

Organizational, Economic or Cultural? Firm-Side Barriers to Employing Women in Saudi Arabia

Claudia Eger^{*1}, Thiemo Fetzer², Jennifer Peck³, and Saleh Alodayni⁴

¹Department of Management, Politics and Philosophy, Copenhagen Business School

²Department of Economics, University of Warwick

³Department of Economics, Swarthmore College

⁴Department of Economics, College of Business Administration, King Saud University

July 26, 2021

Abstract

All-male firms are common around the world, particularly in the Middle East, North Africa, and South Asia, where local norms often favor gender segregation. The integration of women into these previously all-male firms is an important driver of growth in economic opportunity for women. However, the determinants of firm integration decisions are complex and engage a broad set of issues including leadership priorities and beliefs, physical workspace constraints, organizational structure, regulatory compliance, and labor costs. We systematically analyze the results of a survey of firm owners and hiring managers in Saudi Arabia on the barriers to integrating women into the workplace. We show that the personal characteristics and subjective beliefs of managers are a key determinant of whether a firm hires women. Other tangible costs or operational constraints to female hiring are second-order in a statistical sense. The results suggest that shifting perceptions of hiring managers and business owners can be an important driver of increased female economic participation.

JEL Codes: J16, J23, J71, O53

^{*}ceg.mpp@cbs.dk, T.Fetzer@warwick.ac.uk, jpeck1@swarthmore.edu, and salodayni@ksu.edu.sa. We thank Samia Sekkarie and seminar participants at the World Bank and Swarthmore for helpful comments. This research was sponsored by a grant from the Evidence for Policy Design program at the Harvard Kennedy School and the Human Resources Development Fund of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

1 Introduction

All-male firms are common around the world, particularly in the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) and South Asia. In these regions, 48.1% and 49.9% of medium manufacturing firms (20-99 employees) and 22.7% and 28.6% of large manufacturing firms (100+ employees) are all male.¹ These all-male firms are more common than female employment rates would imply, and previous research suggests that this is due to *integration costs*: fixed, one-time costs associated with hiring women for the first time (Miller et al., 2021). Barriers to hiring women may have significant implications for female labor demand, and present a first-order constraint to increasing economic opportunity for women. Addressing these barriers is key to advancing gender equality in the labor market, where gaps in employment outcomes have been particularly persistent (Klasen, 2020).

There are many types of costs that firms may face when employing women for the first time (International Finance Corporation, 2013; World Bank, 2018). These include capital investments as well as organizational restructuring, learning by doing, and changes in corporate culture. Firms may face costs associated with learning to comply with gendered regulations around women's work (see e.g. Hyland et al. (2020b); Islam et al. (2019)). There may also be costs associated with accessing a new segment of the labor market: non-integrated firms may need to adapt their recruiting strategies and develop new HR policies to support an integrated workforce. Firms may also need to adjust their organizational structure in order to accommodate women. This could include restructuring tasks across job titles, adjusting working hours to comply with gendered regulations, or adjusting their targeted qualifications to include degrees and experience available to women. Integration costs appear to be particularly important in countries with strong norms around gender mixing (Hyland et al., 2020b). In these contexts there may also be costs associated with providing gender-separated physical workspaces as well as responding to the preferences of female staff. These factors all generate a set of costly investments that firms must undertake to gain the *ability* to hire and retain female workers. These costs create barriers to hiring (more) women for all-male firms but not (or to a much lesser extent) for firms that have already integrated.

In this paper, we examine firm-level integration in Saudi Arabia, a place where norms around gender segregation are particularly explicit and where women's employment has been historically very low. In this context, strong cultural preferences for gender segregation make navigating mixed-gender workplaces difficult for firms. Laws around women's employment and

¹World Bank Enterprise Survey, 2006-2018. Calculations from Miller et al. (2019).

mixed-gender interactions have also created barriers to integration.² Since 2011, however, a slate of legal and social reforms have corresponded with remarkable growth in women's employment. Policy initiatives like the *Nitaqat* nationalization quotas yielded large increases in the Saudi private sector workforce, with significant employment effects for Saudi women (Peck, 2017). The Retail Employment Decrees and the Hafiz program have also drawn large numbers of women into the private sector (Evidence for Policy Design, 2015). Updates to the guardianship system and a lifting of the female driving ban in 2018 have also made women more mobile and increased access to public spaces (Embassy of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, 2019). As a result, Saudi firms have begun hiring women in unprecedented numbers over the last decade, with private sector female employment increasing from just 71,000 in mid-2011 to 592,000 by 2018. Much of this increase was driven by previously all-male firms hiring women for the first time (Miller et al., 2021). Nonetheless, many firms face significant barriers to hiring women, and all-male firms are still very common: around 40 percent of Saudi private sector firms have no female employees.

There have been significant legal reforms around women's rights in the workplace over the period following our study. Between August 2019 and the end of 2020, legislative reforms significantly expanded women's mobility, increased access to public services, eliminated sectoral restrictions on women's work, allowed night shift work, prohibited dismissal of pregnant workers, criminalized sexual harassment and guaranteed equal pay and retirement benefits (World Bank, 2020, 2021). The World Bank's *Women, Business and the Law* Index, which measures gender equality of legal rights related to work, increased Saudi Arabia's indicator from 25.6/100 in 2019 to 80/100 in 2021, one of the largest global increases over the period World Bank (2021). While the pace of legal reform has been remarkably fast, social norms tend to be slower to adjust (see e.g. Islam et al. (2019); Hyland et al. (2020a)). Gender norms also play a key role in shaping attitudes toward women's empowerment more broadly, especially with regards to access to employment (Eger et al., 2018; Eger, 2021).³ Even with these recent legal updates, it is likely that barriers associated with social norms and cultural expectations will persist.

This study explores the main barriers to hiring women through a survey of owners and hiring

²In early 2019, for example, MLSD released a "Women in the Workplace" initiative providing a series of clarifications and updates to women's employment regulations, some of which presented new organizational barriers to employing women (Arab News, 2019). The initiative explicitly allowed mixed-gender work shifts only if at least two female employees were present. The regulation excluded women from jobs deemed dangerous, provided updated curfews for night work, and prohibited work at male-only facilities and in certain types of jobs (e.g. housekeeping) at mixed-gender facilities. The law further required that employers ensure female employees were comfortable in the workplace, provide separate cubicles for women if desired, provide separate toilet areas and prayer rooms for women, and provide adequate personal security for female workers.

³Evidence suggests that norms persist also in times of economic change. Luke and Munshi (2011) and others have called for increasing research that reliably assesses gender norms and attitudes to advance effective policy interventions. See e.g. Breuer and Asiedu (2017); Dildar (2015); de Haan et al. (2020); Nillesen et al. (2021); Seguino (2011).

managers in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. The survey was designed based on the findings of extensive qualitative fieldwork and collected data on a variety of firm features and manager perceptions, including interest in hiring women, perceptions of women as employees, issues in recruiting and retention, and organizational strategies for integrated workplaces. Managers were also asked about the role of government in regulation and support for employing women. The survey instrument was developed around this broad employment journey and the various stages of the recruitment process.

There were many areas of consensus across surveyed firms, revealing both support for women's employment as well as a remarkably consistent reflection of prevailing gender norms. We find that almost all firms face significant workforce issues, and that many are interested in hiring (more) women. Firms were more or less evenly split on the overall costs of employing women on a per-worker basis: almost all firms agreed that wages were lower for female employees, but many also expected increased costs associated with childcare. Respondents were uniformly concerned about retention of female employees, and many expected that these workers were likely to be recruited away by other firms.

There was strong agreement across firms about what types of tasks were appropriate for female employees and what personal characteristics were important for women. These opinions were consistent with the cultural context, and while many tasks were considered acceptable most tasks that involved unrestricted gender-mixing were seen as inappropriate. Firms reported struggling to provide acceptable workspaces for their Saudi employees. Although fully gender-segregated workplaces had been a standard model in the past, most felt that complete gender segregation was neither necessary nor desirable. Firms appear to navigate the regulatory landscape around mixed-gender workspaces well. While integrated firms reported feeling somewhat burdened by workspace regulations, most reported that this did not present problems. Firms did not report an out-sized number of inspections (or indeed any fines) related to employing women.

We then analyze the key differences between integrated and non-integrated firms in the survey data using a hands-off approach. Conceptually speaking, we want to assess to what extent the structure of the responses that we received from the respondents enable us to distinguish between those firms that employ women and those that do not. We find that the features that are best able to identify firms that employ women are measures of the respondent perceptions of qualities or traits of women, the perceived cultural appropriateness of specific tasks to be performed by women along with the respondent's own demographics. Features that may more directly speak to the tangible costs to firms to employ women appear to have much weaker statistical power. This suggests that policy interventions aimed at alleviating or moderating some

of the (potential) tangible female integration costs may be less effective in increasing female employment than interventions that shift the perceptions of (human resource) managers towards women or encourage demographic change in the management of companies.

This work adds to the broader literature on how social and cultural norms can constrain women's employment opportunities, particularly in countries with strong preferences for gender segregation (Jayachandran, 2020, 2015; Nillesen et al., 2021; Seguino, 2011). There is considerable evidence on how gender norms shape labor supply (e.g., Fernandez and Fogli, 2009; Alesina et al., 2013; Fernandez, 2013; Ashraf et al., 2019; Dildar, 2015), and recent work on how these norms can affect labor demand (Miller et al., 2021; Eger, 2021). The mapping of gender norms into individual attitudes, behaviors, and actions is a key area of study. In Saudi Arabia, Bursztyn et al. (2020) show that husbands underestimate the share of their peers that support women's formal employment; correcting these misperceptions leads to increased support for their own wives joining the labor force. LeRoux-Rutledge (2020) argues that traditional gender narratives can be leveraged to advance women's empowerment. Dildar (2015), however, shows that patriarchal norms can have a significant negative effect on women's labor force participation in a study on female labor supply in Turkey. In Norway, Dahl et al. (2018) show that increased exposure to integrated workplaces can change gender attitudes and build support for mixed-gender teams. This study indicates that changing these perceptions can be materially important for increasing labor market opportunities for women, particularly for those in key gatekeeping positions.

The paper also relates to a small stand of literature across disciplines that has studied gender segregation in the workplace. While occupational gender segregation is very common globally (see for example Cohen, 2013; Ecklund et al., 2012; Cha, 2013; Levanon and Grusky, 2016; Skuratowicz and Hunter, 2004), physical segregation in the workplace is quite specific to the MENA region and has been the focus of mostly interdisciplinary work so far. Salem and Yount (2019) use semi-structured interviews in Qatar to explore attitudes towards employment, specifically those related to gender mixing in the workplace. The focus is primarily on understanding female labor supply decisions with the acceptability of gender mixing strongly depending on characteristics of the working woman, the characteristics of the male colleagues and the physical organization of the workplace. A key factor that induces women to seek to limit interactions with men is the overarching objective to protect their reputation, which is seen as critical to maintaining their families' support and their own marriageability. Eger (2021) explores how in the context of Morocco, an honor and shame continuum serves to moralize and mediate gender relations, and in turn, contributes to the institutionalization and perpetuation of gender inequality. Metcalfe (2007, 2008) uses survey data and semi-structured interviews to qualify to what extent Islam

has shaped gender and human resource management policies, suggesting that gender planning should be key to human resource development strategies in the region (Achoui, 2009; Metcalfe, 2011). Empirical data on this topic and analyses, although of central importance to policy development, are scarce. This study provides a unique insight into the features that distinguish firms that employ women relative to firms that do not.

In the rest of the paper, we first describe the development of the survey and the data collection process (section 2). We then present some of the main results of the survey in section 3, focusing on key areas of agreement across firms and outlining the scope for managers to navigate gender norms in the context of their own firms. Section 4 describes the algorithm we use to systematically identify the key patterns of responses that differentiate integrated and non-integrated firms. These results are discussed in section 5 along with their policy implications, followed by the conclusion.

2 Survey Design and Data Collection

2.1 Survey instrument development

The survey was designed based on the findings from fieldwork conducted in 2017 and 2018. This fieldwork consisted of both individual interviews and focus groups: researchers interviewed 54 managers and employees in 33 semi-structured interviews for approximately 75 minutes. These interviewees were selected by purposive sampling and snowballing techniques, with a focus mostly on firms that already had female employees. These interviews were bookended by two focus groups that occurred in 2017 and 2018. These groups were composed of 12 and 20 managers and were each approximately two hours long. Managers came from firms in a variety of sectors, with the first session focusing on medium and large firms and the second on SMEs. The content from the interviews and focus groups were subsequently analyzed using thematic analysis (King and Horrocks, 2010) and the findings were used to inform the construction of a comprehensive survey instrument. The survey was designed to capture the main themes and specific issues identified in this qualitative work. This responds to recent calls for combining different methods, including in-depth interviews and survey data analysis to advance policy-relevant research (de Haan et al., 2020).

2.2 Survey data collection

The data for this project come from a survey of hiring managers and business owners of private sector firms in Riyadh. The survey instrument, made available through the replication archive,

provides a set of questions governing various dimensions that may impact firm-level decisions to hire women. We collect data on a set of features, focusing on the managers' perceptions of the barriers to hiring women in their firm. Firms answered questions about their interest in hiring women, their impressions of women and men as employees, issues they faced in recruiting and retention, suitability of various workplace tasks and organizational strategies to navigate an integrated workplace. Firms were also asked about the role of the government and regulators, both in terms of support for integration and the potential for costly inspections and fines.

The data collection was implemented between April and June 2019 by a professional survey firm that interviewed representatives from 410 firms in Riyadh. The sample was constructed to include both all-male and integrated firms across four industries: manufacturing, construction, retail, and business services (banking, insurance, and financial services) and in three size categories: micro (1-9 employees), small (10-49 employees) and medium (50-499 employees).⁴ Most participants (292) were randomly selected from an existing database of firms, with the remainder selected using a snowball sampling technique. Surveyors interviewed owners and managers in face to face appointments of 30 to 60 minutes using a computer-assisted personal interview technique. The survey instrument was available in both Arabic and English but almost all interviews were conducted in Arabic.

2.3 Summary statistics

Table 1 presents some summary statistics and simple tabulations of the survey sample. Because the sample was constructed to represent both integrated and non-integrated employers, firms with female employees were over-sampled relative to the general population of firms, particularly in the construction industries and in the smaller size groups. Firms with female employees tend to be larger and have a larger Saudization share. This is true in the overall data and within industry by size cells: firms that employ women have eleven more employees on average and an eleven percentage-point higher Saudization rate than other surveyed firms in their cells. Consistent with Miller et al. (2021), we see that firms with *any* female employees often have large numbers of them: 23% of employees at these firms are women, and firms in the sample have as many as 80% female workers, with a median share of 12.5%.

Interviewees tended to be mid-career Saudi men with relatively high levels of education. All but one of the survey respondents were male and nearly all (96%) were Saudi citizens. The average age of a respondent was 41, and ages ranged from 24-59. The average tenure at the firm

⁴Large firms (500+ employees) were excluded from the sample because it is unusual for firms this large to have no female employees.

was six and half years. The majority of respondents had bachelor's degrees (55%) or technical or professional degrees (26%); only 19% had only secondary-level schooling.

Respondents self-identified as being moderate to open minded, with only 8% describing themselves as conservative. They were very supportive of women entering the labor market from an economic perspective, with 96% agreeing that this would make Saudi Arabia a more productive society. They were supportive of women as business leaders (85%) and moderately supportive of women in government (54%). Interestingly, support for gender mixing in particular was much more muted, with only 14% agreeing that gender mixing would improve productivity and 34% disagreeing (Figure 1).

3 Survey Results

There were many areas of consensus across surveyed firms. These revealed support for female employment alongside a sense that it was necessary to integrate women into the workplace in a way that was culturally sensitive and comfortable for managers and employees. Responses demonstrated areas of strong agreement about prevailing gender norms and barriers to workplace integration, but also outlined areas where interpretations were more nuanced and subject to manager discretion. The findings contribute to research on the malleability of gender attitudes (Dasgupta and Asgari, 2004; Nillesen et al., 2021), further indicating a significant scope for managers to interpret relevant gender norms in the context of their firms.

First, we find that many managers have an interest in hiring women, and that manpower issues are a key obstacle to growth for nearly all firms: ninety percent report that difficulties recruiting and employing effective workers is either a major (51%) or minor (38%) constraint on their growth. The perception of this problem is the same for integrated and non-integrated firms. (Appendix Table A4) This is similar to the share that report problems with government regulations (91%) and licensing (92%) but greater than the share that complain of infrastructure issues (69%) or financial constraints (39%). Firms that employed women were significantly more likely to report concerns about licensing and infrastructure than other firms in their industry and size categories that did not employ women. Eleven percent of firms that did not employ women reported that they had specifically tried to hire Saudi women. This may be because women are seen as lower cost employees: almost all firms agreed that wages were lower for female employees, with some of these savings perhaps offset by increased childcare costs (Appendix Table A6). Firms were, however, also uniformly concerned about retention of female employees, and many expected that these workers were likely to be recruited away by other firms (Appendix Table A7).

This may also be due to career concerns for women at firms with segregated workspaces: about 60% of firms felt that this limited within-firm advancement opportunities for female employees.

There was strong consensus across firms about what types of tasks were appropriate for female employees and what personal characteristics were important for women. These opinions were consistent with the cultural context: managers reported that it was appropriate for women to supervise other workers, make phone calls, and do clerical work. Most considered tasks that involved gender-mixing inappropriate: leading mixed gender-meetings, visiting outside clients, travelling to business meetings were broadly considered unacceptable (Table 5). Managers felt that it was important for women to be well-educated, professionally ambitious, and independent in making career decisions, and agreed that women should also have strong family values, dress modestly, and be religiously observant (Appendix Table A2).

Firms also reported struggling to provide acceptable workspaces for their Saudi employees. By and large firms were not specifically worried about investments needed to make the workplace acceptable to women in particular; the main concern was related to having an attractive workplace for Saudi employees: 93% agreed with the statement that “Providing a workspace that Saudi nationals find acceptable would be / is costly for my firm” and only 14% agreed with the same statement about women (Appendix Table A1). Firms however do feel that their physical workplace constrains hiring women: 87% report that they wouldn’t currently be able to accommodate more female employees in their current workspace, and 61% see access to building facilities (restrooms, entrances) as impeding hiring more women. These physical workplace constraints varied significantly by integration status: integrated firms are more worried about accommodating Saudis, (statistically insignificantly) less worried about accommodating women, less committed to workplace segregation, more space constrained, and slightly more constrained by facilities.

Although fully gender-segregated workplaces had been a standard model in the past, most felt that complete gender segregation was neither necessary nor desirable, and this approach was felt to impede monitoring and communication within the firm. Overall, 77% of respondents felt that work facilities need not separate men and women. Most integrated and non-integrated firms thought that women could work alongside men without problems (91% and 73%) and that women were treated professionally in the workplace (98% and 88%) (Appendix Table A3). However, the majority of firms cited issues with having men and women in a mixed environment and in an integrated reporting structure. This culminates in very few firms feeling that men and women could work together productively in a firm: only 5% of integrated firms and 17% of non-integrated firms agreed with this statement. This suggests that concerns about the organization

of work and effective gender-mixed co-working may be an important constraint for firms in employing women.

Regulatory compliance around mixed-gender workspaces was not usually seen as a burden: managers felt that regulations were enforced fairly, and that inspectors had a great deal of discretion in how to apply labor laws when evaluating their firms. Interestingly, complying with the letter of the law *was* seen as a burden at integrated firms, but that this did not present problems for the firm – perhaps owing to the flexibility in the interpretation of regulations by inspectors (or perhaps a desire not to be directly critical of government regulation). Firms largely did not feel that hiring women put them at greater risk of inspection by government regulators, though they did tend to find these inspections burdensome. Non-integrated and integrated firms were surprisingly consistent in their impressions of regulatory costs, and none of the differences in mean agreement between the groups was statistically significant in the within-cell comparisons (Table A9). Firms appear to be correct in their assessment that hiring women does not make them more likely to be inspected (Figure A2). Integrated firms were only very slightly (and statistically insignificantly) more likely to be inspected, and the average number of inspections was higher at non-integrated firms. Of those who were inspected only five had to pay a fine and all of these were non-integrated firms.⁵ Overall, firms seem to feel that regulations around female employment are nominally costly to comply with, but the flexibility in enforcement means that they do not pose a challenge in practice.

What then do firms see as the potential policy solutions to barriers to hiring women? Firms were (perhaps unsurprisingly) in favor of financial incentives and cost-sharing to upgrade workspaces (Table 6). Despite the infrequency of fines above, firms were quite concerned about the potential of incurring fines, particularly if they employ women. Respondents were also by and large supportive of the (now implemented) abandonment of workplace segregation rules. This was more popular in non-integrated firms, perhaps because integrated firms see this as a fixed cost that they have already incurred, giving them a competitive advantage in this space. Non-integrated firms were also more interested in having their workspace pre-certified as female-friendly. Aside from this, most firms seem to appreciate having more autonomy in interpreting and implementing mixed workspaces even at the cost of less clarity from the government on how this process should work.

The survey results broadly indicate that firms struggle with workforce issues, are often interested in hiring women, but face significant organizational and logistical challenges in integrating female employees into their workplaces. Firms have a remarkably consistent sense of the cultural

⁵Unsurprisingly, none of the fines were reported to involve the employment of women.

and regulatory environment they inhabit. The model of full gender-segregation in workplaces is clearly out of favor, but firms have a nuanced view of what types of between-gender interactions are acceptable and productive in the workplace. Despite considerable agreement among respondents at different types of firms, there is a great deal of variation in *outcomes* when it comes to employing female workers. What can we learn from the differences between these firms? We next describe the empirical approach that we adopt to study systematically the different factors that appear to drive the variation across firms in whether or not they employ women.

4 Empirical approach

Our empirical goal is to identify which features that describe firms or respondents' attitudes more broadly make firms that employ women stand out relative to firms that have not done so. To do so, formally, we define an indicator variable

$$y_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{firm employs women} \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

For each firm i , the survey instrument allows us to construct a broad set of features or variables \mathbf{x}_i . We assess to what extent these features allow us to distinguish between firms that have successfully integrated women vis-a-vis firms that have not done so. Formally, we estimate a large number of logistic regression models. We define $p_i = P(y_i = 1|x_i)$ as the probability that a firm i has hired women, conditional on the observed features \mathbf{x}_i that we measured through the survey instrument.

We estimate variants of the following logistic regressions:

$$\log \frac{p_i}{1 - p_i} = \alpha_{fs(i)} + \beta' \mathbf{x}_i$$

Here, the $\alpha_{fs(i)}$ indicate fixed effects capturing the average propensity for firms to hire female employees within each sector and firm size bin. Adding this baseline control is necessary as our sampling was stratified by sector and firm size. We subsequently study which firm-specific factors \mathbf{x}_i best capture variation in female integration status.

We consider a broad range of features that are constructed from the survey responses. These features are combined into groups of regressors that broadly capture different aspects and dimensions that may affect a firm's decision to employ women.

Best Subset Selection In order to systematically study which variables or features within individual variable groups seem best to capture what makes firms that hire women stand out relative to firms that do not, we leverage a simple machine learning method called “best subset selection” (BSS). The idea of BSS is to study the goodness of fit of all potential subsets of combinations of regressors that could be considered. For example, if a variable group contains p regressors, we would estimate all $\binom{p}{1} = p$ models that include exactly one regressor; all $\binom{p}{2}$ models that include two regressors etc., up to the single model that includes all p regressors $\binom{p}{p} = 1$. This implies that we estimate in total, $\binom{p}{1} + \binom{p}{2} \dots \binom{p}{p} = \sum_{s=1}^p \binom{p}{s} = 2^p$ different models. For each different value of s capturing the model complexity, we identify the single best model that achieves the highest goodness of fit as, for example, measured by the model that yields the lowest Akaike information criterion (AIC) or the highest pseudo R^2 .

This produces a sequence of “best models” $\mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_s, \dots, \mathcal{M}_p$ for every different model complexity s . The overall “best model” is chosen from this sequence of “best models”. Mechanically, when comparing models that include a different number of regressors, naturally one has to penalize models that include more regressors. The AIC does just that: while the pseudo R^2 is monotonically increasing, the AIC includes a penalty to avoid overfitting. We identify the “best model” \mathcal{M}_{s^*} from the sequence of “best models” as the one that produces the minimal AIC.⁶

Variable groups To structure the analysis, we follow our survey structure that broadly organizes the firms’ decision to employ women across key areas of consideration. The broad set of factors under consideration are variables measuring

- Perceptions of various attributes or characteristics of men versus those of women
- Demographic characteristics and attitudes of the respondent
- Broad economic and regulatory constraints
- Constraints in the physical work space or the physical working environment
- Perceptions of the legal and cultural environment
- Perceptions of social acceptance of economic roles for women in employment
- Perceptions of tangible economic costs of hiring women

⁶Computationally, the BSS approach becomes infeasible given the exponential growth in the number of feasible models. In total, $\sum_{k=1}^p \binom{p}{k} = 2^p$ models are estimated. With $p = 30$ this amounts to estimating just over one billion regressions. The non-feasibility of best subset selection for large p in high dimensional data has led to machine learning research efforts focusing on developing algorithms that solve an approximation of the best subset selection optimization problem such as Lasso (see [Hastie et al., 2009](#) for an overview).

- Support for policy changes to support women’s employment

The categories of variables are described in detail in Table 2. For each group of regressors, we identify the best model \mathcal{M}_{s^*} . This then allows us to compare to what extent different groups of features are able to distinguish between firms that are employing and firms that are not employing women. This will help us quantify and qualify the extent to which different *tangible economic* or regulatory concerns seem to explain differences in the propensities of firms to employ women vis-a-vis less tangible features capturing *perceptions* of social or cultural norms.

5 Best subset selection results

We summarize our main findings in Figure 2. The figure plots out the pseudo R^2 that is associated with the “best models” among different groups of regressors.⁷ We use this graph to structure and organize the presentation of the results in this section. What becomes immediately clear is that the groups of variables that seem best in allowing us to identify firms that employ women capture broader perceptions or beliefs about innate qualities that women may have in the work place; the perceptions of “appropriateness” of tasks being given to women in the work place; the perceptions of traits of women along with the demographic characteristics of the respondent which were primarily the owners, senior managers or human resource officials. The detailed results are presented for each group of variables in Table 3 and the full set of BSS tables is presented in Appendix C. We discuss these results in detail below.

Other variables that directly relate to broader economic concerns that firms may have, such as perceived differential operating costs (differential wages and benefits for female employees), broader firm-specific constraints (such as access to capital more broadly), or concerns around costs due to staff turnover or problems retaining employees, at least statistically, seem to play a second order role. These groups of regressors are discussed in Appendix A.

5.1 Beliefs about Women as Employees

Among the set of features that most clearly help in distinguishing between firms that employ and firms that do not employ women are the group of variables that has been labeled as capturing perceptions about the “qualities of women” with the highest pseudo R^2 score in Figure 2. The variables in this group capture beliefs about the relative qualities of male and female employees. Respondents were asked whether they thought that on average men or women were

⁷The same figure is presented for the broad indicator of integration (integrated or actively seeking female employees) in Figure A1.

more productive, had better professional skills, were more reliable, were better at multitasking, had a better work ethic, required lower wages or had lower turnover or whether they were equal. Figure 3 highlights the extent to which firms that employ women and firms that do not employ women are different in the respective perception of qualities or attributes of men.

Respondents from firms that do not employ women consistently perceive that men are more reliable, productive, better skilled, better multitaskers and have a better work ethic compared to women. For example, 58% of respondents from firms that do not hire women perceive that men are more productive; among firms that do employ women, only 32% perceive this to be the case. The gap in perceptions of 26 percentage points is very wide and, at least statistically speaking, the differences in perceptions appear to be a major set of factors that distinguish firms that have hired women versus firms that have not. This suggests that misperceptions may be an important driver of hesitancy among firms to hire more women.

What is noteworthy is that the procedure did not select beliefs about turnover and wages as predictors of integration in the best model, though there are some interesting patterns in these results: firms that employ women are less likely to think that women required lower wages than men and less likely to think that they had lower turnover, though most firms in both categories thought that men and women were likely to require the same wages and have the same rates of turnover.

These differences in impressions could be either due to selection (firms that know women will be successful in their context are more likely to hire them) or information (firms that already employ women have more accurate information about their performance relative to male employees). To distinguish between selection and information we further examine the patterns of beliefs for firms that do not employ women but report that they are actively searching for female employees. These firms are likely to have the same amount of information as non-integrated firms, but are more similar to integrated firms in terms of their unobservable characteristics and attitudes. When non-integrated firms are split into those that report searching for female employees and those that do not, we find that “searching” firms tend to be more similar to “non-searching”, non-integrated firms in terms of their beliefs about female employees (Figure 4). They have lower expectations about female employees’ productivity, professional skills, ability to multitask than integrated firms. Firms that employ women therefore do appear to have better information on their productivity and professional skills and abilities. Firms that do not employ women are more likely than integrated firms to believe that women will require lower wages and have lower turnover. Firms that do not employ women appear to have good information on women’s work ethic relative to men. Interestingly, searching and integrated firms were more likely than non-

searching firms to believe that men and women were equally reliable, while non-searching firms tended to see men as significantly more reliable. Overall, it seems that exposure to female employees is strongly associated with forming better impressions of their contributions to the firm, indicating the importance of role models in changing gender attitudes (Dasgupta and Asgari, 2004; Eger et al., 2018) and suggesting a role for information sharing across managers at different firms.

5.2 Beliefs about Task Appropriateness

Another key area of difference between integrated and non-integrated firms were perceptions about the range of tasks that were appropriate for female employees. Human resource managers need to use their own assessment of gender norms and the needs of the firm to decide to what extent they think female workers can be put to work in socially acceptable tasks.⁸ To elicit these opinions we asked a range of questions in which respondents were asked to indicate whether they perceive a category of tasks as suitable or unsuitable for women.

As Table 5 summarizes, virtually all respondents thought that it was inappropriate to expect women to visit contacts outside the firm, travel to business meetings, do physically demanding work, or lead meetings with male employees. Relatively few saw supervisory, administrative, and telework as inappropriate. Opinions were more mixed on other types of tasks, including secretarial work and manual/routine tasks, and firms with female employees were more likely to see these as acceptable for women. Column 3 of Table 5 reports the results of a within-cell regression of the indicator for considering a task category inappropriate on an indicator for whether the firm employed women. Integrated firms were significantly less likely to consider manual and routine work (by 17 percentage points), attending within-firm meetings (by 14 percentage points), doing secretarial work (by 11 percentage points), and telework (by 8 percentage points) appropriate for female employees.⁹ Opinions on these more controversial tasks were the ones that best predicted the integration status of the firm.

The BSS procedure selected variables capturing opinions on telework, secretarial work, manual work, and visiting outside stakeholders as yielding the best model to predict integration status (Table 3).¹⁰ Firms are therefore most likely to be integrated if managers view the types of tasks associated with many entry-level positions as appropriate for female workers. This may

⁸Eger (2021) cautions that individuals in these positions might experience a backlash if they transgress prevalent gender norms.

⁹Integrated firms were more likely to consider it inappropriate for women to travel outside the firm for work, but nearly all firms (95% and above) found these tasks inappropriate across both groups.

¹⁰See also Appendix Table A11 for full BSS results.

reflect in some cases the particular nature of these tasks across firms, though telework is likely to be similar across contexts. Firms do not appear to require a sense that *all* tasks are appropriate for female employees, but rather an openness to women's participation in *enough* types of tasks to make integration worthwhile.

5.3 Physical Workspace Constraints

The third set of responses concerned constraints around providing an acceptable physical workspace for employees. This is immediately policy-relevant as firms may have to incur tangible costs in order to ensure that the workplace is attractive and complies with social norms – even in the absence of legally-required physical segregation. In this survey module, respondents were asked whether they agreed or disagreed with statements about constraints related to their physical workspace, with indicators set to 1 for respondents who agreed that these aspects presented issues for their firm.

The BSS procedure identified the workspace constraints to be among the third most important set of measures that allow us to distinguish between those firms that hire women and those that do not (see Figure 2). The best model that is selected includes all but one of the variables capturing workspace constraints (see Table 3, Appendix Table A12). In this model, a flexible approach to workplace segregation is strongly associated with employing women. Interestingly, integrated firms were more likely to have concerns about space than non-integrated firms, and limited physical space and dedicated on-site facilities for women (restrooms, private spaces) prevented firms from expanding their female workforce. Integrated firms were significantly more likely to report that providing acceptable workspaces for Saudis was costly. Importantly, while the previous set of variables mostly captures *individual perceptions* about latent norms the question around physical workspace is associated with tangible costs and highlights an area where policy interventions may make a difference.

5.4 Beliefs about Women's Personal Characteristics and Respondent Demographics

Figure 2 highlights that individual perceptions and attitudes of HR managers appear to be an important distinguishing factor between companies that have successfully integrated women and those that have not. In the next two categories, we see that the respondent's own demographic characteristics and his/her own private opinions of desirable subjective personal traits of women are also important predictors of the organization's integration status. This is perhaps not surprising: owners can set their firm's hiring agenda and influence its corporate culture, and hiring

managers may be deliberately selected to achieve integration goals (see e.g. [González \(2021\)](#)).¹¹ The BSS procedure selects two of the responses to the questions about women’s personal characteristics in determining integration status: whether the respondent thought it was important for women to be well-educated (positive point estimate, not statistically significant) and to have strong family values (negative point estimate, significant at the 10% level) (Table 3, Appendix Table A13).

The model selected among the respondent’s demographic characteristics included age, education indicator variables and indicators for whether the respondent was the business owner (see Appendix Table A14). Having a diploma or secondary education (rather than a BA or above) was positively associated with integration. Age was not statistically significant. If the respondent was the business owner (as opposed to an HR manager), there was a negative association with the integration status of the company. Combined we observe that the respondent characteristics and the perceived traits of women are among the more notable set of features that can, in combination, help us distinguish between firms that employ women and those that do not. The relative absence of features that capture hard information or tangible costs from the prominent feature sets suggests that some of the core challenges to female recruitment may lie in the underlying attitudes and perceptions of managers – and not necessarily the underlying economic considerations.

5.5 Coworking Challenges

Concerns about men and women working together were another key area differentiating firms that hired women from those that did not. Although most respondents at integrated and non-integrated firms thought that women could work alongside men without problems (91% and 73%) and that women were treated professionally in the workplace (98% and 88%) (Appendix Table A3), these responses were still important predictors of integration status. In terms of the combined statistical signal that lies within the measures of these expressed concerns, the BSS procedure selects as best model to be the one that includes agreement with statements “Women are treated as professionals in the workplace” and “Female staff members in your firm have no issues working alongside men” (see Appendix Table A15): agreement with both statements is strongly positively associated with firms responding that they employ women. Given that we condition for the cell fixed effects, this means we are unlikely to be confounding systematic differences in the way that work may be organized across firms working in different sectors or in

¹¹Different authors have explored the gatekeeping role of female business leaders and female-only networks ([Dahl et al., 2018](#); [Villesèche and Jossierand, 2017](#))

different firm size classes.

6 Discussion and Conclusion

In a setting where social norms constrain between-gender workplace interactions, firms face a variety of barriers to integrating male and female employees into their workplaces. We examine these specific barriers in Saudi Arabia, where we use extensive fieldwork to develop a detailed survey of barriers to integration including tangible costs, organizational issues, manager perceptions, and firm (and respondent) characteristics. We then analyze the results of a survey of 410 Riyadh firms across a range of representative industries with and without female employees. Women's integration in the workforce emerges as a multi-layered process, in which a broad set of determinants come to bear on managerial decision making. While women's employment has been a key policy interest in Saudi Arabia, many employers continue to struggle with knowing how to integrate women effectively into the workforce. The general survey results indicate that gender norms are perceived very similarly across firms, though managers differ in their ability to negotiate these norms within their firms. We find strong support for women's employment and widespread interest in employing women in a manner sensitive to prevailing norms around gender mixing. Responses also highlighted areas where there was more scope for different approaches to integration and differences in perceptions of integration barriers.

To better understand these dynamics we then look at the systematic differences in perceptions of barriers between integrated and non-integrated firms. While we can compare responses between integrated and non-integrated firms question by question, this quickly becomes unwieldy. To isolate the key differences, we use a simple machine learning method to reveal clusters of firm-specific responses that best distinguish between integrated and non-integrated firms. Results indicate ways to refine fieldwork moving forward, suggesting possible interventions and focuses for future survey work.

This exercise reveals that personal opinions and manager demographics are of core importance: the features that are best able to identify firms that employ women are measures of the respondent perceptions of qualities or traits of women, the perceived cultural appropriateness of specific tasks to be performed by women, and the respondent's own demographic characteristics. While the mechanism for this impact is clear in the case of owners, it also reflects the gatekeeping and agenda-setting role of human resource managers. Gender-inclusive gatekeeping represents an interesting area for future research, to evaluate the effects of the 'first-generation' of female employees entering previously male-dominated professions and firms in the Saudi labor mar-

ket. Moreover, small treatment interventions and nudge experiments studying the malleability of gender attitudes may provide fruitful avenues to investigate how gender specific interventions could alter managers' perceptions and preferences to hire (more) women. Such studies may also adopt a long-term perspective to study the firm history and different integration paths to identify how these factors contribute to breaking down organizational barriers within firms.

Results also reveal possible misperceptions about female employees in firms with no women: firms that employ women are much more likely to view female employees favorably, and this seems to be the result of actual exposure to women in the workplace rather than a manager's broad attitude toward employing women. In line with prior research (Dahl et al., 2018; Dasgupta and Asgari, 2004; Eger et al., 2018), this suggests that exposure to female role models and integrated workplaces can lessen automatic gender stereotyping beliefs. This indicates that increasing the share of female employees, especially in leadership positions, can have a positive effect on women's recruitment and promotion in firms reducing prejudice through exposure. Respondents at integrated firms also took a broader view of what tasks are appropriate for women. These perceptions of female employee characteristics and tasks may be innate or malleable with more exposure and better information, suggesting a possible role for interventions that target firm decision-makers directly. Successful gender integration strategies also depend on the investment in skilled human resource managers to help firms navigate the complex policy landscape and take affirmative action to promote women's employment.¹² This is likely to be particularly important in the rapidly changing policy and cultural environment around women's employment in Saudi Arabia.

The empirical findings suggest that interventions aimed at addressing the more tangible female integration costs may be less effective in promoting female employment than interventions that contribute to altering perceptions of (human resource) managers towards women employees or encourage demographic change in the management of companies. This becomes even more pronounced in light of recent policy updates that removed gender segregation as legally binding for firms. Physical workspace was one of the only explicit financial outlays that emerged as important. Integrated firms were more likely to be flexible about offering a segregated workspace, but felt more keenly the constraints of the workplace quality and facilities when trying to hire more women. Financial support for workplace upgrades could help increase female employment, particularly at already-integrated firms, and grants could help non-integrated firms provide acceptable workspaces for female employees.

Overall, this work highlights the importance of gender norms, cultural preferences, and gate-

¹²For a review of HRD trends and challenges in Saudi Arabia see Achoui (2009).

keeper perceptions in determining which firms and jobs are open to women. These findings point to the need to understand entrenched social norms and values to advance women's economic empowerment, providing novel insights into how managers' attitudes and beliefs contribute to different labor market outcomes for women in Saudi Arabia. While this paper explores firm-level integration, the interplay between social norms, worker preferences, and employment opportunities also operates at the industry and economy-wide level, and is an important area for further study. Sectoral segregation plays an important (and potentially complex) role in integration, with industries such as construction, defense, and retail facing very different constraints in hiring women. Feminization policies, for example, have led to widespread changes in the Saudi retail sector, which might not have been considered a suitable sector for women to work in otherwise. This has increased women's economic opportunities, but (Alfalih, 2016, 53) cautions that "even where policies overtly suggest good intent and imply positive outcomes, the nature of intent and aspired outcomes are gendered" with feminization policies alluding to a form of job resegregation (see Skuratowicz and Hunter (2004)). In a survey on global gender inequality trends, Klasen (2020) showcases how women's progress – albeit modest – in employment has led to resentment and backlash. This points to the strong persistence of gender-specific social norms related to women's economic roles. Understanding how these norms and beliefs evolve at the individual decision-maker, organizational and society-wide level is key to overcoming the demand-side barriers to gender equality in labor markets.

References

- Achoui, Mustapha**, "Human resource development in Gulf countries: An analysis of the trends and challenges facing Saudi Arabia," *Human Resource Development International*, 02 2009, 12, 35–46.
- Alesina, Alberto, Paola Giuliano, and Nathan Nunn**, "On the Origins of Gender Roles: Women and the Plough," *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, May 2013, 128 (2), 469–530.
- Alfalih, A.**, "Labour flexibility: An analysis of the future trajectory of the employment of female graduates in Saudi Arabia," Doctoral Dissertation, University of Wolverhampton 2016.
- Arab News**, "Initiative launched to ensure better working conditions for Saudi women," *Arab News*, 2019. January 21, 2019.
- Ashraf, Nava, Natalie Bau, Nathan Nunn, and Alessandra Voena**, "Bride Price and Female Education," *Journal of Political Economy*, 2019.

- Breuer, Anita and Edward Asiedu**, “Can Gender-Targeted Employment Interventions Help Enhance Community Participation? Evidence from Urban Togo,” *World Development*, 2017, 96, 390–407.
- Bursztyn, Leonardo, Alessandra L. González, and David Yanagizawa-Drott**, “Misperceived Social Norms: Women Working Outside the Home in Saudi Arabia,” *American Economic Review*, October 2020, 110 (10), 2997–3029.
- Cha, Youngjoo**, “Overwork and the Persistence of Gender Segregation in Occupations,” *Gender & Society*, apr 2013, 27 (2), 158–184.
- Cohen, Philip N.**, “The persistence of workplace gender segregation in the US,” *Sociology Compass*, 2013, 7 (11), 889–899.
- Dahl, Gordon B., Andreas Kotsadam, and Dan-Olof Rooth**, “Does Integration Change Gender Attitudes? The Effect of Randomly Assigning Women to Traditionally Male Teams,” February 2018. Unpublished manuscript.
- Dasgupta, N. and S. Asgari**, “Seeing is believing: Exposure to counterstereotypic women leaders and its effect on the malleability of automatic gender stereotyping,” *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 2004, 40 (5), 642–658.
- de Haan, Arjan, Gillian Dowie, and Jane Mariara**, “To RCT or not, is not the question: Methods for policy-relevant research on gender equality,” *World Development*, 2020, 127, 104794.
- Dildar, Yasemin**, “Patriarchal Norms, Religion, and Female Labor Supply: Evidence from Turkey,” *World Development*, 2015, 76, 40–61.
- Ecklund, Elaine H., Anne E. Lincoln, and Cassandra Tansey**, “Gender Segregation in Elite Academic Science,” *Gender and Society*, 2012, 26 (5), 693–717.
- Eger, Claudia**, “Equality and Gender at Work in Islam: The Case of the Berber Population of the High Atlas Mountains,” *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 2021, 31 (2), 210–241.
- , **Graham Miller, and Caroline Scarles**, “Gender and capacity building: A multi-layered study of empowerment,” *World Development*, 2018, 106, 207–219.
- Embassy of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia**, “Saudi Arabia’s Reforms and Programs to Empower Women,” Factsheet 2019.

- Evidence for Policy Design**, “Back to Work in a New Economy: Background Paper on the Saudi Labor Market,” Harvard Kennedy School, Harvard University April 2015.
- Fernandez, Raquel**, “Cultural Change as Learning: The Evolution of Female Labor Force Participation over a Century,” *American Economic Review*, 2013, 103 (1), 472–500.
- **and Alessandra Fogli**, “Culture: An Empirical Investigation of Beliefs, Work, and Fertility,” *American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics*, January 2009, 1 (1), 146–177.
- González, Alessandra**, “Signals and Role Models: Female Managers, Firms, and Female Employment,” Technical Report 2021. Unpublished manuscript.
- Hastie, Trevor, Robert Tibshirani, and Jerome Friedman**, *The Elements of Statistical Learning: Data Mining, Inference, and Prediction* Springer Series in Statistics, New York, NY: Springer New York, 2009.
- Hyland, Marie Caitriona, Asif Mohammed Islam, and Silvia Muzi**, “Firms’ Discriminatory Behavior, and Women’s Employment in the Democratic Republic of Congo,” Policy Research Working Paper Series 9224, The World Bank April 2020.
- Hyland, Marie, Simeon Djankov, and Pinelopi Koujianou Goldberg**, “Gendered Laws and Women in the Workforce,” *American Economic Review: Insights*, December 2020, 2 (4), 475–90.
- International Finance Corporation**, *Investing in Women’s Employment: Good for Business, Good for Development*, World Bank, 2013.
<https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/16257>.
- Islam, Asif, Silvia Muzi, and Mohammad Amin**, “Unequal Laws and the Disempowerment of Women in the Labour Market: Evidence from Firm-Level Data,” *The Journal of Development Studies*, 2019, 55 (5), 822–844.
- Jayachandran, Seema**, “The Roots of Gender Inequality in Developing Countries,” *Annual Review of Economics*, August 2015, 7, 63–88.
- , “Social Norms as a Barrier to Women’s Employment in Developing Countries,” Working Paper 27449, National Bureau of Economic Research June 2020.
- King, Nigel and Christine Horrocks**, *Interviews in Qualitative Research*, Sage Publications Ltd, 2010.

- Klasen, Stephan**, "From "MeToo" to Boko Haram: A survey of levels and trends of gender inequality in the world," *World Development*, 2020, 128, 104862.
- LeRoux-Rutledge, Emily**, "Re-evaluating the "traditional": How the South Sudanese use established gender narratives to advance women's equality and empowerment," *World Development*, 2020, 132, 104929.
- Levanon, Asaf and David B. Grusky**, "The Persistence of Extreme Gender Segregation in the Twenty-first Century," *American Journal of Sociology*, sep 2016, 122 (2), 573–619.
- Luke, Nancy and Kaivan Munshi**, "Women as agents of change: Female income and mobility in India," *Journal of Development Economics*, 2011, 94 (1), 1–17.
- Metcalfe, Beverly Dawn**, "Gender and human resource management in the Middle East," *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 2007, 18 (1), 54–74.
- , "Women, Management and Globalization in the Middle East," *Journal of Business Ethics*, nov 2008, 83 (1), 85–100.
- , "Women, empowerment and development in Arab Gulf States: a critical appraisal of governance, culture and national human resource development (HRD) frameworks," *Human Resource Development International*, 2011, 14 (2), 131–148.
- Miller, Conrad, Jennifer Peck, and Mehmet Seflek**, "Integration Costs and Missing Women in Firms," *NBER Working Paper*, 2019, (August), No. 26271.
- , – , and – , "Missing Women, Integration Costs, and Big Push Policies in the Saudi Labor Market," *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 2021, *forthcoming*.
- Nillesen, Eleonora, Michael Grimm, Micheline Goedhuys, Ann-Kristin Reitmann, and Aline Meysonnat**, "On the malleability of gender attitudes: Evidence from implicit and explicit measures in Tunisia," *World Development*, 2021, 138, 105263.
- Peck, Jennifer R.**, "Can hiring quotas work? The effect of the Nitaqat program on the Saudi private sector," *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy*, 2017, 9 (2), 316–347.
- Salem, Rania and Kathryn M. Yount**, "Structural accommodations of patriarchy: Women and workplace gender segregation in Qatar," *Gender, Work and Organization*, 2019, 26 (4), 501–519.
- Seguino, Stephanie**, "Help or Hindrance? Religion's Impact on Gender Inequality in Attitudes and Outcomes," *World Development*, 2011, 39 (8), 1308–1321.

Skuratowicz, Eva and Larry W. Hunter, “Where Do Women’s Jobs Come from?: Job Resegregation in an American Bank,” *Work and Occupations*, 2004, 31 (1), 73–110.

Villesèche, Florence and Emmanuel Josserand, “Formal women-only networks: literature review and propositions,” *Personnel Review*, 06 2017, 46, 00–00.

World Bank, *Women, Business and the Law 2018*, The World Bank, 2018.

—, *Women, Business and the Law 2020*, The World Bank, 2020.

—, *Women, Business and the Law 2021*, The World Bank, 2021.

7 Figures

Figure 1: Respondent Attitudes about Gender Equality and Integration






Figure 2: Pseudo R^2 measuring the goodness of fit across various groups of features




Notes: Figure presents the pseudo R^2 measures associated with the statistically robust “best models” that can be built by combining variables capturing different concepts or factors that may drive the decision of firms to employ women. All regressions include firm-size by sector group controls to account for the fact that sampling was stratified at that level. “Best models” have been selected among all potential models using the Akaike Information Criterion. The dependent variable is equal to 1 if a firm has hired women. Appendix Figure A1 presents similar results where the dependent variable is equal to 1 if a firm has, at any point in time, attempted to hire women.

Figure 3: Perceived qualities of women in the work place



Note: Figure presents some summary statistics of judgements of qualities of different genders relevant to economic performance. The survey allowed respondents to attribute certain qualities to either Men or Women or chose Equal. The tabulation presents the share of respondents indicating they believe men have a specific set of qualities (as compared to women or the perception that men and women have equal qualities). The shares are computed by whether a respondent is from a firm that has hired women (integration status equal to 1) or from one that has not (integration status equal to 0).

Figure 4: Perceived qualities of women in the work place: Integrated, Searching, and Non-Searching Firms



Note: Figure presents some summary statistics of judgements of qualities of different genders relevant to economic performance. The survey allowed respondents to attribute certain qualities to either Men or Women or chose Equal. The figure presents the share of respondents indicating they believe men have a specific set of qualities (as compared to women or the perception that men and women have equal qualities). The shares are computed by whether a respondent is from a firm that has hired women (integrated), is from a firm that has not hired women but is actively searching for female employees (searching), or is from a firm that has not hired women and is not searching for female employees (non-searching).

8 Tables

Table 1: Sample Summary Statistics

	Firm status		Overall
	Integrated	Non-Integrated	
Number of Firms	128	282	410
Total Employees (Avg)	71.2	38.8	48.9
Share Saudi Employees	0.51	0.43	0.45
Share Female Employees	0.23	.	0.07
Number of Firms by Size:			
Tiny (1-9 employees)	37	110	147
Small (10-49 employees)	66	143	209
Medium (50-499 employees)	25	29	54
Number of Firms by Industry:			
Business Services	19	42	61
Construction	17	47	64
Manufacturing	26	45	71
Retail	66	148	214

Note: The table presents summary statistics by firms' female integration status.

Table 2: BSS Variable Groups

Rank	Group Label	Description
1	Qualities of women	Respondents were asked whether they thought that on average men or women were more productive, had better professional skills, were more reliable, were better at multitasking, had a better work ethic, required lower wages or had lower turnover or whether they were equal. The independent variable is equal to 1 if men were perceived as better employees and 0 otherwise.
2	Task appropriateness	Respondents were asked whether the following types of tasks were suitable or unsuitable for women. Variables were set equal to 1 for respondents that found these tasks unsuitable
3	Physical work space	Respondents were asked whether they agreed or disagreed with the following statements about constraints related to their physical workspace. Indicators were set to 1 for respondents who agreed that these issues presented constraints.
4	Subjective traits	Respondents were asked about whether the following traits were important or not important for women. Indicators were set equal to 1 if respondents said that these were very or somewhat important
5	Respondent demographics	Respondents reported their own demographic information, including nationality, age, education, job tenure, income, and self-assessed personal attitudes. Age is reported in years, education and open-mindedness/conservatism indicated with categorical indicator variables
6	Coworking challenges	Respondents were asked whether they agreed with the following statements about the challenges of coworking in a mixed-gender environment. Indicators were set equal to 1 if the respondent agreed with these statements.
7	Firm constraints	Respondents indicated whether the following presented constraints to the growth of their firm. Indicators equal to 1 indicated that these factors presented either a minor or major constraint to growth.
8	Organizational barriers	Respondents were asked whether they agreed that the following presented organizational barriers to integration. Indicators equal to 1 indicate agreement.
9	Operating costs	Respondents indicated whether they agreed with the following statements about the relative costs of employing men and women. Indicators equal to 1 indicate agreement.
10	Retention	Respondents were asked whether they agreed with the following statements about difficulties retaining female employees. Indicators equal to 1 indicate agreement.
11	Workplace regulations	Respondents were asked whether they agreed with the following statements about regulatory compliance around employing women and providing a mixed-gender workplace. Indicators equal to 1 indicate agreement
12	Compliance costs	Respondents were asked whether they agreed with the following statements about the costs of regulatory compliance around employing women. Indicators equal to 1 indicate agreement

Table 3: BSS Variable List

Rank	Group Label	BSS Variables	+/-	Sig.
1	Qualities of women	On average men are more productive	-	***
		On average men have a better work ethic	-	*
		On average men have better professional skills	-	***
		On average men are more reliable employees	-	**
		On average men are better multi-taskers	-	***
2	Task appropriateness	Making phone calls to clients/ business partners/ public agents is unsuitable for women	-	.
		Doing secretarial work is unsuitable for women	-	**
		Carrying out manual work and routine tasks is unsuitable for women	-	**
		Visiting clients/ business partners/ stakeholders outside the firm is unsuitable for women	+	.
3	Physical work space	Providing a workspace that Saudi nationals find acceptable would be / is costly for my firm	+	**
		Providing a workspace considered acceptable to women would be / is costly for my firm	+	.
		It is possible to provide suitable work facilities without segregating men and women.	+	***
		There is limited physical space to accommodate (more) women in your current business premises.	+	***
		Insufficient female facilities in the larger building (like restrooms, entrances) impede hiring (more) women.	+	*
4	Subjective traits	It is important for a woman to be well-educated	+	.
		It is important for a woman to have strong family values	-	**
5	Respondent demographics	Age	+	.
		Secondary school graduate	+	*
		Diploma graduate	+	***
		Respondent is owner	-	**
6	Coworking challenges	Women are treated as professionals in the workplace.	+	***
		Female staff members in your firm have no issues working alongside men	+	***
7	Firm constraints	Difficult to get required licenses/permissions from authorities	+	***
		Lack of quality infrastructure (roads, transportation, communication, electricity)	+	**
8	Organizational barriers	It is difficult to monitor women's work in a separate section.	+	**
		Workplace segregation can have a negative impact on productivity.	+	**
9	Operating costs	Wage costs are lower for a Saudi woman than for a Saudi man with the same amount of education and experience	+	*
		It is more difficult to provide on the job training for women	+	**
10	Retention	Women are / would be more difficult to retain than men	+	.
		Women are / would be more likely than men to be poached by other firms	+	*
11	Workplace regulations	There is no clear information on what the law/regulations requires for mixed-gender workspaces	-	*
		It is best for an employer and employee to agree on a suitable workplace without government intervention.	+	**
		It is difficult to comply with all rules governing female work spaces.	+	**
12	Compliance costs	Workplace inspectors have discretion over how they interpret the current law and regulations relating to women.	+	.
		Complying with regulations puts / would put our firm at a competitive disadvantage.	+	*

Note: This table summarizes the best model selected by the BSS procedure in each group of responses. Independent variables equal to 1 indicate agreement with the listed statements, and the dependent variable is an indicator taking the value 1 if the firm employs women. The last two columns indicate whether the point estimate on the variable in the selected model is positive or negative and indicate statistical significance with stars indicating *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$ using robust standard errors.

Table 4: Impressions of Male vs. Female Employees: Best Subset Selection

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
More productive	-1.133*** (0.239)	-0.921*** (0.249)	-0.871*** (0.251)	-0.734*** (0.259)	-0.726*** (0.259)	-0.724*** (0.259)	-0.724*** (0.259)
Better work ethic					-0.417* (0.242)	-0.418* (0.242)	-0.419* (0.242)
Better professional skills		-0.869*** (0.244)	-0.751*** (0.250)	-0.733*** (0.251)	-0.815*** (0.256)	-0.811*** (0.256)	-0.808*** (0.257)
More reliable employees				-0.555** (0.244)	-0.556** (0.244)	-0.552** (0.244)	-0.547** (0.246)
Better multi taskers			-0.670*** (0.243)	-0.664*** (0.244)	-0.631*** (0.244)	-0.630*** (0.244)	-0.621** (0.249)
Require a lower wage							0.049 (0.290)
Have lower turnover						0.091 (0.277)	0.093 (0.277)
Constant	1.468* (0.874)	1.637* (0.883)	1.780** (0.900)	1.803* (0.923)	2.111** (0.953)	2.083** (0.958)	2.059** (0.968)
Best Model					X		
Pseudo R2	0.081	0.106	0.121	0.131	0.137	0.137	0.137
Observations	410	410	410	410	410	410	410
Akaike Inf. Crit.	492.640	481.720	476.140	472.986	471.998	473.892	475.864

Note: The dependent variable is an indicator taking the value 1 if firms employ women. Respondents were asked whether they thought that on average men or women were more productive, had better professional skills, were more reliable, were better at multitasking, had a better work ethic, required lower wages or had lower turnover or whether they were equal. The independent variable is equal to 1 if men were perceived as better employees and 0 otherwise. Robust standard errors are presented in parentheses with stars indicating *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$.

Table 5: Task Appropriateness: Summary

	Integrated	Non-Integrated	Within-cell difference (LPM)
Supervising workers/ other employees	0.09	0.13	-0.05 (0.03)
Phone calls to clients/partners/agents	0.00	0.07	-0.08*** (0.02)
Doing physical work	0.98	0.93	0.04* (0.02)
Doing secretarial work	0.01	0.10	-0.11*** (0.03)
Attending work meetings inside the firm	0.32	0.47	-0.14*** (0.05)
Carrying out manual work and routine tasks	0.39	0.56	-0.17*** (0.05)
Leading work meetings in mixed environment	0.97	0.94	0.03 (0.02)
Visiting clients/partners/stakeholders	1.00	0.95	0.05** (0.02)
Traveling to business meetings	1.00	0.96	0.04** (0.02)

Note: The dependent variable is an indicator taking the value 1 if the respondent indicated that the task was unsuitable for female employees. The first two columns report the share of integrated and non-integrated firms that report finding the task unsuitable, and the last column reports the results of an LPM regression of the indicator on an integration indicator with within-cell fixed effects. Robust standard errors clustered at the group level are reported in parentheses, with stars indicating *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$.

Table 6: Possible Solutions: Summary

	Overall	Integrated	Non-Integrated
Government should provide financial support to pay for workplace adjustment to create female sections.	0.92	0.96	0.90
Workplace inspectors should be given less autonomy to issue fines on the spot.	0.80	0.91	0.75
Workplace segregation should be abandoned.	0.65	0.58	0.68
Government should provide childcare facilities.	0.64	0.66	0.64
More stringent and consistent enforcement of female employment rules by MLSD is required to guide firms.	0.62	0.65	0.61
Government should give firms positive incentives to employing women (over men).	0.61	0.62	0.61
Workplace inspectors should not directly benefit from the fine.	0.60	0.65	0.59
Government should mandate quotas for employing women e.g. through Nitaqat.	0.59	0.63	0.57
It would be useful to be able to receive certification of a female friendly working environment.	0.59	0.51	0.62
Employer and employees should self-regulate work relationships and arrangements.	0.58	0.66	0.55
Integrating women in the workplace requires firms to experiment and take some risks.	0.56	0.52	0.57
Requirements for separate entrances and elevators should be lifted.	0.51	0.57	0.48
Government should provide clear guidelines about integrating women in workplace in each sector.	0.12	0.10	0.12

Note: This table reports the share of respondents (overall and for integrated vs. non-integrated firms) that agreed with the listed possible interventions to increase female employment.

For Online Publication

A Appendix: Discussion of Secondary BSS Regressor Groups

The main text describes the BSS results for the six groups of regressors that yield the models that best predict integration status. Here we discuss the other six groups of regressors, which have a lower pseudo R^2 for the best models they generate and seem to play a second-order role in distinguishing between integrated and non-integrated firms (Figure 2). These tend to capture broader economic concerns associated with employing women rather than the perceptions, beliefs, and personal characteristics that tend to be captured in the first six groups of regressors discussed above. These categories are firm constraints on growth, organizational barriers to integration, additional operating costs associated with female workers, difficulties in retaining female employees, difficulties complying with regulations around integrated workplaces, and regulatory compliance costs (Table 3).

Firm constraints Although almost all firms reported facing manpower issues, burdensome government regulations and difficulties with licenses and permissions, integrated and non-integrated firms had some important differences in their reported constraints to firm growth (Table A4). The model includes indicators for concerns about difficulties getting required licenses and permits as well as a lack of quality infrastructure (both positive and statistically significant) (Table A16). Integrated firms may have more sophisticated infrastructure needs if they use telework or if their female employees face more difficult commuting situations. It is interesting that licenses and permits seem to be a bigger issue for integrated firms, and later in the survey they were more likely to agree with the statement that “It is difficult to comply with all rules governing female work spaces”. It may also be the case that integrated firms are more likely to be willing to take risks, which requires more effort navigating government regulations.

Organizational barriers The most important operational challenges had to do with managing a segregated workforce. Nearly all firms found it difficult to monitor work in the women’s section and felt it caused communication problems (Table A5). Perhaps for this reason two-thirds of integrated firms felt that segregation itself negatively impacted productivity. Firms that employ women are more concerned about these segregation effects and less concerned about women’s working hours than non-integrated firms. The BSS best model includes the indicator that it is difficult to monitor women’s work in a separate section and that segregation negatively affects

productivity (Table A17). A follow-up question revealed that successfully integrated firms employed several strategies to address operational issues. Most used regular team meetings to mitigate segregation issues, and more than half offered flexible working hours and provided channels for women to make complaints. Interestingly, strategies focused on men or the workplace in general are less common: only 32% had a posted code of conduct and 19% offered professional conduct training.

Operating costs There are a variety of reasons that women may be more costly to employ than men. As described in the main text, firms that already employ women are more likely to think that men require a lower wage, though firms that do not yet employ women are more likely to think the opposite. In addition to wages, firms may face or perceive different additional costs to employing women. Although nearly all firms across both groups agreed that wage costs were lower for women, about 58% of firms felt that women were overall more costly as employees overall (Table A6). Firms primarily focused on childcare costs and training costs when asked about specific outlays.

In this group of regressors the best model uses responses about wages and difficulties providing on-the-job training to women: integrated firms were significantly more likely to report lower wage costs for women as well as more difficulty providing training (Table 3, Appendix Table A18).

Retention Nearly all firms agreed with the notion that women were harder to retain than men (Table A7). Firms attribute this primarily to their female employees being poached by other firms and also to leaving the workforce at higher rates than men. Firms that already employed women were more likely to focus on poaching (e.g. rather than leaving the workforce). This is also reflected in the BSS model, which includes the regressors indicating that women are more difficult to retain (coefficient not statistically significant) and concerns about poaching (coefficient positive and significant at the 10% level) (Table A19).

Workspace Regulations Firms were also concerned with the costs and uncertainty associated with complying with government rules around workspace. 79% agreed with the statement that “There is no clear information on what the law/regulations requires for mixed-gender workspaces”. The level of agreement was significantly higher for firms with female employees. 66% agreed that “Complying with government regulations for female workspace is costly for my firm.” And 65% that “It is difficult to comply with all rules governing female workspaces.”


In the BSS best model, agreement that “There is no clear information on what the law/regulations requires for mixed-gender workspaces” is negatively associated with integration, while agreement that “It is best for an employer and employee to agree on a suitable workplace without government intervention” and “ It is difficult to comply with all rules governing female work spaces” were positively associated with integration status. Integrated firms seem to have better information about the rules regarding female employees, but also a clearer sense of what works at their firm. While firms that are not integrated worry about a lack of clarity on the rules, already integrated firms value flexibility and customized solutions.

How do firms build this knowledge about how to navigate government regulations in a way that meets the needs of their employees? A follow-up question revealed that firms pursued a variety of strategies in gathering information on how to meet government requirements (Table A8). Most successful firms worked with contacts in the government or used government inspection reports to meet regulatory guidelines. Very few (9%) reported no efforts to seek outside advice. Firms with no female employees were less likely to pursue outside advice: 25% said they would not plan to use any of these information channels. This was the case even for firms that reported that they had taken active steps to recruit female workers. Other firms were not an important source of information for either type of employer.

Compliance Costs Non-integrated and integrated firms were surprisingly consistent in their impressions of regulatory costs associated with employing women, and none of the differences in mean agreement between the groups was statistically significant in the within-cell comparisons (Table A9). The BSS selects a model that includes two of these statements: “Workplace inspectors have discretion over how they interpret the current law and regulations relating to women” and “Complying with regulations puts / would put our firm at a competitive disadvantage.” The point estimates indicate that integrated firms are more likely to agree with both statements, but only the second is statistically significant (Table A21).


B Appendix: Additional Tables and Figures

Figure A1: Pseudo R^2 measuring the goodness of fit across various groups of features (broad integration indicator)



Note: Figure presents the pseudo R^2 measures associated with the statistically robust “best models” that can be built by combining variables capturing different concepts or factors that may drive the decision of firms to employ women. All regressions include firm-size by sector group controls to account for the fact that sampling was stratified at that level. “Best models” have been selected among all potential models using the Akaike Information Criterion. The dependent variable is equal to 1 if a firm has, at any point in time, attempted to hire women.

Figure A2: Share of Firms by Number of Inspections in the Past Year



Note: Figure plots the share of integrated and non-integrated firms by the number of on-site inspections by regulators in the past 12 months.

Table A1: Physical Workspace: Summary

	Integrated	Non-Integrated	Within-cell difference (LPM)
Providing a workspace that Saudi nationals find acceptable would be / is costly for my firm	0.98	0.90	0.08*** (0.02)
Providing a workspace considered acceptable to women would be / is costly for my firm	0.10	0.16	-0.06 (0.04)
It is possible to provide suitable work facilities without segregating men and women	0.87	0.72	0.13*** (0.04)
There is limited physical space to accommodate (more) women in your current business premises	0.68	0.54	0.16*** (0.05)
Workplace adjustments to accommodate (more) women are difficult to plan ahead	0.55	0.64	-0.13** (0.05)
Insufficient female facilities in the larger building (like restrooms, entrances) impede hiring (more) women	0.61	0.54	0.09* (0.05)

Note: The dependent variable is an indicator taking the value 1 if the respondent agreed with the statement about their firm's physical workspace. The first two columns report the share of integrated and non-integrated firms that report agreement, and the last column reports the results of an LPM regression of the indicator on an integration indicator with within-cell fixed effects. Robust standard errors clustered at the group level are reported in parentheses, with stars indicating *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$.

Table A2: Subjective Impressions of Women's Personal Traits: Summary

	Integrated	Non-Integrated	Within-cell difference (LPM)
It is important for a woman to be well-educated	1.00	1.00	.
It is important for a woman to have strong family values	0.78	0.77	0.01 (0.08)
It is important for a woman to dress modestly	0.98	0.96	0.03* (0.02)
It is important for a woman to follow religious teachings in all aspects of her life	0.76	0.83	-0.06 (0.04)
It is important for a woman be ambitious in her career	0.81	0.85	-0.04* (0.02)
It is important for a woman make her own career decisions independently	0.97	0.98	-0.01 (0.02)

Note: The dependent variable is an indicator taking the value 1 if the respondent agreed with the statement about various subjective personal traits of women. The first two columns report the share of intergrated and non-integrated firms that report agreement, and the last column reports the results of an LPM regression of the indicator on an integration indicator with within-cell fixed effects. Robust standard errors clustered at the group level are reported in parentheses, with stars indicating *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$.

Table A3: Coworking Challenges: Summary

	Integrated	Non-Integrated	Within-cell difference (LPM)
Women are treated as professionals in the workplace	0.98	0.88	0.11*** (0.03)
Men and women can work productively together in a firm	0.05	0.17	-0.12*** (0.04)
Female staff members in your firm have no issues working alongside men	0.91	0.73	0.16*** (0.04)
Current working culture is suitable for women	0.52	0.54	-0.03 (0.05)
Training is needed for men and women to interact professionally in the workplace	0.66	0.66	0.01 (0.05)
Female staff members wearing Nigab are welcomed in your firm	0.62	0.61	0.02 (0.05)
Harassment in the workplace is a potential concern for your firm	0.56	0.55	0.02 (0.05)
Women working under the supervision of males may be perceived as inappropriate	0.67	0.62	0.04 (0.05)
Men working under the supervision of women may be perceived as inappropriate	0.62	0.54	0.09* (0.05)

Note: The dependent variable is an indicator taking the value 1 if the respondent agreed with the statement about potential coworking challenges in their firm. The first two columns report the share of intergrated and non-integrated firms that report agreement, and the last column reports the results of an LPM regression of the indicator on an integration indicator with within-cell fixed effects. Robust standard errors clustered at the group level are reported in parentheses, with stars indicating *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$.

Table A4: Major or Minor Constraints to Growth: Summary

Constraint to Growth	Integrated	Non-Integrated	Within-cell difference (LPM)
Financial constraints (shortage of capital/credit)	0.40	0.39	0.01 (0.05)
Difficulty hiring and employing effective workers	0.89	0.90	-0.002 (0.03)
Burdensome government regulations	0.95	0.90	0.04 (0.03)
Difficult to get required licenses/permissions	0.98	0.90	0.09* (0.05)
Lack of quality infrastructure (roads, transport, communication, electricity)	0.75	0.66	0.09* (0.05)

Note: The dependent variable is an indicator taking the value 1 if the respondent reports the issue as being either a major or minor constraint to growth for their firm. The first two columns report the share of integrated and non-integrated firms that report facing this constraint, and the last column reports the results of an LPM regression of the constraint indicator on an integration indicator with within-cell fixed effects. Robust standard errors clustered at the group level are reported in parentheses, with stars indicating *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$.

Table A5: Organizational Barriers to Integration: Summary

	Integrated	Non-Integrated	Within-cell difference (LPM)
It is difficult to monitor women's work in a separate section	0.98	0.94	0.06*** (0.02)
Organizing day to day work is more difficult with a mixed workforce	0.10	0.18	-0.08** (0.04)
Workplace segregation can create frictions in internal and external communication	0.88	0.80	0.07* (0.04)
Workplace segregation can have a negative impact on productivity	0.66	0.55	0.12** (0.05)
Female working hours can have a constraining effect on productivity	0.49	0.56	-0.06 (0.05)
Women are more likely to be absent due to family responsibilities	0.57	0.57	0.00 (0.05)

Note: The dependent variable is an indicator taking the value 1 if the respondent agreed with the statement about organizational barriers to employing women in their firm. The first two columns report the share of intergrated and non-integrated firms that report agreement, and the last column reports the results of an LPM regression of the indicator on an integration indicator with within-cell fixed effects. Robust standard errors clustered at the group level are reported in parentheses, with stars indicating *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$.

Table A6: Operating Costs: Summary

	Integrated	Non-Integrated	Within-cell difference (LPM)
Wage costs are lower for a Saudi woman than for a Saudi man with the same education and experience	0.98	0.94	0.04* (0.02)
Transportation costs raise the cost of employing women relative to men	0.16	0.14	0.02 (0.04)
Childcare costs raise the cost of employing women relative to men	0.84	0.80	0.04 (0.04)
Women require more training than men	0.60	0.55	0.03 (0.05)
It is more difficult to provide on the job training for women	0.76	0.64	0.12** (0.05)
Training new female workers is easier if you already employ experienced female workers	0.56	0.61	-0.02 (0.05)
On average, female employees are more costly than male employees	0.58	0.58	0.00 (0.05)

Notes: The dependent variable is an indicator taking the value 1 if the respondent agreed with the statement about operating costs associated with employing women. The first two columns report the share of intergrated and non-integrated firms that agree with the statement, and the last column reports the results of an LPM regression of the agreement indicator on an integration indicator with within-cell fixed effects. Robust standard errors clustered at the group level are reported in parentheses, with stars indicating *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$.

Table A7: Retention of Female Workers: Summary

	Integrated	Non-Integrated	Within-cell difference (LPM)
Women more difficult to retain than men	0.99	0.95	0.04** (0.02)
Women more likely than men to leave for a better/more desirable job	0.09	0.11	-0.03 (0.03)
Women more likely than men to be poached by other firms	0.88	0.79	0.10** (0.04)
Women more likely than men to quit for personal reasons	0.59	0.64	-0.04 (0.05)
Segregated workplaces limit career progression for women	0.59	0.61	-0.03 (0.05)

Note: The dependent variable is an indicator taking the value 1 if the respondent agreed with the statement about issues retaining female employees. The first two columns report the share of intergrated and non-integrated firms that report agreement, and the last column reports the results of an LPM regression of the indicator on an integration indicator with within-cell fixed effects. Robust standard errors clustered at the group level are reported in parentheses, with stars indicating *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$.

Table A8: Workplace Regulation Guidance

	Integrated	Non-Integrated
Guidance from government contacts	0.68	0.52
Report from government inspection	0.55	0.37
Guidance from industry groups	0.5	0.4
Hiring of a consultant	0.45	0.45
Women's work guide in the private sector	0.42	0.45
Guidance from chamber of commerce	0.35	0.25
Guidelines from official government resources	0.3	0.27
Advice from firms that have already hired women	0.02	0.07
I did not/ do not plan to seek outside advice	0.09	0.25

Notes: Firms were asked where they did find information (if they had already hired women) or where they would look for information (if not hired) about government requirements regarding female workspaces.

Table A9: Regulatory Compliance Costs: Summary

	Integrated	Non-Integrated	Within-cell difference (LPM)
MLSD uniformly enforces existing regulations across all firms in the same sector	0.95	0.93	0.02 (0.02)
Hiring women increases the risk of being inspected by MLSD	0.13	0.18	-0.07 (0.05)
Workplace inspectors have discretion over how they interpret the current law and regulations relating to women	0.82	0.76	0.07 (0.05)
Workplace inspections and fines are a serious burden on firms	0.55	0.57	-0.02 (0.05)
Complying with regulations puts would put our firm at a competitive disadvantage	0.66	0.59	0.08* (0.04)
Complying with government regulations is not a problem at my firm	0.45	0.50	-0.03 (0.05)

Note: The dependent variable is an indicator taking the value 1 if the respondent agreed with the statement about their firm's experience with regulatory enforcement. The first two columns report the share of intergrated and non-integrated firms that report agreement, and the last column reports the results of an LPM regression of the indicator on an integration indicator with within-cell fixed effects. Robust standard errors clustered at the group level are reported in parentheses, with stars indicating *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$.

C Appendix: Full BSS Results Tables by Variable Group

Table A10: Impressions of Male vs. Female Employees: Best Subset Selection

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
More productive	-1.133*** (0.239)	-0.921*** (0.249)	-0.871*** (0.251)	-0.734*** (0.259)	-0.726*** (0.259)	-0.724*** (0.259)	-0.724*** (0.259)
Better work ethic					-0.417* (0.242)	-0.418* (0.242)	-0.419* (0.242)
Better professional skills		-0.869*** (0.244)	-0.751*** (0.250)	-0.733*** (0.251)	-0.815*** (0.256)	-0.811*** (0.256)	-0.808*** (0.257)
More reliable employees				-0.555** (0.244)	-0.556** (0.244)	-0.552** (0.244)	-0.547** (0.246)
Better multi taskers			-0.670*** (0.243)	-0.664*** (0.244)	-0.631*** (0.244)	-0.630*** (0.244)	-0.621** (0.249)
Require a lower wage							0.049 (0.290)
Have lower turnover						0.091 (0.277)	0.093 (0.277)
Constant	1.468* (0.874)	1.637* (0.883)	1.780** (0.900)	1.803* (0.923)	2.111** (0.953)	2.083** (0.958)	2.059** (0.968)
Best Model					X		
Pseudo R2	0.081	0.106	0.121	0.131	0.137	0.137	0.137
Observations	410	410	410	410	410	410	410
Akaike Inf. Crit.	492.640	481.720	476.140	472.986	471.998	473.892	475.864

Note: The dependent variable is an indicator taking the value 1 if firms employ women. Respondents were asked whether they thought that on average men or women were more productive, had better professional skills, were more reliable, were better at multitasking, had a better work ethic, required lower wages or had lower turnover or whether they were equal. The independent variable is equal to 1 if men were perceived as better employees and 0 otherwise. Robust standard errors are presented in parentheses with stars indicating *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$.

Table A11: Task Appropriateness: Best Subset Selection

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Supervising workers/ other employees						-0.412 (0.432)	-0.429 (0.432)	-0.435 (0.435)	-0.435 (0.434)
Phone calls to clients/partners/agents		-16.593 (795.767)	-16.279 (834.907)	-16.166 (819.675)	-16.073 (814.656)	-15.956 (807.713)	-15.988 (833.165)	-15.997 (832.752)	-16.010 (832.341)
Doing physical work								-0.108 (0.779)	-0.090 (0.799)
Doing secretarial work	-3.040*** (1.049)	-2.605** (1.077)	-2.424** (1.074)	-2.330** (1.083)	-2.291** (1.087)	-2.342** (1.093)	-2.310** (1.094)	-2.321** (1.097)	-2.316** (1.098)
Attending work meetings inside the firm							-0.198 (0.321)	-0.210 (0.332)	-0.209 (0.332)
Carrying out manual work and routine tasks			-0.536** (0.234)	-0.528** (0.235)	-0.528** (0.236)	-0.581** (0.243)	-0.461 (0.310)	-0.450 (0.318)	-0.452 (0.318)
Leading work meetings in mixed environment									-0.075 (0.721)
Visiting clients/partners/stakeholders				16.018 (1,130.711)	15.175 (1,070.219)	15.167 (1,065.814)	15.327 (1,205.158)	15.463 (1,294.133)	15.480 (1,294.956)
Traveling to business meetings					12.145 (1,264.932)	12.083 (1,260.732)	12.088 (1,277.870)	12.247 (1,393.054)	12.252 (1,394.952)
Constant	1.423 (0.973)	1.362 (0.947)	1.583 (0.967)	-14.453 (1,130.711)	-25.761 (1,656.917)	-25.492 (1,650.865)	-25.618 (1,756.502)	-25.799 (1,901.403)	-25.774 (1,903.354)
Best Model				X					
Pseudo R2	0.074	0.095	0.104	0.111	0.112	0.114	0.112	0.111	0.111
Observations	407	404	403	401	399	399	397	396	396
Akaike Inf. Crit.	493.900	483.296	479.975	476.947	477.208	478.272	479.891	481.872	483.861

Note: The dependent variable is an indicator taking the value 1 if firms employ women. Respondents were asked whether they thought that the listed types of tasks were inappropriate for female employees. The independent variable is equal to 1 if the task was seen as inappropriate and 0 otherwise. Robust standard errors are presented in parentheses with stars indicating *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$.

Table A12: Physical Workspace: Best Subset Selection

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Providing a workspace that Saudi nationals find acceptable would be / is costly for my firm	2.022*** (0.756)		1.638** (0.771)	1.619** (0.774)	2.161** (0.862)	2.169** (0.864)
Providing a workspace considered acceptable to women would be / is costly for my firm					0.741 (0.459)	0.753 (0.461)
It is possible to provide suitable work facilities without segregating men and women		1.169*** (0.315)	1.033*** (0.322)	1.002*** (0.324)	1.284*** (0.379)	1.318*** (0.391)
There is limited physical space to accommodate (more) women in your current business premises		0.942*** (0.247)	0.887*** (0.250)	0.960*** (0.255)	1.014*** (0.257)	1.070*** (0.303)
Workplace adjustments to accommodate (more) women are difficult to plan ahead						0.105 (0.296)
Insufficient female facilities in the larger building (like restrooms, entrances) impede hiring (more) women				0.458* (0.239)	0.418* (0.241)	0.457* (0.265)
Constant	-1.106 (1.127)	-0.890 (0.938)	-2.357** (1.190)	-2.566** (1.197)	-3.407** (1.338)	-3.599** (1.445)
Best Model					X	
Pseudo R2	0.057	0.082	0.095	0.102	0.107	0.108
Observations	410	410	410	410	410	410
Akaike Inf. Crit.	504.598	493.905	489.370	487.643	487.069	488.942

Note: The dependent variable is an indicator taking the value 1 if firms employ women. The independent variables are equal to 1 if the respondent agreed with the corresponding statement about their firm's physical workspace. Robust standard errors are presented in parentheses with stars indicating *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$.

Table A13: Subjective Impressions of Women's Personal Traits: Best Subset Selection

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
It is important for a woman to be well-educated	17.125 (714.218)	16.608 (714.279)	16.594 (715.743)	16.584 (716.228)	16.572 (715.833)	16.585 (715.949)
It is important for a woman to have strong family values		-0.713** (0.316)	-0.740** (0.318)	-0.672* (0.346)	-0.676* (0.347)	-0.664* (0.351)
It is important for a woman to dress modestly				0.196 (0.412)	0.198 (0.412)	0.209 (0.416)
It is important for a woman to follow religious teachings in all aspects of her life			0.231 (0.230)	0.248 (0.233)	0.269 (0.251)	0.261 (0.254)
It is important for a woman be ambitious in her career					0.058 (0.247)	0.055 (0.247)
It is important for a woman make her own career decisions independently						-0.050 (0.242)
Constant	-16.209 (714.218)	-15.467 (714.279)	-15.603 (715.744)	-15.788 (716.228)	-15.824 (715.833)	-15.822 (715.949)
Best Model		X				
Pseudo R2	0.084	0.095	0.097	0.097	0.097	0.097
Observations	410	410	410	410	410	410
Akaike Inf. Crit.	490.889	487.400	488.387	490.158	492.102	494.060

Note: The dependent variable is an indicator taking the value 1 if firms employ women. The independent variables are equal to 1 if the respondent agreed with the corresponding statement about various subjective personal traits of women. Robust standard errors are presented in parentheses with stars indicating *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$.

Table A14: Respondent Demographics: Best Subset Selection

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
Saudi									0.604 (0.640)		0.607 (0.641)	0.620 (0.642)
Age				0.030 (0.019)	0.028 (0.019)	0.028 (0.019)	0.027 (0.019)	0.026 (0.019)	0.028 (0.019)	0.026 (0.019)	0.028 (0.019)	0.033 (0.021)
Job Tenure (Years)												-0.025 (0.040)
Above Median Income								-0.265 (0.251)	-0.281 (0.252)	-0.265 (0.251)	-0.281 (0.252)	-0.259 (0.255)
Business Owner		-0.602** (0.262)	-0.615** (0.263)	-0.563** (0.266)	-0.575** (0.267)	-0.575** (0.267)	-0.572** (0.268)	-0.543** (0.270)	-0.563** (0.270)	-0.544** (0.270)	-0.564** (0.270)	-0.567** (0.270)
<i>Education:</i>												
Secondary			0.608* (0.327)	0.640* (0.329)	14.475 (549.609)	14.475 (549.609)	14.278 (550.840)	14.187 (553.398)	13.851 (578.028)	14.189 (553.472)	13.856 (578.315)	13.666 (579.126)
Diploma	0.957*** (0.246)	0.896*** (0.249)	1.092*** (0.275)	1.157*** (0.280)	14.987 (549.609)	14.987 (549.609)	14.819 (550.840)	14.725 (553.398)	14.411 (578.028)	14.727 (553.471)	14.417 (578.315)	14.229 (579.126)
BA					13.842 (549.609)	13.842 (549.609)	13.670 (550.840)	13.654 (553.398)	13.360 (578.028)	13.656 (553.471)	13.363 (578.315)	13.208 (579.126)
<i>Consider themselves:</i>												
(Very) Open-Minded										-0.277 (0.250)	-0.247 (0.252)	-0.249 (0.252)
(Very) Conservative										-0.285 (0.447)	-0.283 (0.448)	-0.254 (0.451)
Moderate							0.284 (0.240)	0.278 (0.241)	0.253 (0.242)			
Constant	0.805 (0.844)	0.910 (0.850)	0.896 (0.853)	-0.237 (1.107)	-14.018 (549.610)	-14.018 (549.610)	-13.950 (550.841)	-13.694 (553.399)	-14.051 (578.029)	-13.417 (553.472)	-13.805 (578.316)	-13.728 (579.127)
Best Model				X								
Pseudo R2	0.063	0.074	0.081	0.086	0.089	0.089	0.092	0.094	0.096	0.094	0.096	0.097
Observations	410	410	410	410	410	410	410	410	410	410	410	410
Akaike Inf. Crit.	501.323	497.861	496.451	495.850	496.230	496.230	496.834	497.732	498.784	499.732	500.777	502.401

Note: The dependent variable is an indicator taking the value 1 if firms employ women. The independent variables are an indicator for being of Saudi nationality, continuous indicators of age and job tenure in years, an indicator for whether the respondent is the business owner, a set of indicators for highest level of education completed, and a set of indicators for whether the respondent considered themselves open-minded or very open-minded, conservative or very conservative, or moderate. Robust standard errors are presented in parentheses with stars indicating *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$.

Table A15: Coworking Challenges: Best Subset Selection

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Women are treated as professionals in the workplace		1.678*** (0.631)	1.642*** (0.634)	1.454** (0.666)	1.447** (0.667)	1.427** (0.669)	1.440** (0.670)	1.434** (0.671)	1.437** (0.671)
Men and women can work productively together in a firm				-0.420 (0.499)	-0.417 (0.500)	-0.438 (0.501)	-0.444 (0.501)	-0.455 (0.505)	-0.446 (0.506)
Female staff members in your firm have no issues working alongside men	1.220*** (0.340)	1.044*** (0.345)	1.024*** (0.346)	0.894** (0.374)	0.912** (0.375)	0.890** (0.376)	0.891** (0.376)	0.882** (0.378)	0.904** (0.395)
Current working culture is suitable for women									0.056 (0.281)
Training is needed for men and women to interact professionally in the workplace							0.098 (0.243)	0.110 (0.251)	0.135 (0.282)
Female staff members wearing Nigab are welcomed in your firm								0.050 (0.260)	0.071 (0.281)
Harassment in the workplace is a potential concern for your firm					0.136 (0.233)	0.188 (0.246)	0.180 (0.247)	0.194 (0.259)	0.194 (0.259)
Women working under the supervision of males may be perceived as inappropriate						0.170 (0.257)	0.157 (0.259)	0.162 (0.260)	0.155 (0.262)
Men working under the supervision of women may be perceived as inappropriate			0.203 (0.234)	0.215 (0.234)	0.226 (0.235)	0.257 (0.240)	0.262 (0.240)	0.257 (0.242)	0.244 (0.251)
Constant	-0.099 (0.901)	-1.343 (1.109)	-1.410 (1.101)	-1.083 (1.165)	-1.215 (1.186)	-1.382 (1.210)	-1.461 (1.227)	-1.492 (1.239)	-1.563 (1.291)
Best Model		X							
Pseudo R2	0.064	0.084	0.086	0.087	0.088	0.089	0.089	0.089	0.089
Observations	410	410	410	410	410	410	410	410	410
Akaike Inf. Crit.	500.968	492.785	494.028	495.296	496.956	498.516	500.352	502.316	504.277

Note: The dependent variable is an indicator taking the value 1 if firms employ women. The independent variables are equal to 1 if the respondent agreed with the corresponding statement about potential coworking challenges in their firm. Robust standard errors are presented in parentheses with stars indicating *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$.

Table A16: Major or Minor Constraints to Growth: Best Subset Selection

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Financial constraints (shortage of capital/credit)			-0.264 (0.252)	-0.273 (0.253)	-0.276 (0.253)
Difficulty hiring and employing effective workers					-0.057 (0.378)
Burdensome government regulations				0.244 (0.476)	0.243 (0.476)
Difficult to get required licenses/permissions	1.819*** (0.643)	1.820*** (0.643)	1.885*** (0.645)	1.800*** (0.665)	1.807*** (0.667)
Lack of quality infrastructure (roads, transport, communication, electricity)		0.445* (0.255)	0.532** (0.268)	0.538** (0.269)	0.545** (0.272)
Constant	-0.588 (1.030)	-0.761 (1.048)	-0.846 (1.058)	-1.023 (1.111)	-0.982 (1.141)
Best Model		X			
Pseudo R2	0.057	0.063	0.065	0.066	0.066
Observations	410	410	410	410	410
Akaike Inf. Crit.	504.646	503.509	504.401	506.130	508.107

Note: The dependent variable is an indicator taking the value 1 if firms employ women. The independent variables are equal to 1 if the respondent felt that the corresponding issue presented a major or minor constraint to growth for their firm. Robust standard errors are presented in parentheses with stars indicating *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$.

Table A17: Organizational Barriers to Integration: Best Subset Selection

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
It is difficult to monitor women's work in a separate section	1.648** (0.764)	1.588** (0.766)	1.330* (0.789)	1.274 (0.795)	1.275 (0.794)	1.273 (0.794)
Organizing day to day work is more difficult with a mixed workforce				-0.272 (0.453)	-0.288 (0.455)	-0.287 (0.455)
Workplace segregation can create frictions in internal and external communication			0.438 (0.343)	0.276 (0.433)	0.258 (0.434)	0.275 (0.440)
Workplace segregation can have a negative impact on productivity		0.471** (0.232)	0.522** (0.236)	0.514** (0.236)	0.536** (0.240)	0.570** (0.277)
Female working hours can have a constraining effect on productivity						0.066 (0.264)
Women are more likely to be absent due to family responsibilities					0.115 (0.234)	0.117 (0.234)
Constant	-0.732 (1.133)	-1.070 (1.148)	-1.227 (1.157)	-0.984 (1.224)	-1.051 (1.232)	-1.112 (1.256)
Best Model		X				
Pseudo R2	0.047	0.055	0.059	0.059	0.06	0.06
Observations	410	410	410	410	410	410
Akaike Inf. Crit.	509.626	507.431	507.729	509.363	511.122	513.059

Note: The dependent variable is an indicator taking the value 1 if firms employ women. The independent variables are equal to 1 if the respondent agreed with the corresponding statement about organizational barriers to employing women in their firm. Robust standard errors are presented in parentheses with stars indicating $p < 0.01$, $** p < 0.05$, $* p < 0.1$.

Table A18: Operating Costs: Best Subset Selection

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Wage costs are lower for a Saudi woman than for a Saudi man with the same education and experience		1.303*	1.263*	1.466**	1.360*	1.328*	1.329*
		(0.701)	(0.705)	(0.741)	(0.748)	(0.749)	(0.750)
Transportation costs raise the cost of employing women relative to men			0.267		0.420*	0.533*	0.533*
			(0.237)		(0.255)	(0.282)	(0.282)
Childcare costs raise the cost of employing women relative to men				0.673*	0.769*	0.773*	0.774*
				(0.407)	(0.413)	(0.415)	(0.416)
Women require more training than men				0.522	0.747*	0.790*	0.790*
				(0.375)	(0.402)	(0.407)	(0.407)
It is more difficult to provide on the job training for women	0.611**	0.620**	0.706***	0.627**	0.770***	0.904***	0.903***
	(0.254)	(0.255)	(0.266)	(0.256)	(0.272)	(0.306)	(0.309)
Training new female workers is easier if you already employ experienced female workers						0.268	0.266
						(0.271)	(0.287)
On average, female employees are more costly than male employees							-0.005
							(0.247)
Constant	0.759	-0.083	-0.317	-0.919	-1.494	-1.880	-1.878
	(0.844)	(0.987)	(1.007)	(1.102)	(1.163)	(1.231)	(1.236)
Best Model		X					
Pseudo R2	0.046	0.054	0.057	0.061	0.066	0.068	0.068
Observations	410	410	410	410	410	410	410
Akaike Inf. Crit.	510.290	507.845	508.563	508.746	508.011	509.016	511.016

Note: The dependent variable is an indicator taking the value 1 if firms employ women. The independent variables are equal to 1 if the respondent agreed with the corresponding statement about operating costs associated with employing women. Robust standard errors are presented in parentheses with stars indicating *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$.

Table A19: Retention of Female Workers: Best Subset Selection

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Women more difficult to retain than men	2.104** (1.070)	1.784 (1.087)	2.052* (1.105)	2.055* (1.105)	2.078* (1.104)
Women more likely than men to leave for a better/more desirable job			0.622 (0.505)	0.641 (0.507)	0.618 (0.508)
Women more likely than men to be poached by other firms		0.624* (0.330)	0.893** (0.406)	0.894** (0.407)	0.827* (0.422)
Women more likely than men to quit for personal reasons					-0.148 (0.251)
Segregated workplaces limit career progression for women				-0.118 (0.229)	-0.157 (0.238)
Constant	-1.188 (1.359)	-1.393 (1.371)	-2.064 (1.477)	-1.956 (1.492)	-1.787 (1.515)
Best Model		X			
Pseudo R2	0.046	0.054	0.057	0.057	0.058
Observations	410	410	410	410	410
Akaike Inf. Crit.	509.939	508.093	508.588	510.322	511.977

Note: The dependent variable is an indicator taking the value 1 if firms employ women. The independent variables are equal to 1 if the respondent agreed with the corresponding statement about issues with retaining female employees. Robust standard errors are presented in parentheses with stars indicating *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$.

Table A20: Workplace Regulations: Best Subset Selection

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
The labor law clearly spells out how to achieve segregation in the workplace	0.485* (0.288)				0.592* (0.303)	0.564* (0.305)	0.420 (0.392)	0.429 (0.394)
The labor law is clear enough to anticipate the cost of complying with female workplace requirements				0.814 (0.689)		0.876 (0.685)	0.780 (0.700)	0.789 (0.701)
There is no clear information on what the law requires for mixed-gender workspaces			-0.578* (0.345)	-0.487 (0.352)			-0.263 (0.460)	-0.250 (0.463)
Complying with government regulations for female workspace would be / is costly for my firm					0.521* (0.288)	0.494* (0.290)	0.481* (0.292)	0.487* (0.292)
Family members of female staff have the right to visit and inspect her workplace					0.512* (0.299)	0.508* (0.301)	0.508* (0.302)	0.518* (0.304)
It is best for an employer and employee to agree on a suitable workplace without govt intervention		0.477** (0.241)	0.486** (0.242)	0.497** (0.243)	0.712** (0.292)	0.734** (0.294)	0.744** (0.295)	0.735** (0.297)
It is difficult to comply with all rules governing female work spaces		0.533** (0.254)	0.547** (0.255)	0.530** (0.256)	0.573** (0.261)	0.560** (0.262)	0.570** (0.263)	0.550** (0.276)
Our firm acts according to the rules of the <i>Women's Work Guide in the Private Sector</i>								-0.056 (0.248)
Constant	0.651 (0.855)	0.346 (0.869)	0.589 (0.888)	-0.121 (1.081)	-0.947 (1.039)	-1.631 (1.195)	-1.351 (1.282)	-1.322 (1.288)
Best Model			X					
Pseudo R2	0.04	0.046	0.052	0.055	0.059	0.063	0.064	0.064
Observations	410	410	410	410	410	410	410	410
Akaike Inf. Crit.	513.396	511.992	510.985	511.395	511.360	511.493	513.166	515.115

Note: The dependent variable is an indicator taking the value 1 if firms employ women. The independent variables are equal to 1 if the respondent agreed with the corresponding statement about compliance with regulations around women's workspace. Robust standard errors are presented in parentheses with stars indicating *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$.

Table A21: Regulatory Compliance Costs: Best Subset Selection

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
MLSD uniformly enforces existing regulations across all firms in the same sector				0.188 (0.534)	0.196 (0.535)	0.195 (0.535)
Hiring women increases the risk of being inspected by MLSD			-0.323 (0.372)	-0.273 (0.397)	-0.255 (0.403)	-0.252 (0.403)
Workplace inspectors have discretion over how they interpret the current law and regulations relating to women		0.467 (0.286)	0.316 (0.332)	0.329 (0.335)	0.342 (0.338)	0.356 (0.355)
Workplace inspections and fines are a serious burden on firms						0.032 (0.250)
Complying with regulations puts would put our firm at a competitive disadvantage	0.388* (0.231)	0.390* (0.232)	0.385* (0.232)	0.380 (0.233)	0.360 (0.244)	0.367 (0.250)
Complying with government regulations is not a problem at my firm					-0.065 (0.237)	-0.058 (0.242)
Constant	0.758 (0.844)	0.554 (0.853)	0.765 (0.890)	0.551 (1.076)	0.584 (1.083)	0.543 (1.129)
Best Model		X				
Pseudo R2	0.039	0.045	0.046	0.047	0.047	0.047
Observations	410	410	410	410	410	410
Akaike Inf. Crit.	513.515	512.732	513.964	515.838	517.763	519.747

Note: The dependent variable is an indicator taking the value 1 if firms employ women. The independent variables are equal to 1 if the respondent agreed with the corresponding statement about their firm's experience with regulatory enforcement. Robust standard errors are presented in parentheses with stars indicating *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$.