Gender Discrimination in Household Education in India: A Study

Aman Kumar, Assistant Professor

Department of Design, Vivekananda Global University, Jaipur

Email Id- aman.kumar@vgu.ac.in

ABSTRACT: ***In many nations across the globe, gender inequality in family education spending has resulted in women's educational achievement being unsatisfactory. It has been found that families in rural and urban India prefer to spend more money on male relatives' education than female members' education. Other studies have shown that there is substantial gender bias in the costs of education borne by Indian families. However, few of these studies are based on large, current datasets, and therefore are unable to give a picture of gender discrimination at the disaggregated level, i.e. at the state level. Because Indian states differ greatly in terms of social, cultural, anthropometrical, economic, and other variables, it is critical to examine gender disparities in India at the state level. An effort is made here, using individual-level data on educational spending from the 64th round of the National Sample Survey, to evaluate the present situation in gender disparity in family educational expenditure in India at both the national and state levels. Significant gender disparities in intra-household educational expenditures have been found, and this prejudice is not limited to India's "backward" or developing regions.***

KEYWORDS: ***Birth Rate, Gender Discrimination, House Hold Education, Tribal Population, Substantial Gender***

1. INTRODUCTION

Education is critical in guaranteeing a country's complete and long-term development, especially in developing nations. The international community today recognizes the significance of education in a nation's overall development, and as a result, considerable progress has been achieved in the universalization of primary education throughout the globe. Government spending on education has risen consistently throughout the globe, while private involvement in education has expanded considerably[1]. Since independence, India has made significant development in a number of key sectors. GDP growth rose from 2.3 percent nominally in 1951–1952 to 9.7 percent nominally in 2006–2007 both at 1999–2000 prices. 1 Since independence, India has achieved significant progress in lowering infant mortality, maternal mortality, and total fertility rates. From 123 per 1000 live births in 1972 to 53 per 1000 live births in 2008, the infant mortality rate has dropped by half, and the overall fertility rate has dropped by half as well from 5.2 percent in 1972 to 2.6 percent in 2008[2].

However, India's educational development has lagged behind its accomplishments during the previous six decades. When it comes to the education and literacy of female children and women in India, the situation is even more bleak. Even now, more than 60 years after India's independence and with the country's economy booming, women's educational attainment remains a major issue[3]. India's total literacy rate has risen from 18.3 percent in 1951 to 74.0 percent in 2011, according to data from seven decadal population censuses performed since independence. During this time, male literacy has grown by more than thrice from 27.2 percent in 1951 to 82.1 percent in 2011, while female literacy has climbed by more than threefold (from 8.9 percent in 1951 to 65.5 percent in 2011. 2 Despite this remarkable progress, the gender gap in literacy remained relatively constant from 1951 to 2001, and, although it decreased significantly from 2001 to 2011, it remains large in contrast to industrialized nations and trails behind many developing countries[4]. Gender disparities in the distribution of family resources to its members have been observed in research since 1974.

Discrimination in the distribution of commodities between boys and girls using data from household surveys in Cote d'Ivoire and Thailand. In Cote d'Ivoire, however, he finds no indication of gender discrimination, while in Thailand, he observes a statistically small tilt in favor of boys. Discovered evidence supporting parents' preference for boys' education, as well as evidence that spending on a boy who goes to school is higher than spending on a school-going girl of the same age[5]. Using household-level data from rural China, investigated the effects of different socioeconomic variables on gender disparity in schooling. In rural China, they discovered substantial gender disparities in family educational expenditure. Individual-level household data on educational spending from the Pakistan Integrated Household Survey 2001–2002 to identify intra household differences in the distribution of household educational expenditure between male and female members using the Engel curve technique[6].

A pro-male bias in family education expenditure in Paraguay in a recent research, but this was not constant across regions and age groups. Substantial gender bias in family educational spending in a number of Indian

states using data from the National Council of Applied Economic Research in New Delhi. Chaudhuri & Roy Engel curve specification and estimated an individual-level educational expenditure function using data from the 1997 Living Standard Measurement Survey for Bihar and Uttar Pradesh. Their findings showed the existence of substantial gender bias in household expenditures in the two states[7]. Different data sets to detect gender bias in household spending on education: I the Survey of Living Conditions conducted in 1997–1998 in Bihar and Uttar Pradesh, and (ii) the Household Consumption Expenditure Survey of the National Sample Survey (NSS) in its 50th round[8].

Many other studies, used the Engel curve technique using a three-stage least squares estimate method. In undeveloped rural India, there was also evidence of substantial gender bias in educational spending, according to this research. Data from the second wave of the Young Lives Survey, which was performed in Andhra Pradesh, India, to determine if there was a male bias in household-level educational spending for children aged 5 to 19. Parents prefer to provide better-quality education for boys than for girls, according to the research, resulting in gender disparities in school expenditure[9]. As a result, there is substantial evidence in India that males and females in India spend different amounts on schooling. Few of these studies, on the other hand, are based on the study of sufficiently big, current datasets to provide a picture of gender discrimination at disaggregated levels, such as state levels. Because social, cultural, anthropometrical, and economic variables, among others, vary greatly across Indian states, it is critical to examine gender inequalities in India at the state level[10].

2. DISCUSSION ON GENDER DISCRIMINATION IN INDIAN SCHOOL

Detailed information on the private spending spent by families toward the educational costs of each presently enrolled member in the age range 5–29 years was gathered in the 64th round of the NSS, which was performed in July 2007–June 2008. This presents an opportunity to look at gender bias in family education spending. Using regression methods, the average size of the pay difference between male and female employees. This important work has been widely used by researchers to investigate gender discrimination in salaries, intra-household gender disparity, and a variety of other topics. A technique for measuring absolute and relative pay discrimination between male and female employees in the Spanish labor market, based on the pioneering work. Using current NSS data, an effort is made to evaluate gender disparity in family educational spending in India at the national and state levels using. Section 2 provides a short description of the data utilized in the research. The techniques used in the analysis are explained in Section 3. The results are given in Section 4 along with the conclusions. In its 64th round, the National Sample Survey Office gathered comprehensive information on education participation and spending from 63 318 rural and 37 263 urban families throughout the nation, encompassing a total of 7953 villages and 4682 urban blocks. However, due to unfavorable sociopolitical factors and difficult field conditions, the survey did not cover (ii) Nagaland's interior villages located beyond 5 km of a bus route, and (iii) villages in the Andaman and Nicobar Islands that are inaccessible throughout the year. The survey utilized a stratified multi-stage sample methodology, with the 2001 census villages and urban blocks serving as the first-stage units (FSUs) for rural and urban regions, respectively, in keeping with NSS tradition. Large villages and blocks are split once further into a number of hamlet groupings or sub-blocks. For both sectors, the ultimate stage units (USUs) are the households. In general, each district of a state/UT is divided into two strata for stratification purposes: I a rural stratum that includes all of the district's rural areas, and (ii) an urban stratum that includes all of the district's urban regions. Four villages were picked with probability proportionate to size with replacement from each rural sub-stratum, based on 2001 population data, while four FSUs were chosen from each urban sub-stratum using simple random sampling without replacement (SRSWOR). For both the rural and urban sectors, samples are drawn in the form of two independent sub-samples within each sub-stratum. In the rural sector, large FSUs with a population of 1200 or more are split into a sufficient number of "hamlet-groups" and "sub-blocks" in the urban sector. SRSWOR selects two hamlet-groups or sub-blocks from a vast FSU whenever hamlet-groups/sub-blocks are created.

For both rural and urban regions, the USUs, or families from the selected FSUs, are picked using the SRSWOR method. For further information on the ideas, terminology, sample design, and estimate technique, see the links below. The Oaxaca–Blinder decomposition technique, which usually performs the decomposition analysis at the mean of the pay distribution, has been the most frequent and widely used way of dissecting the gender gap in research dedicated to identifying gender discrimination in salaries. All of the explanatory factors included in the regression study are statistically significant predictors of education spending for both rural and urban families, according to the findings. Household size, the educational level of the head and spouse of the head of the family, the age of the student, the social group, and the kind of household are all found to be important predictors of the spending spent on the education of household members, in addition to MPCE. A

comparison of the estimated non-parametric kernel density functions reveals that the quantile regression method provides a more accurate fit to the log of observed educational expenditure for female students in both rural and urban areas, and thus the discussion will be limited to the quantile regression method's results from now on. The estimated spending on female students' education in relation to indicators of relative gender inequality for various kinds of families and socioeconomic groupings. These figures show that in terms of educational expenditure, both rural and urban families discriminate between male and female members.

The discrimination indices for various household sizes in rural and urban India, whereas Table A1 in the Appendix shows those related to various kinds of parental educational level. Gender discrimination has also been found in rural and urban regions throughout the country, in all 16 major states examined. In urban regions, the percentage of discriminating female students (D0) fluctuates within a relatively tight range of 96–99 percent among states, while in rural areas, there is a large variance. Gender discrimination (D0) among female students was found to be greatest in Bihar and Uttar Pradesh and lowest in rural Punjab, followed by Kerala. The frequency of relative discrimination (D1) varies significantly across states. Kerala has the lowest gender discrimination in rural regions, whereas Assam has the lowest in urban areas. In rural regions of Punjab, Jharkhand, Maharashtra, and West Bengal, the incidence of relative gender inequality in family educational expenditures is lower. In metropolitan regions, the frequency is almost same in all states. Gender inequality in family educational spending is not only seen in socially and economically backward states like Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, and Andhra Pradesh, but also in forward-thinking states like Gujarat, Tamil Nadu, Karnataka, and Kerala. Gender prejudice is less prevalent in states with a large tribal population, such as Orissa and Jharkhand.

The greatest frequency of gender disparity (D0) is found in urban Bihar, followed by Uttar Pradesh and Rajasthan, and the lowest in rural Punjab, while the lowest degree of relative discrimination is seen in Kerala in rural India and Assam in urban regions (D1). According to the results of several other studies, the state with the greatest degree of disparity (D2) among disadvantaged female students is Bihar, followed by Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, and Madhya Pradesh. These states' high D2 scores definitely imply substantial gender prejudice. The research shows that even in "advanced" states like Maharashtra, Karnataka, Gujarat, and Tamil Nadu, there is still substantial disparity among female students. Figure 2 depicts the degree of disparity among discriminating females in rural and urban regions of India's main states. The highest degree of disparity among discriminating female students is seen in homes where both parents are uneducated, and it diminishes as the parents' combined educational rank rises. The distribution of per capita educational spending on male and female students by deciles, demonstrating that parents are more likely to spend more on their male children's education. They also show how male and female students are treated differently throughout the spending spectrum. As a consequence of analyzing the individual-level data gathered in the 64th round, the findings clearly show significant gender bias in family educational expenditure both throughout India and in a number of important Indian states. The existence of pro-male bias in family education spending in Indian states with skewed sex-ratios, i.e. with fewer females per 1000 men. While corroborating the results of, the current research also shows the surprising reality that gender bias in family educational spending exists in both developed and progressive Indian states. In Kerala, gender inequality in family education expenditure is found, contrary to the results of.

However, this state has the lowest level of inequality (D2) among discriminating female students. The presence of a gender disparity in the intra-household distribution of educational spending in the states of Bihar and Uttar Pradesh was discovered using data gathered more than a decade ago. In both rural and urban India, a comparison of per capita education spending for male and female students by deciles reveals significant gender bias in family education expenditure. In the center of the spending range, the gender difference is more apparent. At the bottom of the spectrum, when household expenditure on education is not particularly substantial, there is almost no gender bias. In the upper spending groups, a similar trend exists. The graphical comparison of male and female students' per capita educational expenditures also shows the widespread prevalence of gender inequality in metropolitan regions. Although the use of quantile regression in conjunction with the Oaxaca–Blinder decomposition has allowed for the detection of gender discrimination, it does not provide a complete picture of gender discrimination in states because it does not take into account the severity of gender bias among discriminated female students. Gender inequality in the intra-household distribution of educational expenditures poses significant barriers to female members' educational achievement. This is expected to have an impact on India's total literacy, as well as its long-term economic growth. As more women enter the workforce, there is an immediate need to improve women's abilities and knowledge, which may be accomplished via appropriate education. Because gender bias in the distribution of family resources is deeply

ingrained in Indian culture, deliberate efforts must be made to increase awareness of the necessity of providing women with equal standing in society.

3. CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATION

The study of individual-level data reveals that there is substantial gender inequality in family education spending in India, as well as across Indian states. There is no discernible difference in the frequency of gender prejudice in rural and urban India. This study found that families in both rural and urban areas of the nation choose to spend more on their male members than on their female relatives. Inequality among discriminating female students is observed to be smaller in metropolitan parts of the nation than in rural ones. The findings also show significant variations in the type and severity of gender bias in the two industries in various Indian states. This study's results are in line with previous research on the use of individual-level data in identifying gender bias in family educational spending. Gender bias is found in the intra household distribution of educational spending in all of the 16 main states studied, although the degree of discrimination as well as disparity among discriminated female students varies greatly among the states. It's worth noting that gender discrimination in family education expenditure is least common among tribal groups throughout India's states, both rural and urban, and inequality among disadvantaged girls is likewise lowest in this category. This may be because a significant number of tribal groups in India have matriarchal structures. In contrast to the so-called progressive groups, discrimination between boys and girls is also reduced among the SCs. The state of Bihar has the most severe gender discrimination, with the greatest level of D2 and the other two measures hanging around their maximum levels. Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, and Madhya Pradesh seem to be in the same boat.

REFERENCES:

[1] A. Ray, “A class of decomposable poverty measures with public transfers,” *Econ. Bull.*, 2006, doi: 10.2139/ssrn.713762.

[2] J. Foster, J. Greer, and E. Thorbecke, “A Class of Decomposable Poverty Measures,” *Econometrica*, 1984, doi: 10.2307/1913475.

[3] J. Foster, J. Greer, and E. Thorbecke, “A Class of Decomposable Poverty Measures Published by : The Econometric Society Stable URL : http://www.jstor.org/stable/1913475,” *Econom. Soc. is Collab. with JSTOR to Digit. Preserv. extend access to Econom.*, 2010.

[4] J. Foster, J. Greer, and E. Thorbecke, “The Foster-Greer-Thorbecke (FGT) poverty measures: 25 years later,” *J. Econ. Inequal.*, 2010, doi: 10.1007/s10888-010-9136-1.

[5] E. Foster E. J. ; Greer J. & Thorbecke, “The Foster-Greer-Thorbecke (FGT) Poverty Measures: Twenty-Five Years Later,” *IIEP-Working Pap.*, 2010.

[6] C. Breitmeyer, H. Hakenes, and A. Pfingsten, “From poverty measurement to the measurement of downside risk,” *Math. Soc. Sci.*, 2004, doi: 10.1016/j.mathsocsci.2003.07.001.

[7] C. B. Barrett, “Development Economics : An Overview,” *Dev. Econ. Crit. Concepts Dev. Stud.*, 2007.

[8] R. K. P. Singh, K. M. Singh, A. Kumar, M. S. Meena, A. K. Jha, and A. Kumar, “Dimensions of Rural Poverty in Bihar: A Village Level Study,” *SSRN Electron. J.*, 2013, doi: 10.2139/ssrn.2330841.

[9] J. E. Foster, J. Greer, and E. Thorbecke, “A Class of Decomposable Poverty Indices,” *Econometrica*, 1984.

[10] O. R. Krishnaswami and B. G. Satyaprasad, “Business Research Methods,” in *Business Research Methods*, 2010.