

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN AT HIGHER EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Dr Radha Maddisetty

(MCOM MBA LLMPhd)

Associate Professor of HRM Global

Education Centre Hyderabad.

Abstract –

The study specifically determines the discrimination of women at higher educational institutions. The study employed descriptive survey. Mean and standard deviation are used to answer research questions while hypotheses were tested using ANOVA. The study involved a sample of 108 teachers. Data was collected through a structured questionnaire. Gender discrimination is examined with respect to three demographic factors: age, designation, and marital status. The major findings revealed that some factors that constituted discrimination to a high extent were harassment from superiors, gossip, unequal distribution of work, non-recognition of work, unequal evaluation of work, working extra hours, threatening from male counterparts, and favoritism. The study recommended that gender discrimination should be eliminated for smooth functioning at workplace.

Key Words :-Discrimination , violence , inequality ,gender bias

Introduction

There was discrimination in 1980 but it reduced to some extent by 2020. The right of women to live free from discrimination is the fundamental principle of human rights system. Stereotypes of gender roles have continued over ages. Men were primary beneficiaries compared to women. In spite of gender segregation, women have made inroads into increasing female representation in male-dominated fields. They face barriers in obtaining proper access to education and information. The functions of knowledge creation and knowledge transmission through research and teaching is stressed by Romainville (1996). Houston, Meyer and Paewai (2006) addressed the complexity of that work in the environment of academics. Women have greater teaching loads than men and less access to resources necessary for research (Kauffman and Perry 1989). The Vienna Declaration, 1993 focused on discrimination and violence against women. The national commission aims to improve the status of women for their economic empowerment. Discrimination against women also hampers their access to equal opportunities for work and equal working conditions and particularly access to the same pay as their male counterparts for work of equal value. Simone N. Vigod Paula A. Rochow (2020) suggests that perceived gender discrimination is an important factor in a woman's mental health. There were gender imbalances at all levels. Gender equality can be promoted by the universities. Experiences of the past have shown discrimination and inequality in academia and today it is being challenged. Hence, discrimination among men and women should not be overlooked.

Literature Review:-

Toren, N., and Kraus, V. (1987). examined the effect of minority size of women in academic position and suggested that sex ratio effected position of women.

Menges, R., and Exum, W.(1983). Documented underrepresentation of women in promotion and tenure. Professional values of women and academic culture is emphasized.

Wilson, Robin.(1999)studied gender discrimination at higher educational level and stressed broadly on individual complaints regarding discrimination.

Teri Bingham and Susan J Nix (2010)examined perceptions of women faculty members in higher education to ascertain their views on gender bias at workplace..The issues were resolved and recommended for policy changes.

Lauran A.Rivera (2017)examined the gender stereotypes and organizational stereotypes practice in academic hiring of women . The study was concluded by discussing implications of such relationship status discrimination for sociological research on labour market inequalities and faculty diversities.

Research Methodology:-**Objectives of Study :-**

- To study whether gender discrimination exists at workplace .
- To investigate discrimination against responsible activities.
- To examine inappropriate physical treatment of women faculty

Hypotheses (HO) :-

- 1 **H1 Age**, designation and marital status do not significantly influence gender discrimination.
- 2 **H2 Age**, designation and marital status significantly influence gender discrimination.

Sources of data :-

- 1 It is a descriptive survey. The sample comprises of 108 women faculty.
- 2 Mean and standard deviation are used to answer research questions while hypotheses were tested using ANOVA.
- 3 The questionnaire consists of section A & B.

• Limitations :-

- a) The present study is based on the opinions collected from women faculty only.
- b) The study focused mainly on higher education system.

3 DATA ANALYSIS:-**Table1**

Q1. Whether discrimination exists at workplace ?

Sl.No	Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Decision
1	Is the work distributed equally	108	2.86	1.33	MH
2	Are you given subjects you preferred	108	3.14	1.09	H
3	work scheduled at odd time against your preference	108	3.11	1.11	H
4	Entrusted with extra hours of your colleague	108	3.07	1.25	H
5	Feel discriminated in evaluating work	108	3.63	1.05	H
6	Promotion based on favoritism , influence	108	3.60	1.09	H
7	Appreciated for good work	108	3.49	1.11	H
8	Impartial by higher authorities	108	3.36	1.21	H
		108	3.28	1.16	H

Key limits; 0-2(VL) 2.0 -2.5 (L)2.5 (N) 2.5 to 3.0 (MH)3.0 to 4.0

From the table it is observed that, out of 8 factors distribution of work equally shows moderate discrimination with a score of 2.86. But all other factors show high level of discrimination at workplace.

Analysis of ANOVA:-

Age do not significantly cause gender discrimination at work place.

A1

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Table value
Between Groups	.100	1	.100	0.185	3.92
Within Groups	57.310	106	.541		
Total	57.410	107			

The calculated value $F = 0.185 < \text{table value } 3.92$ hence null hypothesis is accepted. **Age do not significantly cause** gender discrimination at work place.

Designation do not significantly cause gender discrimination at work place

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Table value
Between Groups	.521	1	.521	.972	3.92
Within Groups	56.889	106	.537		
Total	57.410	107			

The calculated value $F = 0.972 < \text{table value } 3.92$ hence null hypothesis is accepted. **Designation do not significantly cause** gender discrimination at work place.

Marital status do not significantly cause gender discrimination at work place.

M1

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Table value
Between Groups	.194	1	.194	.359	3.92
Within Groups	57.216	106	.540		
Total	57.410	107			

The calculated value $F = 0.359 < \text{table value } 3.92$ hence null hypothesis is accepted. **Marital status do not significantly cause** gender discrimination at work place.

Hence it can be deduced that age, designation , marital status and discrimination at work place is independent.

Table 2

Q2. Discriminated against responsible activities ?

S.NO	Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Decision
1	Insignificant tasks assigned to you	108	3.42	1.10	H
2	Equal opportunities given during seminars and conferences	108	3.27	1.20	H
3	Higher authorities	108	3.24	1.22	H

	Sequencing you towards end				
4	Low recognition for Important discussions	108	3.28	1.29	H
		108	3.30	1.20	H

Key limits; 0-2 (VL) 2.0 -2.5 (L)2.5 (N) 2.5 to 3.0 (MH)3.0 to 4.0 (H) 4.0 to 5.0 (VH).

From the table it is observed that, “Out of 4 factors assigning of insignificant tasks show highest discrimination with a score of 3.42”. All other factors also show high discrimination against responsible activities .

Ho1 Age Designation , Marital status do not significantly cause gender discrimination against responsible activities.

Age do not significantly cause gender discrimination against responsible activities.

Table A2

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Table value
Between Groups	3.916	1	3.916	8.548	3.92
Within Groups	48.562	106	.458		
Total	52.479	107			

The calculated value $F = 8.548 >$ table value 3.92 hence null hypothesis is rejected . **Age significantly cause** gender discrimination against responsible activities.

Designation do not significantly cause gender discrimination against responsible activities

Table D2

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Table value
Between Groups	.442	1	.442	.900	3.92
Within Groups	52.037	106	.491		
Total	52.479	107			

The calculated value $F = 0.900 <$ table value 3.92 hence null hypothesis is accepted. **Designation do not significantly cause** gender discrimination against responsible activities

Marital status do not significantly cause gender discrimination against responsible activities

Table M2

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Table value
Between Groups	2.714	1	2.714	5.781	3.92
Within Groups	49.764	106	.469		
Total	52.479	107			

The calculated value $F = 5.781 >$ table value 3.92 hence null hypothesis is rejected. **Marital status significantly cause** gender discrimination against responsible activities.

Hence it can be deduced that age , marital status leads to discrimination from responsible activities are dependent. Designation and discrimination from responsible activities is independent.

Table 3

Q3. Inappropriate physical treatment

S. No	Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Decision
1.	Spreading rumors without proof	108	3.50	1.23	H
2.	Male colleagues talking something unrelated to work	108	3.14	1.07	H
3.	Unnecessarily laughing at you	108	3.17	1.16	H
4.	Unnecessary praising	108	3.12	1.18	H
5.	Threatening from male faculty	108	3.48	1.76	H
6.	Bad behavior	108	3.04	1.30	H
7.	Harassment at workplace	108	3.34	1.15	H
8.	Forcing you to accept	108	3.18	1.37	H
		108	3.24	1.28	H

Key limits 0-2 (VL) 2.0 -2.5 (L)2.5 (N) 2.5 to 3.0 (MH)3.0 to 4.0 (H) 4.0 to 5.0 (VH).

From the table it is observed that ,”spreading rumors without proof and male faculty threatening their counterparts shows higher discrimination. Overall the average of all eight factors exhibit that women faculty perceive discrimination due to inappropriate physical treatment .

Age do not significantly cause gender discrimination from inappropriate physical treatment

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Table value.
Between Groups	2.196	1	2.196	3.089	3.92
Within Groups	75.364	106	.711		
Total	77.561	107			

The calculated value $F = 3.089 < \text{table value } 3.92$ hence null hypothesis is accepted. **Age do not significantly cause** gender discrimination from inappropriate physical treatment.

Designation do not significantly cause gender discrimination from inappropriate physical treatment.

D3

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Table value.
Between Groups	.013	1	.013	.017	.3.92
Within Groups	77.548	106	.732		
Total	77.561	107			

The calculated value $F = .017 < \text{table value } 3.92$ hence null hypothesis is accepted.

Designation do not significantly cause gender discrimination from inappropriate physical treatment.

Marital status do not significantly cause gender discrimination from inappropriate physical treatment

M3

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Table value.
Between Groups	8.355	1	8.355	12.797	.3.92
Within Groups	69.206	106	.653		
Total	77.561	107			

The calculated value $F = 12.79 > \text{table value } 3.92$ hence null hypothesis is rejected **Marital status significantly cause** gender discrimination from inappropriate physical treatment.

Hence it can be deduced that age, designation are independent. Marital status and discrimination

from inappropriate physical treatment is dependent.

Findings and conclusions:-

- From my study the following conclusions were drawn
- There was high gender discrimination at the workplace.
- Scheduling of the work also led to lot of discrimination.
- More work was allotted at odd hours which prevented them to work better . .
- Tasks which were not recognized were assigned to them .
- At seminars and conferences due to gender bias opportunities were not given to them by overlooking the women faculty ..
- Higher authorities were partial and never appreciated for their good work.
- Promotion worked more on influence and favoritism.
- Preference was not given to take important decisions.
- Harassment from male colleagues was very high and women were judged unfairly in multiple ways.
- Different performance standards were utilized for the quality the work .
- Although huge strides have been made in last few decades women are still experiencing high level of discrimination in higher educational institutions.
- The work climate is less accommodative for women and more permissible for men.

Recommendations:-

- Women should be given a chance to go along with men for academic career and promotion .
- Female faculty should be partnered with men in the pipeline of employment.
- The higher authorities should not exploit the women on any grounds and they should be fair and impartial .
- Higher authorities should tilt in favor of women faculty for gender equality.
- Ensure that policies are well communicated and implemented .
- The institutions should be identified as non discrimination against women by the policy of the institution
- Awareness among the academicians should be more liberal and progressive increasing gender parity.
- Elimination of gender discrimination is a must for any institution and they should have code of conduct based on morality.

Bibliography:-

- Menges, R., and Exum, W.(1983). *Barriers to the progress of women and minority faculty. Journal of Higher Education* 54 (2): 123-144. Monk-Turner, E. and Fogerty, R. 20.
- Toren, N., and Kraus, V. (1987). *The effects of minority size on women's position in academia. Social Forces* 65: 1090-1100.
- Romainville, M.(1996). *Teaching and research at university: A difficult pairing. Higher Education Management* 8: 135-144.



**Anveshana's International Journal of Research in Regional Studies, Law, Social Sciences,
Journalism and Management Practices**

- *Wilson, Robin. (1999) "An MIT Professor's Suspicion of Bias Leads to a New Movement for Academic Women." Chronicle of Higher Education, December 3, 1999.*
- *Teri Bingham (2010) women faculty in higher education A case study on gender bias Forum on Public Policy A journal of the Oxford round table.*
- *Lauran A. Riveria Gender and relationship status Discrimination in academic hiring (2017) American sociological association sage publication.com*