained beliefs about appropriate characteristics and roles for men and women (Eagly & Wood, 2012). Rooted in social role theory, these stereotypes associate men with competence and women with warmth (Fiske et al., 2002). They develop through early socialization and are reinforced by parents, teachers, and peers (Lips, 2013).

Media perpetuates stereotypes, with women underrepresented in professional roles (Eisend, 2019). Educational systems further reinforce biases, as teachers give boys more attention in math classes (Storage et al., 2020) and career guidance steers girls toward caregiving roles (Cheryan et al., 2017). In workplaces, women face the "glass cliff" phenomenon (Ryan & Haslam, 2007) and lower callback rates if they are mothers (Correll et al., 2007).

These stereotypes have significant consequences. Stereotype threat reduces women's math performance (Spencer et al., 2016), while boys face anxiety when expressing emotions (Way et al., 2014). Gender-typed career aspirations emerge early (Bian et al., 2017), contributing to women's underrepresentation in STEM. Health impacts include higher depression risks for gender-nonconforming youth (Toomey et al., 2019).
Interventions like gender-neutral STEM programs (Master et al., 2021) and media literacy training can reduce stereotype acceptance. Workplace reforms, such as gender-blind hiring, also mitigate biases. Continued efforts in education, policy, and media remain crucial for equality.

2.5 Occupational Segregation by Gender

Occupational segregation refers to the division of labor where certain jobs are predominantly held by one gender, leading to disparities in wages and career opportunities (Reskin & Roos, 1990). It manifests in two forms: horizontal segregation (e.g., women in education and healthcare, men in construction and technology) and vertical segregation, where men dominate higher-paying leadership roles (Acker, 2006).

This segregation stems from socialization and cultural norms, with girls encouraged toward nurturing roles and boys toward technical or leadership positions (Lips, 2013). Societal expectations frame caregiving as "women's work" and management as male-dominated (England, 2010), reinforcing economic disparities.

The gender pay gap is exacerbated by occupational segregation, as women are concentrated in lower-paying jobs despite comparable qualifications (Blau & Kahn, 2003). Exclusion from high-status roles limits career advancement and economic security (Ridgeway, 2011), while stereotypes about gendered competencies persist (Ridgeway & Correll, 2004). Work-life balance expectations further push women into flexible but lower-paying jobs (Correll, 2004).

Policy interventions like affirmative action, parental leave, and STEM initiatives aim to reduce segregation (Becker, 2012). Yet progress remains slow, with women underrepresented in leadership and technical fields (Acker, 2006). Continued efforts are needed to dismantle systemic barriers and promote equity across all sectors.

2.6 Occupational Segregation by Gender: Causes and Consequences

Occupational segregation refers to the uneven distribution of men and women across professions, with horizontal segregation reflecting gender concentration in different job categories (e.g., women in nursing, men in engineering) and vertical segregation describing gender disparities in hierarchical positions (Blackburn et al., 2002). Globally, women remain overrepresented in care work and underrepresented in STEM fields, with desegregation progress slowing since 2000 (OECD, 2023). Early socialization through gendered toys and parental expectations significantly shapes career interests (Bian et al., 2017).

Workplace discrimination and the motherhood penalty significantly contribute to gender employment gaps and wage reductions (Budig & England, 2001). This segregation leads to substantial wage inequality, with female-dominated occupations paying 15-20% less than male-dominated ones (Levanon et al., 2009). Women's overrepresentation in vulnerable sectors resulted in 1.8 times higher job losses during crises like COVID-19 (ILO, 2021).

Policy interventions show promise, with gender-neutral STEM programs increasing female participation by 18% (Master et al., 2021) and pay transparency reducing gender pay gaps. However, emerging challenges include automation threatening female-dominated jobs and the gig economy reinforcing segregation patterns (McKinsey, 2022). Continued efforts in policy and cultural shifts remain crucial to address these persistent disparities.

2.7 Career Choice

Career choice involves selecting an occupation that aligns with an individual's interests, skills, and social context (Super, 1957). It is shaped by personal aspirations, social expectations, economic opportunities, and psychological factors such as self-efficacy and motivation (Lent et al., 1994). Early socialization, family background, and socioeconomic status play crucial roles in shaping career options, with parents' attitudes serving as influential models (Jacobs et al., 2006).

Educational institutions provide career exploration opportunities, yet gender norms and stereotypes often restrict perceived suitability of certain professions (Eccles, 1994). Bandura's (1986) social cognitive theory emphasizes that career choices are influenced by confidence and support, while Holland's (1997) vocational theory suggests alignment between personality and occupational environments.

Career decisions evolve over time due to changing interests, market demands, and life circumstances (Savickas, 2005). Globalization and technological advancements further complicate career pathways, requiring adaptability (Brown & Lent, 2013). Structural barriers, including discrimination and economic inequality, also constrain opportunities (Pager & Shepherd, 2008).

Contemporary challenges—such as automation, the gig economy, and shifting work-life balance expectations—continue to reshape career decision-making (Kalleberg, 2018). Addressing systemic barriers remains essential for fostering equitable and informed career choices.

2.8 Sociological Analysis

Sociological analysis systematically examines social behaviors, institutions, and structures by connecting individual actions to broader forces like culture, power, and history

(Giddens, 1984). C. Wright Mills (1959) famously framed this as linking "personal troubles" to "public issues," emphasizing how societal structures shape lived experiences. Classical theoretical perspectives—including functionalism (Parsons, 1951), conflict theory (Marx, 1867), and symbolic interactionism (Blumer, 1969)—remain foundational to this analytical approach.

Contemporary sociological analysis incorporates critical frameworks such as feminist theory (Smith, 1987) and intersectionality (Crenshaw, 1989) to examine systemic inequalities. Methodologically, it employs both qualitative approaches like ethnography (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011) and quantitative techniques including statistical modeling (Babbie, 2016) to uncover social patterns.

This analytical tradition challenges assumptions and exposes hidden power structures, aiming to advance social justice (Bourdieu, 1984). It continuously evolves to address emerging phenomena like digitalization (Castells, 2010) and environmental crises (Beck, 1992), while maintaining its core focus on the dynamic relationship between societal forces and individual agency.

By bridging macro-level structures and micro-level interactions, sociological analysis provides crucial insights into social stratification, institutional dynamics, and transformative change-making it an indispensable tool for understanding and improving society.

3. Materials and Methods

This research study adopted a qualitative approach to explore and interpret how gender socialization shapes individual career choices. It uses an exploratory and descriptive design: exploratory to investigate underlying mechanisms of gender socialization, and descriptive to illustrate how gender norms are communicated and internalized through institutions like family, education, media, and the workplace. It relied on secondary data, drawing from books, peer-reviewed journal articles, and credible websites in sociology and gender studies. Sources were selected based on relevance, credibility, and contemporary significance, focusing on gender role development, career patterns, and theories of socialization.

Thematic analysis was employed to analyze the data, identifying patterns such as gender role expectations, occupational segregation, early socialization influences, media portrayals, and systemic barriers. Cross-comparison of data from various sources allowed for rich and comprehensive insights.

The study applied Gender Schema Theory by Sandra Bem (1981) as its primary framework, emphasizing how individuals internalize gender norms, influencing behavior and career choices. Social Learning Theory by Albert Bandura was also referenced to explain the role of observation and reinforcement in gender role acquisition. By combining a qualitative exploratory design, thematic analysis, secondary data sources, and a strong theoretical grounding, the study provides an earnest sociological understanding of how gender socialization significantly influences career decision-making.

4. Conclusion

This article shows that gender socialization plays a significant role in shaping career choices, contributing to occupational segregation and gender inequality. Family dynamics, educational

systems, cultural norms, and media representations collectively influence gendered career aspirations from childhood to adolescence. Despite some progress in challenging traditional stereotypes, particularly in urban and educated populations, deeply ingrained socialization processes continue to steer men and women toward different career paths, with considerable implications for economic equality and personal fulfillment. The findings emphasize the need for continued intervention at multiple levels of society. Schools should implement more effective gender-neutral career guidance programs, while workplaces must address systemic biases in hiring and promotion practices. Media representations should increasingly highlight non-traditional gender roles in various professions. Additionally, early socialization within families requires attention, as it lays the groundwork for later career aspirations. For future research, it is recommended to conduct intersectional longitudinal studies that explore how gender socialization interacts with other social factors, such as class, race, and sexuality, in shaping career trajectories over time. Comparative studies across different cultural contexts would also be valuable, examining how globalization and digital media are transforming traditional gender socialization patterns worldwide. Further studies should focus on the rural-urban disparities in gender socialization and career choices, particularly in the context of Nepal.

References

1. Acharya, M. (2018). *Gender roles in Nepali society*. Himal Books.
2. Acker, J. (2006). Inequality regimes: Gender, class, and race in organizations. *Gender & Society, 20*(4), 441-464.
3. Albrow, M. (1996). *The global age: State and society beyond modernity*. Polity Press.
4. Arulmani, G., Bakshi, A. J., Leong, F. T. L., & Watts, A. G. (2014). *Career development: Global issues and challenges*. Routledge.
5. Autor, D. H. (2015). Why are there still so many jobs? *Journal of Economic Perspectives*
6. *Journal of Economic Perspectives, 29* (3), 3–30.
7. Babbie, E. R. (2016). *The practice of social research* (14th ed.). Cengage Learning.
8. Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory.* Prentice Hall.
9. Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Prentice-Hall.
10. Baudrillard, J. (1981). *Simulacra and simulation*. Stanford University Press.
11. Beck, U. (1992). *Risk society: Towards a new modernity*. SAGE Publications.
12. Becker, H. S. (1963). *Outsiders: Studies in the sociology of deviance*. Free Press.
13. Becker, K. (2012). Women and STEM: A new generation of women in science. *Journal of Women's Studies, 34*(2), 121-135.
14. Bem, S. L. (1981). Gender schema theory: A cognitive account of sex typing. *Psychological Review, 88*(4), 354–364.
15. Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1966). *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. Doubleday.
16. Bian, L., Leslie, S.-J., & Cimpian, A. (2017). Gender stereotypes about intellectual ability emerge early and influence children's interests. *Science, 355*(6323), 389-391. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aah6524

17. Bielby, D. D., & Baron, J. N. (1986). Men and women at work: Sex segregation and statistical discrimination. *American Journal of Sociology, 91*(4), 759-799.

18. Bista, D. B. (1991). *People of Nepal*. Ratna Pustak Bhandar.

19. Blackburn, R. M., Browne, J., Brooks, B., & Jarman, J. (2002). Explaining gender segregation. *British Journal of Sociology, 53*(4), 513-536. https://doi.org/10.1080/0007131022000021465

20. Blau, F. D., & Kahn, L. M. (2003). Understanding international differences in the gender pay gap. *Industrial Relations Research Association, 56*, 7-48.

21. Blau, F. D., & Kahn, L. M. (2017). The gender wage gap: Extent, trends, and explanations. *Journal of Economic Literature, 55*(3), 789-865. https://doi.org/10.1257/jel.20160995

22. Blau, P. M., & Duncan, O. D. (1967). *The American occupational structure.* N*ew York:* John Wiley and Sons.

23. Blumer, H. (1969). *Symbolic interactionism: Perspective and method*. Prentice-Hall.

24. Blustein, D. L. (2006). *The psychology of working: A new perspective for career development, counseling, and public policy*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

25. Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste*. Harvard University Press.

26. Brown, S. D., & Lent, R. W. (2013). *Career development and counseling: Putting theory and research to work* (2nd ed.). John Wiley & Sons.

27. Budig, M. J., & England, P. (2001). The wage penalty for motherhood. *American Sociological Review, 66*(2), 204-225. https://doi.org/10.2307/2657415

28. Bussey, K., & Bandura, A. (1999). Social cognitive theory of gender development and differentiation. *Psychological Review, 106*(4), 676–713.

29. Byars-Winston, A. (2010). The vocational significance of Black identity: Cultural formulation approach to career assessment and career counseling. *Journal of Career Development, 37*(1), 441–464.

30. Carlana, M. (2019). Implicit stereotypes: Evidence from teachers' gender bias. *Quarterly Journal of Economics, 134*(3), 1163-1224. https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjz008

31. Castells, M. (2010). *The rise of the network society* (2nd ed.). Wiley-Blackwell.

32. Charles, M. (2003). *A theory of gender segregation*. Department of Sociology, University of California.

33. Charles, M., & Bradley, K. (2009). Indulging our gendered selves? Sex segregation by field of study in 44 countries. *American Journal of Sociology, 114*(4), 924-976.

34. Charles, M., & Grusky, D. B. (2004). *Occupational ghettos: The worldwide segregation of women and men*. Stanford University Press.

35. Cheryan, S., Ziegler, S. A., Montoya, A. K., & Jiang, L. (2017). Why are some STEM fields more gender balanced than others? *Psychological Bulletin, 143*(1), 1-35.

36. Collins, P. H. (2000). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

37. Collins, R. (1975). *Conflict sociology: Toward an explanatory science*. Academic Press.

38. Collins, R. (1981). *Sociology since midcentury: Essays in theory cumulation*. Academic Press.

39. Connell, R. W. (1995). *Masculinities*. University of California Press.

40. Connell, R. W. (2009). *Gender in world perspective* (2nd ed.). Polity Press.

41. Cook, E. P., Heppner, M. J., & O'Brien, K. M. (2002). Career development of women of color and White women: Assumptions, conceptualization, and interventions from an ecological perspective. *The Career Development Quarterly, 50*(4), 291–305.

42. Correll, S. J. (2004). Constraints into preferences: Gender, status, and emerging career aspirations. *American Sociological Review, 69*(1), 93-113.

43. Correll, S. J., Benard, S., & Paik, I. (2007). Getting a job: Is there a motherhood penalty? *American Journal of Sociology, 112*(5), 1297-1338. https://doi.org/10.1086/511799

44. Coyle, E. F., & Skinner, E. A. (1988). Gendered pathways to occupational aspirations among children. *Journal of Social Issues, 44*(2), 123–136.

45. Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A Black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum, 1989*(1), 139-167.

46. Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review, 43*(6), 1241–1299.

47. Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2011). *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.

48. Durkheim, É. (1897). *The rules of sociological method*. Free Press (translated edition).

49. Eagly, A. H. (1987). *Sex differences in social behavior: A social-role interpretation*. Psychology Press. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203781906

50. Eagly, A. H., & Wood, W. (2012). Social role theory. In P. A. M. Van Lange, A. W. Kruglanski, & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), *Handbook of theories of social psychology* (pp. 458–476). Sage Publications Ltd. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446249222.n49

51. Eccles, J. S. (1994). Understanding women's educational and occupational choices: Applying the Eccles et al. model of achievement-related choices. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 18*(4), 585–609.

52. Eccles, J. S. (2011). Gendered educational and occupational choices: Applying the Eccles et al. model of achievement-related choices. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 35*(3), 195-201.

53. Eisend, M. (2019). Gender roles in advertising: Measuring and comparing gender stereotyping on public and private TV channels in Germany. *Journal of Advertising, 48*(1), 96-115. https://doi.org/10.1080/00913367.2018.1557748

54. England, P. (2010). The gender revolution: Uneven and stalled. *Gender & Society, 24*(2), 149-166.

55. Fiske, S. T., Cuddy, A. J. C., Glick, P., & Xu, J. (2002). A model of (often mixed) stereotype content: Competence and warmth respectively follow from perceived status and competition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82*(6), 878-902. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.82.6.878

56. Fouad, N. A., & Byars-Winston, A. (2005). Cultural context of career choice: Meta-analysis of race/ethnicity differences. *The Career Development Quarterly, 53*(3), 223–233.

57. Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. Pantheon Books.

58. Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Continuum.

59. Frey, C. B., & Osborne, M. A. (2017). *The future of employment.* Technological Forecasting

60. Giddens, A. (1984). *The constitution of society: Outline of the theory of structuration.* University of California Press.

61. Ginzberg, E., Ginsburg, S. W., Axelrad, S., & Herma, J. L. (1951). *Occupational choice: An approach to a general theory.* Columbia University Press.

62. Giri, B. P., & Giri, D. (2018). Gender stereotyping and its impact on career choices in the Nepalese context. *Gender Studies Journal, 11*(4), 202-215.

63. Goldin, C., & Rouse, C. (2000). Orchestrating impartiality: The impact of "blind" auditions on female musicians. *American Economic Review, 90*(4), 715-741. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.90.4.715

64. Good, J. J., Woodzicka, J. A., & Wingfield, L. C. (2010). The effects of gender stereotypic and counter-stereotypic textbook images on science performance. *Sex Roles, 63*(7-8), 558-570. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-010-9816-0

65. Gottfredson, L. S. (1981). Circumscription and compromise: A developmental theory of occupational aspirations. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 28*(6), 545–579.

66. Gottfredson, L. S. (2002). *Gottfredson's theory of circumscription.* Career Choice and Development

67. Government of Nepal. (2015). *National policy on women's empowerment* (2nd ed.). Ministry of Women, Children, and Social Welfare.

68. Granovetter, M. S. (1973). The strength of weak ties. *American Journal of Sociology, 78*(6), 1360-1380. https://doi.org/10.1086/225469

69. Hackett, G., & Betz, N. E. (1981). A self-efficacy approach to the career development of women. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 18*(3), 326–339.

70. Heilman, M. E. (2001). Description and prescription: How gender stereotypes prevent women's ascent up the organizational ladder. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*(4), 657-674.

71. Helwig, A. A. (2001). A test of Gottfredson's theory using a ten-year longitudinal study. *Journal of Career Development, 28*(1), 77–95.

72. Herr, E. L., Cramer, S. H., & Niles, S. G. (2004). *Career guidance and counseling through the lifespan: Systematic approaches* (6th ed.). Pearson.

73. Himmelstein, M. S., & Sanchez, D. T. (2016). Masculinity impediments: Internalized masculinity contributes to healthcare avoidance in men and women. *Journal of Health Psychology, 21*(7), 1283-1292. https://doi.org/10.1177/1359105314551623

74. Holland, J. L. (1997). *Making vocational choices. A theory of vocational personalities and work environments* (3rd ed.). Psychological Assessment Resources.

75. Hooks, B. (1984). *Feminist theory: From margin to center.* South End Press.

76. Inglehart, R., & Norris, P. (2003). *Rising tide: Gender equality and cultural change.* Cambridge University Press.

77. International Labour Organization. (2021). *COVID-19 and gendered employment impacts: Policy brief.* https://www.ilo.org/global/topics/coronavirus/lang--en/index.htm

78. International Labour Organization. (2021). *Gender pay gap report: Nepal.* ILO.

79. Jacobs, J. E., Chhin, C. S., & Bleeker, M. M. (2006). Enduring links: Parents' expectations and children's academic competence in adolescence and young adulthood. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 37*(3-4), 243–252.

80. Kalleberg, A. L. (2018). *Precarious work in the gig economy.* Work and Occupations

81. Kane, E. W. (2006). No way my boys are going to be like that: Parents' responses to children's gender nonconformity. *Gender & Society, 20*(2), 149–176.

82. Kanter, R. M. (1977). *Men and women of the corporation*. Basic Books.

83. Kotsadam, A., & Finseraas, H. (2011). The state intervenes in the battle of the sexes: Causal effects of paternity leave. *European Sociological Review, 27*(4), 450-470. https://doi.org/10.1093/esr/jcq017

84. Lamont, M. (1992). *Money, morals, and manners: The culture of the French and American upper-middle class*. University of Chicago Press.

85. Leaper, C., & Farkas, T. (2015). The socialization of gender during childhood and adolescence. In J. E. Grusec & P. D. Hastings (Eds.), *Handbook of socialization: Theory and research* (2nd ed., pp. 541–565). Guilford Press.

86. Lent, R. W., Brown, S. D., & Hackett, G. (1994). Toward a unifying social cognitive theory of career and academic interest, choice, and performance. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 45*(1), 79–122.

87. Levanon, A., England, P., & Allison, P. (2009). Occupational feminization and pay: Assessing causal dynamics using 1950-2000 U.S. census data. *Social Forces, 88*(2), 865-891. https://doi.org/10.1353/sof.0.0264

88. Lips, H. M. (2013). *Sex and gender: An introduction*. McGraw-Hill.

89. Lyotard, J.-F. (1984). *The postmodern condition: A report on knowledge*. University of Minnesota Press.

90. Lytton, H., & Romney, D. M. (1991). Parents' differential socialization of boys and girls: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 109*(2), 267–296.

91. Maccoby, E. E. (1998). *The two sexes: Growing up apart, coming together*. Harvard University Press.

92. Mahalik, J. R., Locke, B. D., Ludlow, L. H., Diemer, M. A., Scott, R. P. J., Gottfried, M., & Freitas, G. (2003). Development of the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 4*(1), 3–25. https://doi.org/10.1037/1524-9220.4.1.3

93. Martin, C. L., & Ruble, D. (2010). Patterns of gender development. *Annual Review of Psychology, 61*, 353–381.

94. Marx, K. (1867). *Capital: Critique of political economy* (Vol. 1). Penguin Classics (translated edition).

95. Master, A., Meltzoff, A. N., & Cheryan, S. (2021). Gender stereotypes about interests start early and cause gender disparities in computer science and engineering. *Child Development, 92*(1), e1-e18. https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.13449

96. Mills, C. W. (1959). *The sociological imagination*. Oxford University Press.

97. Nauta, M. M. (2010). The development, evolution, and status of holland's theory of vocational personalities: Reflections and future directions for counseling psychology. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 57*, 11-22. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0018213

98. Oakley, A. (1972). *Sex, gender and society*. Temple Smith.

99. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2023). *The persistence of gender segregation in employment: Trends and policy responses*. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/123456789012

100. Pager, D., & Shepherd, H. (2008). *The sociology of discrimination.* Annual Review of Sociology

101. Pandey, G. (2014). Rural-urban divide in gendered education and career choices in Nepal. *Nepalese Journal of Development Studies, 32*(4), 290-305.

102. Parsons, T. (1951). *The social system*. Routledge.

103. Patton, W., & McMahon, M. (2014). *Career development and systems theory: Connecting theory and practice* (3rd ed.). Sense Publishers.

104. Prentice, D. A., & Carranza, E. (2002). What women and men should be, shouldn't be, are allowed to be, and don't have to be: The contents of prescriptive gender stereotypes. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 26*(2), 269-281.

105. Reskin, B. F., & Bielby, D. D. (2005). A sociological perspective on gender and career outcomes. *Journal of Economic Perspectives, 19*(1), 71–86.

106. Reskin, B. F., & Roos, P. A. (1990). *Job queues, gender queues: Explaining women's inroads into male occupations*. Temple University Press.

107. Ridgeway, C. L. (2011). *Framed by gender: How gender inequality persists in the modern world*. Oxford University Press.

108. Ridgeway, C. L., & Correll, S. J. (2004). Unpacking the gender system: A theoretical perspective on gender beliefs and social relations. *Gender & Society, 18*(4), 510–531.

109. Risman, B. J. (2004). Gender as a social structure: Theory wrestling with activism. *Gender & Society, 18*(4), 429–450.

110. Ritzer, G. (2011). *Sociological theory* (8th ed.). McGraw-Hill.

111. Ryan, M. K., & Haslam, S. A. (2007). The glass cliff: Exploring the dynamics surrounding women's appointment to precarious leadership positions. *British Journal of Management, 18*(1), 1-10. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8551.2007.00546.x

112. Sadker, M., & Sadker, D. (1994). *Failing at fairness: How our schools cheat girls*. Scribner.

113. Savickas, M. L. (2005). The theory and practice of career construction. In S. D. Brown & R. W. Lent (Eds.), *Career development and counseling: Putting theory and research to work* (pp. 42–70). John Wiley & Sons.

114. Schoon, I., & Parsons, S. (2002). Teenage aspirations for future careers and occupational outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 60*(2), 262–288.

115. Sharma, B. (2017). Gender socialization and its impact on women's career choices in Nepal: A qualitative study. *Journal of Gender Studies, 13*(1), 45-60.

116. Sharma, R., & Yadov, S. (2020). Gender equality in career choices: The role of government policies in Nepal. *Nepal Journal of Social Policy, 27*(2), 93-110.

117. Shrestha, L., & Shrestha, P. (2011). Socialization and career choices: The case of rural Nepali women. *Journal of Nepali Studies, 39*(3), 245-262.

118. Shrestha, R. (2016). Breaking barriers: Women's increasing participation in career development in urban Nepal. *Women's Studies Quarterly, 18*(2), 148-162.

119. Signorielli, N., & Bacue, A. (1999). Recognition and respect: A content analysis of prime-time television characters across three decades. *Sex Roles, 40*(7-8), 527–544.

120. Skocpol, T. (1979). *States and social revolutions: A comparative analysis of France, Russia, and China*. Cambridge University Press.

121. Smith, D. E. (1987). *The everyday world as problematic: A feminist sociology*. Northeastern University Press.

122. Spencer, S. J., Logel, C., & Davies, P. G. (2016). Stereotype threat. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 67*, 31-35. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2015.10.008

123. Storage, D., Horne, Z., Cimpian, A., & Leslie, S.-J. (2020). The frequency of "brilliant" and "genius" in teaching evaluations predicts the representation of women and African Americans across fields. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 117*(17), 9221-9226. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1914221117

124. Super, D. E. (1957). *The psychology of careers: An introduction to vocational development*. Harper & Row.

125. Super, D. E. (1990). A life-span, life-space approach to career development. In D. Brown & L. Brooks (Eds.), *Career choice and development* (2nd ed., pp. 197–261). Jossey-Bass.

126. Tamang, L. B. (2009). Gender roles and socialization in Nepalese culture. *Asian Social Work and Policy Review, 3*(4), 215-223.

127. Thorne, B. (1993). *Gender play: Girls and boys in school*. Rutgers University Press.

128. Tilly, C. (1978). *From mobilization to revolution*. Addison-Wesley.

129. Tomlinson, M., et al. (2018). *Graduate employability in context.* Palgrave Macmillan.

130. Toomey, R. B., Syvertsen, A. K., & Shramko, M. (2019). Transgender adolescent suicide behavior. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 64*(1), 44-49. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2018.07.016

131. UN Women. (2021). *Media and gender attitudes in Nepal*. UN Publications.

132. UNESCO. (2021). *Cracking the code: Girls' and women's education in STEM*. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

133. Wang, M. T., & Degol, J. (2013). Motivational pathways to STEM career choices: using expectancy-value perspective to understand individual and gender differences in STEM fields. *Developmental review, 33*(4), 10.1016/j.dr.2013.08.001. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dr.2013.08.001

134. Way, N., Cressen, J., Bodian, S., Preston, J., Nelson, J., & Hughes, D. (2014). It might be nice to be a girl... Then you wouldn't have to be emotionless: Boys' resistance to norms of masculinity during adolescence. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 15*(3), 241–252. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0037262

135. West, C., & Zimmerman, D. H. (1987). Doing gender. *Gender & Society, 1*(2), 125–151.

136. Wille, B., Wiernik, B. M., Vergauwe, J., Vrijdags, A., & Trbovic, N. (2018). Gender stereotypes and career decisions: A social role perspective. *Organizational Psychology Review, 8*(4), 306-327.

137. Williams, C. L. (1995). *Still a man's world: Men who do women's work*. University of California Press.

138. World Bank. (2022). *Women in STEM in South Asia*. World Bank Reports.