



Gender-Based Disparities In Various Forms Of Discriminatory Experiences

¹Vikrant Jha* and ²Shah Mohd. Khan²

¹Research Scholar, ²Professor

¹Department of Psychology, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh, Uttar Pradesh, India.

²Department of Psychology, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh, Uttar Pradesh, India.

Abstract: In day-to-day life, men and women are equally likely to face a variety of forms of discrimination, despite the fact that the specific experiences and situations may be different for each. Gender-based discrimination refers to the unequal treatment or treatment of individuals depending on their gender. Prejudice or bias arises when someone is treated unfairly or disadvantaged because of their gender identity or sex. Gender-based prejudice must be addressed by social efforts to promote gender equality, challenge preconceptions, and offer equitable opportunities for all individuals. Therefore, this study ($N = 120$, $M_{age} = 25.13$, $SD = 11.52$) was an attempt to understand the different forms of discriminatory experiences male and female face in their daily life and also how these experiences vary in their expression. Maximum variation purposive sampling method was employed to select the participants from metropolitan city Delhi. We measured discriminatory experiences by using everyday discrimination scale. Results revealed that male and female experienced all forms of discriminatory actions similarly and there was disparity in terms of different forms scenarios of discriminatory experiences in male and female. The findings were analysed and interpreted in relation to the current scholarly literature. We concluded that gender based disparities in experience of discriminatory actions has been diminished. Male and female equally experience different forms of discriminatory experiences and both highly experience 'Got poorer service at different places' highly as discriminatory action. It is recommended that further investigations be undertaken in the domain of discrimination and prejudice, as societal transformation is an inevitable phenomenon.

Keywords. Gender-based disparities, gender equality, and discriminatory experiences.

Introduction

In the realm of everyday existence, individuals of both genders are susceptible to encountering diverse manifestations of prejudice, albeit with potential variations in the specific encounters and contextual circumstances. According to Allport's seminal work in 1954, the concept of discrimination encompasses the act of withholding equal treatment from individuals or groups, thereby depriving them of the desired level of equality (p. 51). According to Jones (1972), discrimination can be defined as the deliberate actions taken to preserve the distinct characteristics and advantageous position of one's own group, often at the detriment of another group (p.4). Prejudice rooted in notions of identity and the desire to align oneself with a particular group lies at the core of various manifestations of discrimination. This phenomenon has the potential to result in societal fragmentation, animosity, and the devaluation of individuals due to their divergent identities. Gender-based discrimination includes the practice of providing differential treatment or unequal opportunities to individuals on the basis of their gender. Gender-based discrimination refers to the manifestation of prejudice or bias, whereby individuals are subjected to unfair treatment or disadvantages based on their gender identity or biological sex. As an illustration, Gender-based violence, encompassing domestic violence, sexual assault, and human trafficking, exhibits a disproportionate impact on women. These encounters may lead to enduring physical, psychological, and emotional effects. Although gender-based violence can affect both men and women, it is more prevalent among women, who are often the primary targets.

Discrimination, prejudice, and stereotyping include both individual and social-structural dimensions (Link & Phelan, 2001; Pager, 2008). Gender discrimination covers a wide range of manifestations, which may include:

1. *Employment Discrimination*: Gender-based workplace discrimination refers to the phenomenon in which individuals are subjected to differential treatment within the professional setting on the basis of their gender. Gender-based discrimination can manifest in various aspects of employment, such as the recruitment process, advancement opportunities, wage disparities, task allocation, and the implementation of workplace regulations that exhibit bias towards a particular gender.
2. *Wage Gap*: The concept of gender-based wage disparity pertains to the discrepancy in earnings observed between individuals of different genders who are engaged in the same occupation or undertaking work of comparable worth. The matter at hand holds considerable importance within numerous societies, serving as a manifestation of systemic gender disparities.
3. *Stereotyping and Bias*: Individuals are given certain duties, behaviours, or qualities depending on their gender, which contributes to the perpetuation of gender stereotypes and the subsequent practice of discrimination.
4. *Educational Discrimination*: Gender-based discrimination in education manifests itself through various mechanisms, including but not limited to, the provision of biased treatment, the imposition of restrictions on access to educational opportunities, and the reinforcement of traditional gender norms that curtail the range of educational options available to individuals.
5. *Violence and Harassment*: Gender-based violence, encompassing acts such as sexual harassment and assault, exhibits a disproportionate impact on women and individuals who identify with non-binary gender identities. The aforementioned phenomenon engenders a climate characterized by apprehension and coercion, thereby perpetuating asymmetrical power dynamics.

6. *Legal and Policy Discrimination*: Gender-based discrimination can be perpetuated by laws and policies that are discriminatory in nature. Examples of gender-based inequalities encompass various aspects such as limitations imposed on reproductive autonomy, gender-biased inheritance legislation, and insufficient legal safeguards against acts of violence based on gender.

The resolution of gender-based discrimination necessitates collective societal endeavours aimed at fostering gender equality, challenging prevailing stereotypes, and guaranteeing equitable opportunities for every individual. Legal frameworks, workplace policies, educational initiatives, and social awareness campaigns are essential components in the effort to address and mitigate discrimination while promoting inclusivity.

Objectives

1. To see the gender-based disparities in various forms of discriminatory experiences.
2. To examine the mean differences in various forms of discriminatory experiences.

Hypotheses

- H₁ There will be gender-based disparities in various forms of discriminatory experiences.
H₂ There will be mean differences in various forms of discriminatory experiences.

Method

Participants

This study included a total of 120 individuals from the metropolitan city of Delhi, India. The gender composition of participants included 60 male and 60 female working adults whose ages ranged from 18-56 years with a mean age of 25.13 ($SD = 11.52$). Participants were chosen using the maximum variation purposive sampling method, which assured that the entire range and scope of the discriminatory experience was reflected.

Inclusion Criteria

- Participants above or equal to the age of 18 years.
- People working in Delhi.
- Must be living in Delhi for one year.

Exclusion Criteria

- Participants below the age of 18 years.
- People who were not working in Delhi.
- Individuals who moved to Delhi within the last one year.

Measures

Participants Characteristics

Age and gender of individuals were asked by the researcher.

Discriminatory Experiences

The researchers employed the Everyday Discrimination Scale, which was originally developed by Williams et al. (1997), to evaluate the various manifestations of discriminatory experiences reported by the study participants. The scale employed in this study consists of nine items that were utilized to measure different manifestations of discriminatory experiences, such as being treated with less courtesy or being

treated with less respect. The scale consisted of a six-point scale measured on an interval scale, with 1 belonging to 'Almost' everyday and 6 belonging to 'Never'. Higher scores were indicative of individuals experiencing fewer instances of discriminatory actions in their daily lives. The internal consistency reliability Cronbach's α for this scale on present sample was found to be .71 which means that scale yielded satisfactory reliability.

Procedure

The researchers initially approached the participants and established a rapport with them. Subsequently, the researchers obtained the participants' consent to participate in the research study. The participants' involvement in the study was entirely voluntary, in accordance with the ethical code of conduct outlined by the American Psychological Association (APA, 2002). They had the right to withdraw their participation at any point during the study. The questionnaire was made available only to those participants who had provided their consent. At the conclusion of the survey, the researcher expressed gratitude to the participants for their invaluable time and support. Additionally, any inquiries raised by the participants were duly attended to by the researcher.

Statistical Analysis

The data was quantified using Microsoft Excel 10, and an examination was carried out to identify any missing values. The statistical analysis was conducted using IBM-SPSS Statistics version 27. The hypotheses of the current research were tested using suitable inferential statistics.

Results

Following an investigation of the assumptions made by parametric tests, it became apparent that the variables of interest satisfied the requirements for normality, homogeneity, and other characteristics. The hypotheses of this study have been tested with the use of suitable statistical methods.

Table 1
Gender-Based Disparities in Discriminatory Experiences

Individuals' Discriminatory Experience	Male		Female		<i>t</i> (118)	<i>p</i>	Cohen's <i>d</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			
Treated with less courtesy	3.68	1.44	4.05	1.43	1.40	.165	0.26
Treated with less respect	4.42	1.33	4.57	1.27	0.63	.529	0.12
Got poorer service at different places	5.12	0.85	5.20	0.66	0.60	.548	0.10
Perception that individual is not smart	3.90	1.40	4.18	1.40	1.11	.269	0.20
People act that they afraid of individual	4.57	1.25	4.33	1.05	1.10	.272	0.21
People act that Individual is dishonest	4.20	1.22	4.23	1.38	0.14	.889	0.02
Individual is not as good as other people	4.18	1.11	4.27	1.00	0.43	.665	0.09
Called names or insulted	4.32	1.20	4.20	1.35	0.50	.618	0.09
Threatened or harassed	4.50	1.07	4.33	1.08	0.85	.397	0.16

Note. Male ($n = 60$) and Female ($n = 60$).

Table 1 representing the independent sample t-test to compare the gender differences on various forms of discriminatory experiences faced by individuals. Results suggested non-significant gender difference on mean experience of discriminatory action 'Treated with less courtesy' with $t(118) = 1.40$, $p = .165$. The obtained value of Cohen's d was 0.26, suggesting small effect size. The experience of discriminatory action 'Treated with less courtesy' for male ($M = 3.68$, $SD = 1.44$) and for female ($M = 4.05$, $SD = 1.43$). We found similar findings for other discriminatory experiences which suggested that there were no gender-based disparities in terms of experiences of various forms of discriminatory actions on daily basis. Hence, our proposed hypothesis H_1 was not supported.

Table 2*One-Way ANOVA for Various Forms of Discriminatory Experiences*

Individuals' discriminatory experience	Male		Female	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Treated with less courtesy	3.68 _c	1.44	4.05 _b	1.43
Treated with less respect	4.42 _b	1.33	4.57 _{ab}	1.27
Got poorer service at different places	5.12 _a	0.85	5.20 _a	0.66
Perception that individual is not smart	3.90 _{bc}	1.40	4.18 _b	1.40
People act that they afraid of individual	4.57 _a	1.25	4.33 _b	1.05
People act that Individual is dishonest	4.20 _b	1.22	4.23 _b	1.38
Individual is not as good as other people	4.18 _b	1.11	4.27 _b	1.00
Called names or insulted	4.32 _b	1.20	4.20 _b	1.35
Threatened or harassed	4.50 _{ab}	1.07	4.33 _b	1.08
	$F(8, 531) = 6.85^{***}$, $\eta^2 = .10$		$F(8, 531) = 4.72^{***}$, $\eta^2 = .07$	

Note. Means in columns with different subscripts differ at the $p = .05$ level by Tukey HSD.

*** $p < .001$.

Table 2 representing One-way ANOVA for comparing mean differences in various forms of discriminatory experiences faced by individuals. We compared nine scenarios and found that, in male, results suggested significant mean differences across various forms of discriminatory experiences $F(8, 531) = 6.85$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .10$. The obtained value of η^2 revealed medium effect size (Field, 2009). Males experienced highly 'Got poorer service at different places' ($M = 5.12$, $SD = 0.85$), 'People act that they afraid of individual' ($M = 4.57$, $SD = 1.25$), and 'Threatened or harassed' ($M = 4.50$, $SD = 1.07$) whereas they experienced 'Treated with less courtesy' ($M = 3.68$, $SD = 1.44$), and 'Perception that individual is not smart' ($M = 3.90$, $SD = 1.40$) least as discriminatory actions.

In female, results revealed significant mean differences across various forms of discriminatory experiences $F(8, 531) = 4.72$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .07$. The obtained value of η^2 revealed medium effect size (Field, 2009). Female experienced highly 'Got poorer service at different places' ($M = 5.20$, $SD = 0.66$), and 'Treated with less respect' ($M = 4.57$, $SD = 1.27$) whereas other discriminatory actions were experienced equally as suggested by table 2. Based on findings and observations our proposed hypothesis H_2 was supported.

Discussion

Discrimination refers to the inequitable or biased treatment of individuals and collectives on the basis of attributes such as race, gender, age, or sexual orientation (APA, 2022). The phenomenon of escalating blame and fear within political contexts is increasingly observed across various regions worldwide. The prevalence of intolerance, hatred, and discrimination is contributing to a growing divide within societies. The phenomenon of fear-based politics is causing societal divisions as political leaders engage in the dissemination of harmful rhetoric, attributing social or economic challenges to specific groups of individuals. Hence, the aim of the current study is to better understand the gender-related discrepancies in different manifestations of discriminatory experiences. This study assesses diverse manifestations of discriminatory experiences among individuals of both genders while also conducting comparative analyses across various scenarios. The results of the independent sample t-test indicate that there is no significant difference in the experiences of males and females regarding different forms of discriminatory actions. However, it is widely acknowledged at a societal level that discrimination against individuals belonging to marginalized groups, such as people of colour, women, sexual minorities, overweight individuals, and other low-status groups, is

well-documented. This is evident in various population-level phenomena, such as the gender wage gap (Pew Research Center, 2013) and the disparity in sentencing between Black and White men (US Sentencing Commission, 2013). Nevertheless, it remains challenging to attribute individual incidents to discrimination completely.

The findings of the One-way ANOVA indicate that there is a significant variation in the occurrence of discriminatory experiences across different scenarios for both males and females. One thing male and female respondents had in common was that they both perceived 'poorer service at different venues' as discriminatory action. The differences in the encounters of different types of discriminatory incidents may be attributed to the perception that these events are primarily caused by discrimination when they are seen as both (1) stemming from social identity and (2) being unfair, unjust, or undeserved. Factors that enhance either the salience of group membership or the salience of injustice as a cause of behaviour are likely to amplify the tendency to attribute these incidents to discrimination (Major et al., 2003). Also, the findings confirm the conclusions reported in the Oxfam India study (2022), which reveals that gender-based discrimination accounts for 98% of the discrepancy in employment rates between male and female individuals in urban districts. This disparity was shown to be evident in urban areas. Since societal shifts are unavoidable, we advocate for further studies to be undertaken on prejudice and discrimination.

Conclusions

Based on our findings, we can conclude that in the contemporary era, particularly in urban areas, there has been a reduction in gender-based disparities regarding the experiences of discriminatory actions. Males and females experience discrimination in numerous instances equally, and both strongly consider "got poorer service at different places" as discriminating behaviour. In addition, there exists a range of diversity in the ways individuals encounter various forms of discriminatory experiences.

Limitation and Suggestions

The generalizability of the study's findings is limited due to the exclusive focus on participants from a single metropolitan area. Hence, it is imperative that future investigations encompass a comprehensive and extensive study conducted on a national scale. In addition, our investigation focused on a limited number of instances of discrimination. In future research endeavours, it is essential to incorporate a broader range of everyday discriminatory occurrences. The attribution of the findings to non-working individuals is not feasible, as the inclusion of non-working individuals could reveal distinct patterns. Therefore, a comparative study should be undertaken to gain a comprehensive understanding of this issue.

Acknowledgements

We express our gratitude to the participants for their invaluable time and support.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

Ethical Guidelines

The APA Ethical Code of Conduct (APA, 2002) was followed at every stage of this research study.

References

- Allport, G. (1954). *The Nature of Prejudice*. MA: Addison-Wesley.
- American Psychological Association. (2002). Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct. *American Psychologist*, 57(12), 1060–1073. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.57.12.1060>
- Field, A. (2009). *Discovering Statistics Using SPSS* (3rd ed.). London: Sage.
- Jones, J. (1972). *Prejudice and Racism*. Mass: Addison-Wesley.
- Link, B.G. & Phelan, J.C. (2001). Conceptualizing stigma. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 27, 363–385.
- Major, B., Quinton, W. J., & Schmader, T. (2003). Attributions to discrimination and self-esteem: Impact of group identification and situational ambiguity. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 39(3), 220–231.
- Oxfam India. (2022, September 15). *Indian Discrimination report 2022*. Retrieved from <https://www.oxfamindia.org/knowledgehub/workingpaper/india-discrimination-report-2022>
- Pager, D. (2008). The dynamics of discrimination. In A.C. Lin, & D.R. Harris (eds.), *The colors of poverty: Why racial and ethnic disparities persist* (pp. 21–51). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Pew Research Center.(2013, March). *On pay gap, millennial women near parity – for now*. Retrieved from: www.pewsocialtrends.org/2013/12/11/on-pay-gap-millennial-women-near-parity-for-now
- US Sentencing Commission.(2013). Retrieved from: <http://isb.usc.gov>
- Williams, D. R., Yu, Y., Jackson, J. S., & Anderson, N. B. (1997). Racial Differences in Physical and Mental Health: Socioeconomic Status, Stress, and Discrimination. *Journal of Health Psychology*, 2 (3), 335–351.