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Abstract

Keeping the view of existence of gender inequity in workplace that disregards the rationale of equal dealing with all workers, the present study explored the contribution of factors associated with individual and organizations in construction of perception of gender inequity among teachers. A sample of 341 college teachers provided data on Perceived Gender Inequity Scale and filled the information sheet for individual and organizational-level predictors. Results reveal that college teachers perceived gender inequity in their colleges and female teachers perceived higher gender inequity privileging males as compared to be male teachers we find organizational-level variables as a group highly predictive for perceived gender inequity than individual predictors. Individual predictors as one group explicated smaller variance, with gender, age, education, and marital status (except for job status and job experience) yielding a substantial impact in the predicted direction.
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Introduction

Gender discrimination is the sting matter of world. Several researches have confirmed the existence of gender inequity at workplace. Wages, power, and notoriety are all divided unequally between men and women, regardless of the possibility that they have the same job level (Britton & Williams, 2000). Gender discrimination is the uneven dissemination of sources, possibilities, and incentives on the premise of gender (Reskin & Padavic, 1994). Analysts have proposed a mixture of clarifications for efficient gender inequity in the working environment such as social convictions, men’s movements, managers’ activities, and employees’ own choices (Reskin and Padavic, 1994).

Gender inequity is viewed as unethical in the light of the fact that it disregards human self-worth and self-reliance, and generally prompts the rights’ retraction that should be accessible to every person of community (Mcewan, 2001). Gender inequity disregards the rule of equivalent distribution that expects people of similar privilege to an advantage for being handled likewise subjected to approaching opportunities (Mcewan, 2001).

Several studies have been carried out to understand gender inequity, reason for sex disparity, in other words to clarify why gender discrimination prevails. Nonetheless, in consistent with objective realities about gender inequity, there is also a subjective measurement pertaining to how a person understand, deciphers, sees, or gives important to inequity among males and females (Ngo, 2001). Be relevant to objective measures of gender inequity, people might interpret gender inequity in the light of social settings that usually honor individuals distinctively on the premise of the societal groups to whom they have association. Perceived gender inequity is a conviction that disparity subsists at workplace depended purely on gender, an ascribed attribute, as opposed to other achieved attributes. Concentrating on
perceived gender inequity as opposed to real gender inequity is beneficial and significant since perceived organizational environment influences organizational attitude and actions (Sanchez & Brock, 1996).

People’s perceptions about gender inequity are significant as it generally create issues with maintenance, assurance, and execution (Shah, 1998). Perceived gender inequity in organization might be considered as an ethical issue since it is identified with decency and equity in the working environment and employees’ rights (Mcewan, 2001). When people experience gender inequity in organization as a result of prejudicial exercises, then individuals will put effort in decreasing such inequity and discriminations.

Expression of gender inequity is unique and different in every organization, with its bases of segregation profoundly implanted in its frameworks, experiences, and suppositions (Meyerson & Fletcher, 2000). In a working context, direct relations with other people brings about socially built perceptions (Ibarra & Andrews, 1993), and therefore, people can experience sex disparity at their working place in the division of constrained and esteemed assets.

Work environment disparity between male and female workers is among the most subtle and tenacious manifestations of gender segregation (Reskin, 2000). In spite of the fact that females have taken extraordinary steps in the worldwide work power, gender discrimination yet prevails in several sorts. If the wages of men and women heads and employees are equated, women remain inferior to men in pay and wages advancement (Blum, Fields, & Goodman, 1994). The findings of another study (Channar, 2010) also demonstrated that women perceived more discrimination as compared to men employment, assignments, trainings, and behavior. He also explored that female employees in all age groups are treated differently than male employees.
Males and females generally vary in their way of perception, and these gender variations in their perceptions may be inborn and natural, an outcome of socialization or an individual’s norm system, or because of related knowledge (Rotundo, Nguyen, & Sackett, 2001). The theory of gender differences suggests that men and women have a tendency to respect their work surroundings with diverse demeanor and desires (Smith and Rogers, 2000). Females perceive greater inequity compared to males, and males and females both report a higher level of victimization against females than against males (Gutek, Cohen, & Tsui, 1996).

Female employees’ incentives and honors, and working environment are normally less ideal than that of male employees (Mueller & Wallace, 1996), and females are likewise greater probable than men to perform in deadlock occupations and, therefore, have low opportunities to progress to higher position (Reskin & Padavic, 1994). Head honchos have a tendency to hold compelling status for males, and females have low chances compared to males to practice power and autonomy in work environment (Lyness & Thompson, 1997; Reskin & Padavic, 1994). Indeed in overwhelmingly female tunes of work, for example, nursing, if the position is higher, the chances will be greater that the employee is to be man (Williams, 1992).

All over the world, males out earn females (Reskin & Padavic, 1994). Females incline to possess a burdened status in the work field in both advance and under progress nations (Blau, Ferber, & Winkler, 1998; Ngo, 1997). The theory of social comparison has exhibited the criticalness of societal terms in facilitating people assess their salary, work many-sided quality, working environment status, execution, remuneration, vocation trajectories, and work responsibilities, particularly under uncertain situation (Shah, 1998).

Organizational attributes, for example, gender of head, sex segregation, gender inequity, and size of organization, are prone to structure examination process by molding the relative importance
people relate to work groups (Wharton, 1992). Faisal (2010) also offered empirical proves on the extent to which the working climate in public organizations of Pakistan is responsive to female workers’ perception and needs. In spite of friendly environment in the organization, female employees were found dissatisfied with working conditions provided to them. In fact significant differences were found in males and females’ perceptions regarding the gender inequity.

As gender discrimination is the top current issue of world, females in Pakistan also experience inequity in the work power, which is either fit as a fiddle of Sticky Floor or Glass Ceiling Effects. Segregation on one side nullifies the equity laws, which will negatively influence the HRM principles; on the other side refuses the value, social equity and the activity of essential human rights, which will bring about the less improvement. Gender inequity transforms the workers emotionally weak, basic peace adoring workers convert into suspicious, dreadful, and irate people (Bielby & Baron, 1984).

Utilizing social comparison theories, for example, gender socialization, social comparison, and social identity, I speculated that (1) teachers in colleges will report greater perceived inequity versus female teachers than that versus male teachers, (2) compared to male teachers, female teachers will have greater perceived inequity versus females, and (3) individual-level and organizational-level factors will determine the degree of perceived gender inequity. The aim for this investigation is triple: first, to expand the research in gender equity in addition to recognize reasons of gender inequity, second, to investigate the differences between males and females in their perception of gender inequity, and third, to analyze the individual and organizational predictors of perceived gender inequity. Following the design of study by Ngo, et al. (2003), this study aimed at examining the underline factors of perceived gender inequity in educational field. Thus, the present study is an extension to the research, and addition to the literature on perceived gender inequity beyond business to educational sector, and developed to developing countries.
Research

Unveiling the Perceived Gender Inequity:...

Individual-level Variables:
- Gender
- Age
- Education
- Marital Status
- Job Position
- Job Experience

Organizational-level Variables:
- Gender of head
- Ratio of females
- Size of organization
- Job segregation

Perceived Gender Inequity

H1
H2
H3
H4
H5
H6
H7
H8
H9
H10
H11

Method

Participants

The data came from a survey of public (n = 5) and private (n = 5) college teachers conducted in Multan in 2013. The targeted respondents were selected through a proportional stratified random sampling technique. Using an online sample size calculator from Raosoft, Inc. (2009), the calculated sample size was found to be 341 individuals from a total population of 1123. Of these 341 respondents, males were 158 and females were 183 with age range between 24 and 57 years. The sample was further characterized by different demographic variables like gender, age, education, and marital status.

Instruments

Perceived Gender Inequity Scale

To measure the dependent variable of gender inequity, a six-item scale of perceived gender inequity (Ngo, et al., 2013) was used.
These items address the following facets of work: salary and allowance, fringe benefits, chances of progression, job autonomy, coaching and development possibility, and authority practiced. Responses are obtained on 5-point Likert scale wherein 2 is allocated to the option “males are much better than females”, 1 is given to the option “males are better than females”, 0 is ascribed to the option “males and females are the same”, while –1 is given to the answer “females are better than males”, and –2 is given to the answer “females are much better than males.” Scores on all six items are then averaged out. A +tive score yields bias preferring men and a –tive score yields bias preferring women. In case of low level of perceived gender inequity reported by participant, the score will be close to 0. The scale was found highly reliable measure with a alpha coefficient of 0.75.

Individual and Organizational-Level Characteristics

Several independent variables at two levels were included in this study. At the individual-level; gender, age, education, marital status, job position, and job experience were measured by asking from respondents on a booklet. Questionnaire booklet also included the various organizational-level predictors for example (1) gender of college head, (2) ratio of women computed as the number of female teachers divided by the total number of teachers in college, (3) the size of organization computed as the total count of employees in college. Finally, (4) job segregation by gender computed as the degree of distribution of assignments among males and females in college. Participants were inquired about who generally perform these following six duties in their college; teaching, seminars, arranging ceremonies, study tours and trips, participating in academic meetings, administrative work. Five possible responses were provided and are scored as under.

2 = “predominantly by males” and “predominantly by females”,
1 = “largely by males” and “largely by females”,
0 = “equally shared by males and females”.

By averaging the scores on these six items, a composite score is maintained. A high score indicates a high level of job segregation by sex and vice versa.

**Procedures**

Employing the proportion stratified random sampling, the teachers were selected and approached in their colleges. After incurring consent from teachers to participate in the survey, responses were obtained on perceived gender inequity scale and a variable sheet. Teachers were told about the objectives of the study, and were then guided how to answer on questionnaire. All the respondents were informed that their responses on questionnaire will not be shared with anyone, and will only be utilized in current research objectives. Survey data were analysed using SPSS 17 version.

**Results**

In order to see the comparison between male and female teachers’ perceived gender inequity, independent sample t-test was performed (Table 1). A correlation matrix was computed among all study variables to see the inter relationship among individual and organizational factors (Table 2). Results pertaining to the expected effects of individual and organizational-level factors on perceived

### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Gender Inequity</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Versus male</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>-3.18</td>
<td>0.00**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Versus female</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ df = 339, ***p < 0.001 \]
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gender inequity were measured through hierarchal regression analysis (Table 3).

Table 1 depicts the significant differences in the perception of college teachers that they have experienced towards male and female gender inequity. Findings imply that teachers perceived greater gender inequity towards female as compared towards male teachers. Results entail that both male and female college teachers have reported that female teachers receive greater gender inequity than male teachers in any college.

Table 2

Differences in Perception of Male and Female Teachers about Gender Inequity (N = 158, 183)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>0.00**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Employing t-test, findings in Table 2 indicate that male and female teachers highly significantly differed in terms of reporting gender inequity ($t = 2.73$; $p < 0.001$). Results suggest that female perceive greater gender inequity than male teachers.

The descriptive analyses and zero-order correlations among all individual and organizational factors are presented in Table 3, and results from regression analysis on perceived gender inequity are presented in Table 4.

Table 4 presents a computation of series of ordinary least squares (OLS) regression analyses that was run to test a family of assumptions regarding individual and organizational-level predictors.
### Table 3

**Descriptive Statistics and Correlations among Study Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>9.17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Position</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Experience</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of Head</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of females</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>9.85</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of Organization</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>8.81</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p > .05, **p < .01

### Table 3

**Prediction of perceived gender inequity from individual and organizational-level factors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Individual &amp; Organizational Predictors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.23**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.31**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>.38*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job position</td>
<td>- .06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job experience</td>
<td>- .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of Head</td>
<td>- .19**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of females</td>
<td>.53*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of Organization</td>
<td>- .14*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Segregation</td>
<td>.41*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.19**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-statistics</td>
<td>19.32**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, **p < .01

In Model 1, first set of individual-level factors were inserted into the regression pan. As a whole, the model reported 19% of variance in perceived gender inequity. Another control variable related to individual factors, job position and job experience were inserted in Model 2. This set of predictors solely increased the R-square by .22, and explained the 22% of variance in perceived gender inequity. In Model 3, organizational-level factors together described a significant quantity of variation in gender inequity. The standardized regression
beta of gender of head, proportion of females, size of organization, and job segregation were found statistically significant.

Discussion

Based on the main tenets of theories from social psychology, the present study has drawn a model to get comprehensive explanatory factors of perceived gender inequity. The study was not focused on measuring whether gender inequity exists in real among employees in organizations but aimed at knowing the perceived gender inequity. People may have individual differences in defining things. Why do males and females perceive matters in different manners? People are trained and cultured in the ways of perceiving behaviors in different manners. For instance, men and women may have different learning to interpret different organizational incentives as fairly distributed among males and females, thus, it could be rationalized that the same advantages and honors might be sensed as evenly allotted by one gender and as unevenly by the other depending on how males and females are trained and cultured (Rotundo et al., 2001). One another explanation might be found that male and female employees may perceive things differently owning to their different functions and status in the organization.

Grounded in these facts explaining differences in perceptions of men and women, this study established a family of assumptions. It was assumed that college teachers will report greater perceived inequity for female not for male. Finding of the current study has supported the hypothesis and affirmed the claim that generally people perceived higher gender inequity versus females than versus males. It means both male and female teachers perceived that female face greater situations of gender inequity than males (Table 1). Another assumption stated as that female teachers will report greater degree of gender inequity than male teachers was also affirmed by the present findings and female were found with greater perception of gender inequity as compared to males (Table 2).
The individual and organizational level factors were considered to be hypothesized to explain perceived gender inequity. It was hypothesized that individual and organization related factors will affect perceived gender inequity.

The findings from regression analysis (Table 4) confirmed significant positive influences of gender, age, education, and marital status on gender inequity, and provided the support for the assumptions (Hypotheses 2, 3, 4, & 5) that females have been found with greater perception of gender inequity than males. This finding is in line with the research of Gutek et al. (1996) who reported that both gender perceive greater gender inequity versus women than versus men, but females’ perception of discrimination against women was higher as compared to males. Female workers generally face bad and bigger working situations (e.g., low salary, low freedom, and less power) compared to their male co-workers (Mueller & Wallace 1996; Phelan, 1994). Respondents from all age groups, low education groups, and who were married perceived greater gender inequity favoring males. These findings of the present study are also in consistent with the study conducted by Channar, Abbasi, & Ujan (2011) who analyzed that females were discriminated more than males in private organizations and therefore experienced job dissatisfaction & low motivation, low commitment & low enthusiasm and high stress level at working place.

The findings further revealed no significant effects of job position (Hypothesis 6). Though job position has been found related with perceived gender inequity, no statistically significant effect was found in regression analysis. These findings have not supported the hypothesis 5, and are not in line with the structural framework of organizational behavior suggesting status in the organizational hierarchy influences on employees’ actions and understanding at work (Kanter, 1977). Further, the effect of job experience was also not found significant (Hypothesis 7) because no correlation was found between job experience and perceived gender inequity. Hypothesis 6
has not been confirmed through this study. Findings are in contrast with the occupational socialization theory. This theory postulates that trainings and workplace climate provide learning to its employees to be socialized within the organizational culture (Smith & Rogers, 2000), therefore, the workers with greater job experience learn more and become fully socialized and might be highly vulnerable to receive gender inequity in their organizations. But unfortunately this study has failed to confirm this assumption.

Pertaining to the family of hypotheses regarding organizational level factors, results showed the significant effects of gender of head (Hypothesis 8) and proportion of females (Hypothesis 9). In line with Hypothesis 7, teachers experienced a higher degree of perceived gender inequity under male head. This result is in consistent with the work of Pazy (1986) who conducted a study in Israel and reported that employees who were employed under a female head in the past indicated a pro-female prejudice in selecting among nominees with appropriate job experience. Tharenou (2002) also discovered if female workers in an organization do not work under female heads, the female workers are more likely to be expected that they will not be promoted as more as males. Pertaining to hypothesis 8, results imply that employees working in organizations wherein females fall in a lower or higher percentage, reported higher gender inequity as compared to the employees working at workplace with even ratio of males and females. The study has confirmed the work of Gutek and Morasch (1982) that work places dominated by men or by women, gender differences become prominent. The proportional representation of females impacts females’ gender identity at organization (Ely, 1995).

Effect of factor of organizational size (Hypothesis 10) was also found statistically significant. Results show that teachers working in smaller colleges perceived higher gender inequity. Schminke (2001) argued that perception of gender inequity was higher in organizations
with a smaller number of employees because workers of smaller organizations interact with few numbers of workers and systems, therefore, provide more chances to learn much about the workers of other organizations within a limited time period. Assumption for job segregation (Hypothesis 11) indicates that job segregation by gender was positively correlated with perceived gender inequity. Finally, it was discovered that when job segregation increases, the perceived gender inequity also increases. These findings are in favor of Reskin and Padavic’s work (1994) that sex segregation promote the way to undervalue females and their performance, and is a central element differential incentives for males and females.

Conclusion

This study is exploratory in nature. It examines the individual and organizational predictors of perceived gender inequity. The findings of the current study have contributed in literature through investigating how employees explain the existence of gender inequity. First, the findings confirm the statement that people generally perceive gender inequity in their organizations. Second, from individual-level factors, gender, age, education, and marital status were found significantly effective in predicting gender inequity, while effects of job position and job experience were remain non significant. However, all organizational factors contributed more in explaining perceived gender inequity than individual factors.

Limitations & Suggestions

Though the present study has offered several important contributions in the literature of understanding the differential aspects of perceived gender inequity, it acknowledges some limitations also. Nevertheless, the study has employed stratified random sampling technique to select the sample, but it was restricted only to college teachers. Thus findings cannot be generalized to other educational
institutes like university and school teachers. So far, it is suggested that the study should be replicated with this sample to overcome this limitation. No doubt, this study has explored various individual and organizational-level variables, many other variables yet to be addressed at individual and organizational-level such as personality traits, religious aspects, job expertise, and public/private organizations. Lack of qualitative data about the issue under study is also another limitation of the present study. Therefore, for more and deeper understanding of the individual and organizational level predictors, extensive case studies should be taken from the participants by the future researchers.
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