

A STUDY OF GENDER DISCRIMINATION IN GOVERNMENT UNIVERSITIES OF HARYANA STATE

¹Prof. Sultan Singh, ²Ms. Deepa Sharma,

¹Maharishi Markandeshwar Deemed to be University, Mullana, Ambala, India,

²Research Scholar, Maharishi Markandeshwar Deemed to be University, Mullana, Ambala, India.

Abstract:

Gender discrimination is such a bitter truth that no one is untouched; everyone suffers in one form or the other. Male or female, both are facing discrimination. To examine the issue of gender discrimination, which is the main issue in the modern era, an attempt has been made to study the perception of male and female teaching and non-teaching employees of selected Haryana government universities. A sample of 80 teaching and non-teaching employees of selected universities of Haryana was taken. The study seeks to find out whether male and female teaching and non-teaching employees working in government universities in the state of Haryana experience discrimination? It was found that the gender discrimination is experienced by the employees during recruitment, training and career development. The government should make women and men aware of gender inequality and make them aware of their fundamental rights by organizing conferences related to gender equality at the workplace. Not only should programs and policies related to gender inequality be implemented, but if any gaps are noticed after implementation, appropriate action should also be taken.

Keywords: Employees, Universities, Discrimination, Development, Recruitment.

Introduction:

The meaning of gender discrimination has changed over time, as women did not have the right to live freely before independence. When boys were born, there was a (Cailin S. Stamarski, 2015) atmosphere of happiness in the houses. This is the situation even today in backward areas. Earlier (Amutha.D, 2017) women were confined to household chores only and lived under the discipline of the father before marriage and followed (Shafique Owais, 2012) the orders of the husband after marriage. All the rights of the house belonged to the male class. If it is said that there has been discrimination against girls or women in private life in homes, then it will not be wrong. (Agarwal Bina, 2018) After independence and with the passage of time, there has been a change in the status of women, but men also tolerate gender discrimination. This is less than women but which a bitter truth is. Women are leaving (Shaukat Sadiq, 2015) the confines of their homes and contributing to the workplace at par with men. The law of the land has given equal rights to women like men. (Verniers Catherine, 2018) Yet we are aware that there is discrimination somewhere between us. Women have not been able to achieve empowerment despite giving equal education, experience (Hassanzadez Jafar, 2014) and contribution as men. We do not want to say that only women tolerate discrimination but men also tolerate discrimination but face less discrimination than women. Women or men (Das Rituparna, 2016) have been discriminated against each other knowingly or unknowingly. This is why gender discrimination is not ending.

Review of Literature

Pitot et al. (2021) examined how female radiologists and trainees experienced gender discrimination and sexual harassment during the training period, how harassment or discrimination affects gender equality and whether gender equality is affected by the number of women. Ranasinghe et al. (2021) examined the relationship between gender discrimination and occupational tension in public banks in Sri Lanka and evaluated the impact of sexual orientation segregation on employee performance. Njoki et al. (2021) focused on how to deal with gender discrimination in relation to recruitment, pay and promotion in industries. Henningsen et al. (2021) evaluated the government programs and strategies to recruit female-side assistant professors in German, Swiss and Austrian universities. An online examination with 481 economic university individuals evaluating a web-based experiment surveyed whether evaluators rated female candidates as less qualified than male candidates in recruitment positions of assistant professors. Dubbelt et al. (2016) identified the career progression is much slower in the position of women in specific

organizations and focused on a constellation of job characteristics and examined whether women are under-represented than men in specific organizations (for example, IT organizations) and in top administrative positions. *Orser et al. (2012)* highlighted the barriers to the career advancement of women in advanced technology fields at the individual, firm and industry-level. *Russen et al. (2020)* examined on the effect of gender discrimination on the promotion process of men and women as hotel managers and analyzed whether the behavior of the hotel management with the female and male manager in the hotel is the same or behavior parameters are different depending on the gender. *Kern et al. (2020)* examined demographic characteristics *i.e.* gender, discipline and experience of gender discrimination among employees working in the US Forest Service. The researchers based their study on demographic differences in perception and experiences of workplace culture in the private sector. *Gauci et al. (2021)* focused on whether female Registered Nurses (RNs) experienced gender discrimination at the workplace and also examined work environment procedures to guarantee of job security to women.

The above review of the literature shows that various studies have been conducted regarding gender discrimination with reference to women only. The present study covers the attitude of male and female teaching and non-teaching staff of government universities in Haryana. Men or women everywhere are crazy about government jobs. The employees appointed in the government universities are selected on the basis of guidelines issued by the University Grants Commission (UGC) from time to time. Recruitment, selection, training and career development policies are framed by the statutory organizations of the government of India. So the question of discrimination among the employees does not arise but is it true? Government universities are no exception to it; hence the present study is undertaken.

Research Objectives

The present study is conducted to analyze the impact of discrimination during recruitment, selection and training, and to know the impact of gender discrimination on employee's career development in government universities.

Research Hypothesis

The following research hypotheses have been formulated to validate the results of the study:

- H01:** There is no significant difference in the viewpoint of the male and female employees towards the impact of gender discrimination during recruitment, selection and training.
- H02:** There is no significant difference in the viewpoint of the male and female employees towards the impact of gender discrimination on their career development.

Data and Methodology:

To conduct the present study, primary data have been collected through pre-tested structured questionnaire on five Likert scale, *i.e.*, Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Neutral (N), Disagree (D) and Strongly Disagree (SD). A sample of 80 teaching and non-teaching employees of selected Universities of the Haryana government was taken. Data have been collected from 40 teaching and 40 non-teaching employees. To check the reliability of collected data, Cronbach Alpha coefficients (0.772) has been used. Secondary data were gathered from journals, articles, books, magazines and online websites, *etc.*

Results and Discussion

The results of the frequency distributions of male and female teaching and non-teaching employees of selected government universities of Haryana towards gender discrimination show that strongly agree/agree towards 'the questions asked to female employees at the time of interview are easier as compared to male employees' (N=77,P=81.34), followed by irrelevant questions are asked to the female employees (N=75,P=79.32), 'rules, policies and procedures used to evaluate performance during hiring candidates are gender-biased' (N=74,P=77.14), 'responsibilities assigned are based on gender'

(N=66,P=39.09), ‘selection is based on the skills, knowledge and experience of the candidate’ (N=64,P=37.97), management treats male and female employees unfairly during the selection (N=62,P=35.05), ‘methods of evaluating the performance after training of male and female employees are the same’ (N=69,P=41.89), ‘males are given more chances than females for training if provided outside the institution’ (N=71,P=72.64) and morale of employees is reduced due to discriminatory practices during training’ (N=73,P=74.06).

Table-1 indicates the descriptive and inferential statistics of employee’s viewpoint regarding the impact of discrimination during recruitment, selection and training. The females are of view that ‘Selection is based on the skills, knowledge and experience of the candidate’ (Mean=2.89, SD=1.74), followed by ‘at the time of an interview, questions asked to female employees are easier as compared to male employees’ (Mean=2.28, SD=0.68), followed by ‘morale of employees is reduced due to discriminatory practices during training’ (Mean=2.23, SD=1.86). However, the males are also of view that ‘selection is based on the skills, knowledge and experience of the candidate’ (Mean=2.76, SD=1.66), followed by ‘at the time of an interview, questions asked to female employees are easier as compared to male employees (Mean=2.27, SD=0.67), followed by ‘morale of employees is reduced due to discriminatory practices during training’ (Mean=2.19, SD=1.79). Statistically, the results of the t-test show that there is a significant difference in the viewpoint of male and female teaching and non-teaching employees towards the ‘management treats male and female employees unfairly during the selection’ ($p=0.005$) and ‘methods of evaluating the performance after training of male and female employees are the same’ ($p=0.002$); hence the null hypothesis (H_{01}) is rejected.

Table 1: Impact of Discrimination during Recruitment, Selection and Training

Statements	Gender	N	Mean	SD	t-statistics	
					t	Sig.
At the time of an interview, questions asked to female employees are easier as compared to male employees.	Male	80	2.27	0.67	0.19	0.02
	Female	80	2.28	0.68		
Irrelevant questions are asked to the female employees.	Male	80	1.29	1.39	0.82	0.39
	Female	80	1.40	1.05		
The rules, policies and procedures used to evaluate performance during hiring candidates are gender-biased.	Male	80	1.10	1.27	0.35	0.47
	Female	80	1.14	1.14		
Responsibilities assigned are based on gender.	Male	80	1.39	1.67	0.60	0.22
	Female	80	1.46	1.88		
Selection is based on the skills, knowledge and experience of the candidate	Male	80	2.76	1.66	1.23	0.31
	Female	80	2.89	1.74		
Management treats male and female employees unfairly during the selection	Male	80	2.14	1.69	2.17	0.005*
	Female	80	2.22	1.78		
The methods of evaluating the performance after training of male and female employees are the same.	Male	80	1.32	1.32	0.57	0.002*
	Female	80	1.93	1.94		
Males are given more chances than females the training if is provided outside the institution.	Male	80	2.19	1.67	0.09	0.83
	Female	80	2.06	1.43		
Morale of employees is reduced due to discriminatory practices during training.	Male	80	2.19	1.79	0.27	0.82
	Female	80	2.23	1.86		

Note: N=No. of Respondents, *= Significant at 05 percent level

Source: Compiled from primary data (SPSS Output)

Table-2 indicates the descriptive and inferential statistics of employee’s viewpoint regarding the impact of gender discrimination on employee’s career development in government universities. The females are of the view that ‘lack of family support is a barrier to the growth of a career sometimes’ (Mean=3.30, SD=0.79), followed by Institution provides gender-balanced academic career patterns,(Mean=3.19, SD=1.13) and ‘male and female faculty experiences gender inequality in their career development’ (Mean=2.73, SD=1.34). However, the males are also of the view that ‘lack of family support is a barrier to the growth of a career sometimes’ (Mean=3.24, SD=0.61), followed by ‘institution providing gender-balanced academic career patterns’ (Mean=3.11, SD=1.04), ‘male and female faculty experiences gender inequality in their career development’ (Mean=2.64, SD=1.25). Statistically, the results of the t-test show that there is a significant difference in the viewpoint of male and female teaching and non-teaching employees towards ‘career growth depends more on favoritism than ability’ ($p=0.02$) and ‘female employees face more difficulties in their career development’ ($p=0.00$); hence the null hypothesis (H_{02}) is rejected.

Table 2: Impact of Gender Discrimination on Employees in their Career Development

Statements	Gender	N	Mean	SD	t-statistics	
					t	Sig.
Gender discrimination is the main barrier to the growth of your career.	Male	80	2.29	1.31	0.11	0.33
	Female	80	2.32	1.32		
There are gender differences in the number of employees and their impact on education performance.	Male	80	1.84	1.43	1.19	0.22
	Female	80	1.92	1.49		
Gender discrimination equally impacts the career of both genders.	Male	80	2.21	1.32	0.52	0.33
	Female	80	2.11	1.29		
Your Institution contributes much to your personal and career growth.	Male	80	1.87	1.09	0.38	0.26
	Female	80	2.03	1.23		
Male and female faculty experiences gender inequality in their career development.	Male	80	2.64	1.25	0.11	0.74
	Female	80	2.73	1.34		
Academic aspirations and achievements of males and females differ from each other	Male	80	2.16	1.31	1.26	0.43
	Female	80	2.14	1.29		
Your Institution provides gender-balanced academic career patterns.	Male	80	3.11	1.04	0.22	0.66
	Female	80	3.19	1.13		
You felt many times that career growth depends more on favoritism than ability.	Male	80	2.22	1.28	0.32	0.02*
	Female	80	2.16	1.17		
Lack of family support is a barrier to the growth of a career sometimes.	Male	80	3.24	0.61	0.64	0.52
	Female	80	3.30	0.79		
Female employees face more difficulties in their career development.	Male	80	2.32	1.44	1.97	0.00*
	Female	80	2.51	1.68		

Note: N=No. of Respondents, *= Significant at 05 percent level

Source: Compiled from primary data (SPSS Output)

Conclusion

From the above analysis, it is concluded that both male and female employees acknowledged gender discrimination in the selected Universities during recruitment and training. Further, career development depends more on bias than on merit. It is recommended that the organization should constitute a committee consisting of both male and female to identify the issues affecting the gender discrimination at the workplace and suggest appropriate action without ignoring gender inequality. Discrimination is the result of gender differences, so both parties should respect and cooperate with each other at the workplace.

Limitations and Future scope of the Study:

The study presented the viewpoint of male and female teaching and non-teaching employees towards gender discrimination with a small sample size of 80 respondents only, which can be increased to a representative level to get appropriate and relevant results. This study was restricted to government universities located in Haryana, which can be further extended to other states and economic sectors. The present study is of academic nature, which will limit the relevance of its findings.

References-:

1. Kaushik, N., Sharma, A. Kumar, Kaushik, V.(2014). Equality in the workplace: a study of gender issues in Indian organizations. *Journal of Management Development*, 33 (2), 90-106. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-11-2013-0140>.
2. Sharma, Deepa (2020).Analyzing the effects of Gender Discrimination on Female faculty in Government Universities of Haryana. *Journal of Xi'an University of Architecture & Technology*, 12 (5), 607-622.<https://doi.org/10.37896/JXAT12.05/1459>.
3. Jangir Hemraj (2017). Parental Attitudes and Children's Perception on Gender Discrimination: Evidences from Rural Rajasthan. *Indian Journal of Sustainable Development*, 3(1), 29-36 <http://publishingindia.com/ijisd/>.
4. Asfaw Klasen, and Lamanna, Francesca (2007). Intra-household Gender disparities in Children's medical care before death in India. *International journal of culture and gender*, 10(4), 124-129. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.964967>.
5. Arora Umesh Rashmi (2012). Gender Inequality, Economic Development and Globalization: a State Level Analysis of India. *The Journal of Developing Areas*, 46 (1), 147-164. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3201/ssrn.9649671>.
6. Sangwan Sheela (2021). Factors influencing gender stereotyping among adolescents. *The Pharma Innovation Journal* 10(5) 301-304, <http://dx.doi.org/10.2679/ssrn.746321>.
7. Gupta Rotu (2018). Achieving gender equality in Haryana: sensitizing men to enable women. *International Journal of Gender Studies in Developing Societies*, 2(3), 177-206, <http://dx.doi.org/10.2239/ssrn.876665>.
8. Kumari Manisha (2015). Disappearing Daughters in Haryana: Trends, Issues and Concerns. *Journal of Art & Science of Geography* ISSN: 2395-1915 2(2) 20-25, <http://dx.doi.org/10.2271/ssrn.952522>.
9. Selvaraj Kalaiselvi (2017). Does gender discrimination transformed its face over few generations? Exploring gender inequalities among under-6 year children in rural Haryana. *International Journal of Gender Studies in Developing Societies*, 33(1) 29-37. doi: 10.4103/0971-9962.200089.