Gender Parity in Higher Education: Challenges, Opportunities and Institutional Reforms in Chennai

[1]Mr. A. Hariprasad, [2]Ms. K. Srivarthani
[12]Assistant Professor
[12]Department of Commerce (Corporate Secretaryship)
[12]Don Bosco Arts and Science College, Kilpauk, Chennai-10

***Abstract*—Achieving substantive gender parity in higher education extends beyond equalizing gross enrollment ratios to dismantling structural barriers in academic leadership, STEM representation, and institutional governance. This empirical study investigates the challenges, emerging opportunities, and efficacy of institutional reforms across Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in Chennai, Tamil Nadu. Utilizing a descriptive-cum-analytical research design, primary data were collected from 400 stakeholders comprising undergraduate/postgraduate students, research scholars, and faculty members across government, government-aided, and self-financing institutions using stratified random sampling. Quantitative data were analyzed using Chi-Square tests, Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA), and One-Way ANOVA. Chi-Square results reveal significant associations between gender and academic stream selection ($\chi^2 = 28.64$, $p < 0.001$) as well as institutional governance type ($\chi^2 = 14.18$, $p = 0.003$). EFA extracted four latent dimensions explaining 71.42% of variance: Socio-Cultural & Mobility Constraints, Institutional Policy & Infrastructure Support, Career & Leadership Glass Ceilings, and Digital & Pedagogical Empowerment. One-Way ANOVA demonstrated significant perceptual differences in reform efficacy across institutional categories ($F = 9.84$, $p < 0.001$) and academic designations ($F = 6.72$, $p = 0.001$). The study proposes targeted institutional reforms aligned with NEP 2020 to foster inclusive academic ecosystems in Chennai.**

***Index Terms*—Gender Parity, Higher Education Institutions (HEIs), Institutional Reforms, Factor Analysis, ANOVA, Chi-Square, Chennai**

I. Introduction and research gap

Higher education acts as a transformative catalyst for socio-economic mobility, democratic participation, and sustainable human capital formation. Globally and nationally, frameworks such as United Nations Sustainable Development Goal 4 (SDG 4.3 and 4.5) and India's National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 prioritize equitable access, retention, and leadership inclusion across genders. According to the All India Survey on Higher Education (AISHE), Tamil Nadu consistently outperforms national averages in female Gross Enrollment Ratio (GER), with Chennai functioning as a premier metropolitan educational hub housing central universities, autonomous arts and science colleges, engineering campuses, and medical institutions.

Despite encouraging aggregate enrollment figures, quantitative parity at entry levels often masks qualitative disparities within institutional ecosystems. Female students and faculty frequently encounter horizontal segregation being disproportionately concentrated in humanities, commerce, and life sciences while remaining underrepresented in core engineering, computational research, and senior administrative roles such as Deans, Principals, and Syndicate members. Furthermore, commuting safety across suburban corridors, unpaid domestic care burdens, inadequate campus childcare facilities, and uneven operationalization of Internal Complaints Committees (ICCs) continue to constrain holistic participation. While macro-level reports highlight overall female enrollment gains, empirical research rarely examines horizontal discipline segregation and leadership barriers within Chennai's diverse Higher Education

Institutions (HEIs). Furthermore, existing literature overlooks institutional variations across government, aided, and self-financing colleges regarding gender-sensitive campus reforms. This study addresses this critical gap by empirically analyzing the latent structural factors, disparities, and reform efficiencies shaping gender parity across Chennai's academic ecosystem.

II. Objectives and hypotheses of the study

Primary Objective: To empirically evaluate the status of gender parity, identify underlying structural barriers and opportunities, and assess the effectiveness of institutional reforms across Higher Education Institutions in Chennai.

Specific Sub-Objectives:

1. To examine the association between gender, academic discipline selection, and institutional category among respondents in Chennai.
2. To identify the latent structural factors governing gender parity challenges and opportunities using Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA).
3. To analyze variance in the perceived efficacy of institutional gender reforms across institution types and stakeholder designations.
4. To formulate actionable policy and institutional recommendations for strengthening gender-inclusive governance in HEIs.

Null Hypotheses:

• H01: There is no significant association between gender and academic stream selection among higher education stakeholders in Chennai.
• H02: There is no significant association between gender representation and the governance type of HEIs.
• H03: There is no significant difference in perceived institutional reform efficacy across Government, Government-Aided, and Self-Financing HEIs.
• H04: There is no significant difference in perceived institutional reform efficacy across Students, Research Scholars, and Faculty Members.

III. Review of literature

1. Enrollment Expansion vs. Horizontal Segregation: Chanana (2018) and Varghese (2020) observed that while massification of Indian higher education substantially raised female participation, disciplinary clustering persists due to gendered socialization and familial return-on-investment calculations, steering women away from capital-intensive STEM tracks.

2. Leadership Glass Ceilings in Academia: Morley and Crossouard (2016) documented that women remain severely underrepresented in executive academic governance across South Asia. Institutional selection norms, informal male-dominated networks, and work-life penalties during early career stages restrict progression from lecturer to vice-chancellor.

3. Campus Safety, Mobility, and Institutional Infrastructure: Sahni and Shankar (2019) emphasized that urban transit reliability, hostel availability, sanitation infrastructure, and functional gender sensitization cells directly influence female retention and research productivity in metropolitan campuses.

4. Policy Reforms and NEP 2020 Interventions: UGC guidelines on Gender Champions, Saksham measures, and the NEP 2020 Gender Inclusion Fund aim to institutionalize equity audits. However, Rajagopalan (2023) noted wide implementation gaps between autonomous aided colleges and self-financing institutions in Tamil Nadu.

IV. Research Methodology

• Research Design & Study Area: A descriptive and analytical research design was adopted across four educational zones of Chennai (North, Central, South, and Suburban IT/Educational Corridors) covering Arts & Science, Engineering, and Multi-Disciplinary Universities.

• Population & Sample Size: Using Cochran's sample size formula at a 95% confidence level and 5% margin of error ($n_0 = Z^2pq/e^2 = 384.16$), a final valid sample of N = 400 respondents was secured via stratified random sampling across stakeholder roles and institutional categories.

• Data Collection & Reliability: Primary data were gathered using a structured, pre-tested questionnaire on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree) covering 16 scale items. Cronbach's Alpha yielded $\alpha = 0.884$, confirming high internal consistency.

• Statistical Tools: Frequency distribution, Chi-Square Test of Independence, Principal Component Exploratory Factor Analysis (Varimax rotation), and One-Way ANOVA with Tukey HSD post-hoc comparisons were executed.

V. Data analysis and interpretation

5.1 Demographic and Institutional Profile of Respondents (N = 400)

Demographic Variable	Category	Freq (n)	%	Institutional Variable	Category / Freq (%)
Gender	Female	212	53.0%	Academic Stream	Arts & Commerce: 156 (39.0%)
	Male	184	46.0%		Science & Tech (STEM): 168 (42.0%)
	Non-Binary / Other	4	1.0%		Management & Law: 76 (19.0%)
Designation	UG/PG: 240 (60%) | Scholars: 72 (18%) | Faculty: 88 (22%)	-	-	Institution Type	Govt: 112 (28%) | Aided: 144 (36%) | Self-Fin: 144 (36%)

Source: Primary data

Interpretation: The sample exhibits balanced gender representation (53.0% female, 46.0% male, 1.0% non-binary) across students (60.0%), research scholars (18.0%), and faculty (22.0%), proportionately distributed across Government (28.0%), Aided (36.0%), and Self-Financing (36.0%) HEIs in Chennai.

5.2 Chi-Square Test of Independence (Hypotheses H01 and H02)

Association Tested	Chi-Square (χ^2)	Df	p-value	Cramér's V	Statistical Decision
Gender × Academic Stream Selection (H01)	28.64	4	< 0.001**	0.189	Reject H01 (Significant Association)
Gender × HEI Governance Category (H02)	14.18	4	0.003*	0.133	Reject H02 (Significant Association)

Source: Primary data

Interpretation: For H01, $\chi^2 = 28.64$ ($p < 0.001$, Cramér's V = 0.189) confirms significant horizontal discipline segregation: female respondents cluster in Arts, Commerce, and Life Sciences (64.2%), whereas male respondents dominate core Engineering and Technology tracks (54.8%). For H02, $\chi^2 = 14.18$ ($p = 0.003$) indicates higher female enrollment density in Government-Aided colleges compared to private self-financing engineering campuses.

5.3 Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) on Gender Parity Dimensions

Sampling adequacy was verified via Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO = 0.862) and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity ($\chi^2 = 2914.50$, df = 120, $p < 0.001$). Principal Component Analysis with Varimax rotation extracted four factors with eigenvalues > 1.0, explaining 71.42% of total variance.

Extracted Latent Factor	Key Scale Indicators (Loadings)	Eigenvalue	% Variance	Cum. %	Alpha (α)
F1: Institutional Policy & Infrastructure Support	Functional ICC (0.84), Safe hostels/transport (0.81), Childcare & sanitation (0.78), Gender audit (0.74)	4.68	24.15%	24.15%	0.871
F2: Career & Leadership Glass Ceilings	Executive board representation (0.83), Equal promotion criteria (0.79), Research grant parity (0.75), Mentorship (0.71)	3.12	18.60%	42.75%	0.846
F3: Socio-Cultural & Mobility Constraints	Late-hour lab safety (0.82), Domestic care expectations (0.77), STEM stereotyping (0.73), Relocation limits (0.69)	2.04	15.42%	58.17%	0.819
F4: Digital & Pedagogical Empowerment	Hybrid learning access (0.80), Gender-neutral curriculum (0.76), Skill fellowships (0.72), Digital literacy (0.68)	1.59	13.25%	71.42%	0.795

Source: Calculated data

Interpretation: Institutional Policy & Infrastructure Support emerges as the strongest determinant (24.15% variance), followed by Career & Leadership Glass Ceilings (18.60%). Addressing physical campus infrastructure alongside leadership bottlenecks is therefore critical to advancing parity.

5.4 One-Way ANOVA on Perceived Reform Efficacy (Hypotheses H03 and H04)

Grouping Variable	Sub-Groups (Mean ± SD)	Source	Sum of Sq.	df	F-Ratio	p-value
HEI Category (H03)	Govt (3.42±0.68) | Aided (3.91±0.59) | Self-Fin (3.54±0.72)	Between Within	18.42 371.15	2 397	9.84	< 0.001**
Stakeholder Role (H04)	Students (3.76±0.64) | Scholars (3.38±0.71) | Faculty (3.51±0.69)	Between Within	12.76 376.81	2 397	6.72	0.001**

Source: Calculated data

Interpretation: Significant differences exist across HEI types ($F = 9.84$, $p < 0.001$; rejecting H03). Tukey's HSD post-hoc test confirms Government-Aided autonomous colleges ($M = 3.91$) outperform Government ($M = 3.42$, $p < 0.001$) and Self-Financing institutions ($M = 3.54$, $p = 0.002$) in reform execution. Across roles ($F = 6.72$, $p = 0.001$; rejecting H04), Research Scholars report the lowest satisfaction ($M = 3.38$), reflecting acute mid-career funding and maternity/tenure pressures.

VI. Institutional Reforms and Policy Recommendations

1. Mandatory Annual Gender Equity Audits: Integrate gender-disaggregated tracking of STEM admissions, PhD completion, and Dean/HOD appointments into IQAC and NIRF quality benchmarks.

2. Leadership Pipeline & Governance Quotas: Enforce a minimum 40% female representation benchmark in Boards of Studies, Academic Councils, and faculty recruitment panels across Chennai HEIs.

3. Campus Safety, Transit & Care Infrastructure: Establish dedicated evening shuttle links from suburban campuses to MRTS/Metro hubs, on-campus crèche facilities, and transparent Internal Complaints Committees (ICCs) with student representation.

4. Targeted STEM & Doctoral Fellowships: Institute institutional bridge scholarships, flexible doctoral tenure extensions, and return-to-research grants to mitigate the 'leaky pipeline' among female scholars.

VII. Conclusion

While Chennai's Higher Education Institutions have achieved commendable aggregate enrollment parity, empirical findings confirm persistent horizontal discipline segregation ($\chi^2 = 28.64$, $p < 0.001$) and leadership progression barriers. Factor analysis demonstrates that institutional policy infrastructure and leadership glass ceilings account for over 42% of parity variance, while ANOVA underscores substantial execution gaps between autonomous aided colleges and other institutional categories. Transitioning from numerical enrollment parity to substantive gender equity requires binding governance reforms, safe urban mobility infrastructure, and structured academic leadership pipelines.

VIII. Acknowledgment

I express my sincere gratitude to our respected Principal, Rev. Dr. K. A. Maria Arokiaraj SDB, and our Head of the Department, Dr. S. Sivaraman, Department of Commerce (Corporate Secretaryship), Don Bosco Arts and Science College, Chennai, for their constant encouragement, administrative support, and permission to carry out this research work. I extend my heartfelt thanks to the Management of Don Bosco Arts and Science College for fostering a supportive academic and research environment. I am also deeply grateful to the students, research scholars, and faculty members across various Higher Education Institutions in Chennai who generously participated in the survey and shared their valuable responses. Finally, I thank my colleagues, family, and friends for their continuous support throughout the completion of this study.

References

[1] Chanana, K. (2018). Gender inequality in Indian higher education: Issues and challenges. Economic and Political Weekly, 53(12), 45–52.

[2] Ministry of Education, Government of India. (2020). National Education Policy (NEP) 2020. New Delhi: Government of India.

[3] Ministry of Education, Government of India. (2023). All India Survey on Higher Education (AISHE) 2021–22. New Delhi: Department of Higher Education.

[4] Morley, L., & Crossouard, B. (2016). Gender in the neoliberalised global academy: The affective economy of women and leadership in South Asia. British Journal of Sociology of Education, 37(1), 149–168.

[5] Rajagopalan, S. (2023). Institutional autonomy and gender equity reforms in Tamil Nadu higher education. Journal of Educational Planning and Administration, 37(2), 115–130.

[6] Sahni, R., & Shankar, V. K. (2019). Girls' higher education in India on the road to inclusiveness: On track but heading where? Higher Education, 78(4), 635–651.

[7] Varghese, N. V. (2020). Massification and equity in Indian higher education. International Higher Education, (102), 24–26.