

Employees' Perception Regarding Gender Inequality in Higher Education Sector: Evidence from Eastern Mediterranean University

Zahra Eskandri

Submitted to the
Graduation Institute of Studies and Research
in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Master
of
Business Administration

Eastern Mediterranean University
February 2018
Gazimağusa, North Cyprus

Approval of the Institute of Graduate Studies and Research

Assoc.Prof.Dr. Ali Hakan Ulusoy
Acting Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Business Administration.

Assoc.Prof.Dr. Şule Aker
Chair, Department of
Business Administration

We certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate in scope and quality as a thesis for the degree of Master of Business Administration.

Prof.Dr. Sami Fethi
Supervisor

Examining Committee

1. Prof. Dr. Sami Fethi

2. Assoc. Prof. Dr. İlhan Dalci

3. Asst. Prof. Dr. Hale Özgit

ABSTRACT

This study empirically explores employees' perception regarding gender inequality in higher education sector, in this case, Eastern Mediterranean University. Two hundred thirty questionnaires were distributed and a hundred eighty were collected from employees in Eastern Mediterranean University. Frequency, Descriptive Statistics, Independent T-test and One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) were conducted to examine if there existed any statistically significant differences between the examined groups.

Independent T-test results revealed 26 statistically significant differences among men and women employees' perception regarding the enquired items. In order to investigate the possibility of existing any potential differences between the perceptions of our respondents' subset groups, which are Age, Education Level, Job Status and Work Experience, Analyses of Variance (ANOVA Test) was carried out. Statistically significant differences were observed among three sub groups except for Education level.

Keywords: Gender Inequality, Eastern Mediterranean University, Academic/Administrative and Operational staff, North Cyprus, Independent T-test, ANOVA test.

ÖZ

Bu tez, Doğu Akdeniz Üniversitesi'nde cinsiyet ayrımcılığına dayalı erkek ve kadın çalışanların algısını ampirik olarak araştırmaktadır. Bir kısım üniversite çalışanlarına iki yüz otuz soru formu dağıtıldı ve geriye dönüş olarak yüz seksen form toplanmıştır. İncelenen gruplar arasında istatistiksel olarak anlamlı fark olup olmadığını incelemek için frekans dağılımı, tanımlayıcı istatistikler, Bağımsız T testi ve ANOVA analizi uygulanmıştır.

Bağımsız T testi sonuçları, kadın ve erkek çalışanlar arasında algılamada istatistiksel olarak anlamlı 26 farklılık olduğunu ortaya koymuştur. Katılımcıların yaş, eğitim durumu, iş durumu ve iş tecrübesi alt gruplarının algılamaları arasındaki potansiyel farkları araştırmak için Varyans Analizi (ANOVA) Testi yapılmıştır. Eğitim seviyesi dışındaki diğer alt gruplar arasında istatistiksel olarak anlamlı farklılıklar gözlemlenmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Cinsiyet Ayrımı, Doğu Akdeniz Üniversitesi, Akademik / İdari ve Operasyonel personel, Kuzey Kıbrıs, Bağımsız T-testi, ANOVA testi.

To my sister, Sara. Thanks for always being there for me and thank you for your endless support.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I would like to take this opportunity to express my gratitude first of all to my dear supervisor Prof. Dr. Sami Fethi for all his support, supervision, guidance and of course his precious time. He, who merely by his behaviour, thought me that education is not all about taking Masters or PhD degrees, but more importantly, it is about learning to nourish one's personality traits to be a better human being, to be a useful person for other humans, which is far more significant than simply acquiring knowledge or holding high academic degrees. And secondly to my family who supported me throughout my master program without whom I would not be able to reach this status.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iii
ÖZ	iv
DEDICATION	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	vi
LIST OF TABLES.....	ix
1 INTROCUCTION.....	1
1.1 Introduction.....	1
1.2 Objectives of the Study.....	1
1.3 Findings of the Study.....	1
1.4 Structure of the Study.....	2
1.5 Research Hypotheses.....	2
2 LITERATURE REVIEW.....	3
2.1 Introduction.....	3
2.2 Gender Inequality.....	4
2.3 Gender Inequality in TRNC.....	4
2.4 Gender Inequality in Workplace.....	5
2.4.1 Gender Inequality in Recruitment Policies.....	6
2.4.2 Gender Inequality in Managerial Roles.....	8
2.4.3 Sexual Harassment in Workplace.....	9
2.4.4 Gender Wage Gap.....	10
2.4.5 Effects of Physical Appearance on Job Recruitment.....	11
2.5 Gender Inequality in Academia.....	13
2.6 Perceived Gender Inequality.....	14

2.7 Hypotheses Development.....	16
3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY.....	17
3.1 Introduction.....	17
3.2 Research Design	18
3.3 Sample and Data Collection.....	18
3.4 Questionnaire Development.....	18
3.5 Data Analysis.....	19
3.6 Contribution of the Study.....	19
4 ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF EMPERICAL RESULTS.....	21
4.1 Demographic Profile	21
4.2 Descriptive Statistics	23
4.3 Reliability Test	25
4.4 Independent Sample T-test	25
4.5 Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)	34
4.5.1 ANOVA for Age Group	34
4.5.2 ANOVA for Educational Level	39
4.5.3 ANOVA for Job Status	43
4.5.4 ANOVA for Work Experience	46
5 CONCLUSION	51
5.1 Conclusion	51
5.2 Implications and Recommendations	54
5.3 Limitations of the Study	56
REFERENCES	57
APPENDIX	73
Appendix A: Questionnaire	74

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Respondents Demographic Profile.....	22
Table 2. Descriptive Statistics Summary.....	23
Table 3. Independent Sample T-test.....	32
Table 4. One Way Anova Table for Age Group.....	36
Table 5. One Way Anova Table for Educational Level Group.....	39
Table 6. One Way Anova Table for Job Status Group.....	44
Table 7. One Way Anova Table for Work Experience Group.....	48

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

Encyclopedia Britannica defines Gender as “An individual’s self- conception as being male or female, as distinguished from actual biological sex”. Women, throughout the history, have socially been treated unequally in all formal and informal ways (Can, 1995; Maatman, 2000; Muli, 1995; Korabik, 1993; Shaffer et al., 2000) and this issue has extended to workplaces as well which concurrently can be observed in several researches (Cotter et al., 1997). Of course nowadays at work places, where the presence of women is increasing day by day, it has become more and more transparent and vivid. In addition, it signifies the need for equal rights, responsibilities and chances for all people disregarding their gender ILO (2007).

1.2 Objectives of the Study

The aim of this study is to investigate if there are any significant differences between employees’ perception regarding Gender Inequality in Eastern Mediterranean University with respect to the items in the questionnaire. In this research, quantitative analysis is carried out. The methods acquired to measure the study are Descriptive Analysis, Independent T-test and Analysis of variance (ANOVA).

1.3 Findings of the Study

The outcomes deduced from this research, carries significant implications for university administrators in the Eastern Mediterranean University.

The discriminatory organization culture that favors men and reinforces the patriarchal culture was not perceived in EMU. However, T-Test results revealed 26 out of 30 statistically significant differences regarding the respondents' perception, taking gender as the independent variable. Also ANOVA test results revealed the existence of statistically significant differences among sub groups which are: Age, Income, Years of Experience and Job Status.

1.4 Structure of Study

Chapter one introduces the concept. Second chapter is going to give a review on previous researches, which is called literature Review. Third chapter will provide more details on the research methodology. Chapter four discusses the empirical results. Finally, chapter five lists a summary of the findings, policy implications, limitations and Recommendations for further researches.

1.5 Research Hypotheses

The five hypotheses of this study are highlighted below:

H1: There are statistically significant differences among EMU male and female employees' perception regarding Gender Inequality.

H2: There are statistically significant differences among EMU employees' perception regarding Gender Inequality with respect to age group.

H3: There are statistically significant differences among EMU employees' perception regarding Gender Inequality with respect to Educational Level.

H4: There are statistically significant differences among EMU employees' perception regarding Gender Inequality with respect to Job Status.

H5: There are statistically significant differences among EMU employees' perception regarding Gender Inequality with respect to Work Experience.

Chapter 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

“One is not born, but rather becomes, woman.”

Simone de Beauvoir, *The Second Sex*

This is seemingly one of the most frequently quoted sentences from the prominent intellectual existentialist philosopher, Simone de Beauvoir’s avant-garde work “*The Second Sex*”, and consequently it has posed many interesting questions since it was first published in 1949.

The World Health Organization (2015) defines Gender as:

The socially constructed roles, behaviors, activities, and attributes that a given society considers appropriate for men and women.

Mitra (2003), mentions that “Gender refers to culturally based expectations of the roles and behavior of males and females.” Furthermore, C. I. Tongo, (2005) specifies gender as “An economic construct, to be precise the implicit discretionary proportion by which both men and women are economically placed in our societies.” The aforementioned definitions concede that gender pertains to the conventional established roles of males and females in the society. Women have always been socially treated unequally in all formal and informal groups (Can, 1995; Maatman, 2000; Muli, 1995; etal) and this embraces work place too as it has been referred in several researches (Cotter et al., 1997, Rothwell, 1984).

2.2 Gender Inequality

The gender inequality issue ushered constant endeavors at both judicial and societal extents to decrease discriminatory activities between men and women. Due to the increased participation of women at workplace, this issue has become particularly more notable and it suggests equality of rights, duties and chances for all persons regardless of the gender ILO (2007).

ILO (2004) did a research on the gender share at the workplace and the results revealed 33 % in 1960, 43% in 1980 and 45% in 1990 and 40% in 2003. (Kemp, 1994; Shaffer et al., 2000) found that despite the continuous efforts, women still face gender segregation, job promotion inequalities, and lower payments at workforce all around the globe. Kasanita (2008), inferred that there exists this dominant patriarchal attitude against women at the work place and at times women are given token jobs simply to appease them.

Women, simply because of their gender, have been treated differently than men in the labor market regarding recruiting, job status, and income. In this regard, this issue of gender inequality in the labor market is of significant importance. Gender discrimination happens not only before but also after hiring, regarding promotion, payment, fringe benefits, resignation, and dismissal (Yu Gyeong-jun, 2001; Kwak Seon-hwa, 2007).

2.3 Gender Inequality in Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus

Güven-Lisaniler, F. (2006) stated that Just like the rest of the world, Gender Inequality prevails in North Cyprus as well in economic, educational, social and political life. Based on the latest Population Census (1996), 10.3% of women were illiterate

compared to 3.2% of men. The majority of women had primary or secondary school education. On the contrary, the percentage of men in career-oriented educational institutions was higher compared to women (SPO, 1999, Table 9: 25). Despite the existence of gender inequality, noticeable progress has been taken place to increase chances for women to benefit from education services. Güven-Lisaniler, F. (2006) studied that despite all the progress in education, there exist restrictions in women involvement in economic and political life. Only two thirds of women in working age get engaged in the labor market (SPO, 1999, Table 19: 38). Besides, only a small number of women have managerial roles in the public and private sectors⁴ (SPO, 1999, Table 32: 82). Furthermore, there is no woman at top managerial positions in government like mayor or in educational sectors like woman rector among all five universities in all districts and of north Cyprus (Güven-Lisaniler, F., 2006).

Turkish Cypriot women avoid labor force for the most part because of the wage gap, occupational segregation, discrimination in distribution of unpaid work, bias towards working women, and the gender gap and discrimination in education. (Güven-Lisaniler, F., 2006).

2.4 Gender Inequality in the Workplace

The Assessment of gender inequality at work place has appealed both social and economic scientists for a long time. According to Wayne (1995) there has never been any specific law to provide a concise definition for the term “discrimination” in the context of workforce, hence it can be defined as providing unfair advantage (or disadvantage) to a certain group of employees compared to other members of other groups. Equity and inequality is regarded in different ways by UNESCO (2000).

UNESCO (2000) stated:

Equality between men and women entails the concept that all human beings, both men and women, are free to develop their personal abilities and make choices without the limitations set by stereotypes, rigid gender roles and prejudices ... Gender equity means fairness of treatment for women and men, according to their respective needs. This may include equal treatment or 3 treatments that is different but which is considered equivalent in terms of rights, benefits, obligations and opportunities. (p. 5)

Sharma (2006) found out that the number of women is increasing in different sectors; yet the growth rate is slow. In civil services the overall percentage of women in 1997 was 7.5%, the highest being 12.3% in Indian Foreign Service. (Adams, 1965; Greenberg, 1988) believed that in spite of the fact that the monetary outcomes have been the central and predominant focus of study in the field of gender discrimination. The literature on Gender Equality has long been the case study of several fields of studies specifically Gender Study, Business Administration, Humanities, Linguistics, law and Psychology.

For this study, the literature surveyed, predominantly concentrates on business studies that investigates Gender Inequality at work places particularly in this case in academia regarding performance, appraisal biases remuneration, sexual harassment, unfair promotions, inequality in pension or fringe benefits also less cooperative colleagues or supportive superiors etc., in Eastern Mediterranean University, Famagusta, North Cyprus.

2.4.1 Gender Inequality in Recruitment Policies

When it comes to recruitment, organizations normally consider appointing and selecting people based on their relevant expertise and experience. (A. A. Adeniji, and A. O. Osibanjo,2012) affirmed that it is pretty sensible if the organization manages to find a person with the right set of skills and enough experience in the job. In that case,

there would be a high chance that the newly recruited employees be able to perform efficiently in a new role. Still and all, there seemed to be some hesitation when it comes to the issue of gender which evidently impedes the female gender during the hiring process. Although some of these reservations might seem comprehensible due to the peculiarity of female gender, i.e. their physiology or emotional status, still, many instances reveal that some are rejected despite having the required skills and relevant experience.

The collected data from National Research Staffing (NRS) indicates a considerable gap in participation of women. Only 4 of 28 OECD nations (Portugal, Estonia, Slovak Republic, Iceland) have a percentage of women greater than 40 % in their national systems, and in none of them female representation exceeds 46 % (OECD 2014). Similarly, in the UK, women constitute only 38.3 % of total researchers, and in Italy only 34.5 %. In France their participation is below 26.0 %, and in Germany less than 25 %. Women researchers in Japan embody only 13.8 % of the national staff. Although the four Nordic countries (Denmark, Finland, Norway, Sweden) are regarded as avant-garde and progressive in women's rights, in these nations male scientists still exceed their female colleagues two to one (OECD 2014).

Furthermore, a series of researches revealed that women professors promote more slowly through academic ranks and also they do not achieve chief leadership roles and earn less than men in comparable positions (Rotbart et al. 2012; Bilimoria 2011; McGuire et al. 2004; Wright et al. 2003). Women are being marginalized in decision-making posts. Accordingly, it will affect female candidates' recruitment procedure and will lessens their chances as well as hindering their progress (MossRacusin et al. 2012;

Corrice 2009). De Paola and Scoppa (2015) found out that “female candidates are less likely to be promoted when the committee is composed exclusively by males, while the gender gap disappears when the candidates are evaluated by a mixed sex committee”.

2.4.2 Gender Inequality in Managerial Roles

Traditionally, men as breadwinners, work outside the home, consequently they have the opportunity to relish higher status. On the contrary, women, as homemakers, work inside the home and are responsible for home and children. If any woman decides to work outside of the home, she has to challenge the increased workload of working simultaneously inside and outside home, as men are often reluctant to help with work at home (Blau et al., 2001). As a consequence of these conventional images females have often been regarded ineligible for certain jobs. (J. Albrecht, A. Borland, and S. Vroman, (2003) stated that the phrase “glass ceiling” has been coined to designate different types of biases which restrain qualified minorities and women, from progressing towards mid and senior-level management positions within the organization. Gender discrimination and glass ceiling can both synonymously be used to describe the limitations which prevents female gender and minorities from achieving senior management positions in organizations.

Krieg (2006) did research on German women managers who invested in china and wanted to know their perception. He discovered that although some of them had great admiration, just a few number of women staff had executive positions. Li & Leung (2001) analyzed the major impediments that might hinder women despite having professional qualifications and expertise and these obstacles have demonstrated to have significant roles in women progress to higher levels of management. Hemmati,

M. (2000) studied that women have managed to reach to higher levels of education and contribute to close to 40% of human resources in the world so far. Still top executive positions for women are low with only a very small percentage that succeed to reach the upper level of management. Aitchison, Jordan & Brackenridge (1999) claimed that women frequently have to select insignificant jobs, part time or jobs which are only for particular seasons and have to accept large responsibilities with low payments while opportunities for them to promote still remains to be blurred.

2.4.3 Sexual Harassment in the Workplace

Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (E.E.O.C., 1980) defines Sexual Harassment as:

Unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature constitute sexual harassment when (a) submission to such conduct is made either explicitly or implicitly a term or condition of an individual's employment, (b) submission to or rejection of such conduct by an individual is used as the basis for employment decisions affecting such individual, or (c) such conduct has the purpose or effect of unreasonably interfering with an individual's work performance, or creating an intimidating, hostile, or offensive work environment.

The very first hypothetical descriptions for Sexual harassment mainly emphasized on the most common form of SH: by a male boss toward a female subordinate. There also exists the theoretical viewpoint of feminism which is constructed based on the concept of power. It predominantly implies that SH has emerged as a result of men's economic power over women, which empowers men to take advantage and compel women sexually (MacKinnon, 1979; Zalk, 1990). Howbeit, Brant and Too (1994) claim that the feminist power model of SH neglects the plentiful evidence showing harassment from peers or juniors which might even be more common than harassment by a senior executive.

Sexual harassment has been classified as one of the factors resulting in one of the most deleterious effect and obstacles to career progress and contentment for women (Fitzgerald et al., 1988). Not long ago The U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (E.E.O.C.) announced that they received and settled almost 14,000 charges of sexual harassment, at a cost of over \$37 million in monetary benefits over and above litigation (E.E.O.C., 2005). Hereinafter Sexual harassment has become a controversial frequent occurrence, with most American estimates indicating that 40–75% of women and 13–31% of men experience some form of SH in the workplace (e.g., Aggarwal & Gupta, 2000; United States Merit System Protection Board (USMSPB), 1988). Researchers have revealed that there exist evidences of sever damaging consequences caused by SH in socioeconomic groups, no matter the level of education , age groups or vocations, and across cultures and countries (e.g., Antecol & Cobb-Clark, 2003; Barak, 1997; Gelfand, Fitzgerald, & Drasgow, 1995). Many scientists believe that the SH experience might actually be universal (Gruber, 2003).

2.4.4 Gender Wage Gap

Traditionally, men have always been considered as the head of the family and breadwinners, accordingly, what they do has always been regarded financially more significant, ergo men receive higher remunerations (Massey, 2007). Based on Economists' findings women have consistently formed a disproportionately large percentage in jobs with piece-rate payments (e.g., Brown, 1990; Heywood and Jirjahn, 2002; Heywood and Wei, 1997). As stated by Sparrowe & Iverson (1999) gender pay gap, labor force participation and occupational crowding disparity exists and still deleterious types gender inequality remains in the US hospitality industry.

The majority of researches on the income disparity describe pay gap between men and women employees related to attributes such as expertise, schooling, knowledge, etc. Still, the mentioned qualifications do not completely clarify the Income Inequality. The unspecified part of the income difference refers to inequality within sexes (Greenhalgh, 1980; Oaxaca, 1973). Oaxaca (1973), in his approach, applied two elements to clarify the existing income inequality existing among men and women employees. One of the elements reveals the distinction based on perceptible attributes of men and women and the other one is the assessment of inequality.

Miller (1987) in one of his studies, gauged the wage impact caused by the occupational segregation and realized that close to six out of ten of income inequality can be related to disparities in salary related features and the rest is related to inequality or inclination of males and females.

There is also a growing scope of literature which suggests majority of women may prefer lower paid jobs, that consequently leads to a segregation problem. For example, Croson and Gneezy (2009) delineate that women could be less risk-seeking and go for more stable jobs, and Niederle and Vesterlund (2007) suggested that women are less enthusiastic about competitive jobs. In both cases, those types of occupations are always less well paid.

2.4.5 Effects of Physical Appearance on Job Recruitment

(Morrow, 1990) determines “Physical attractiveness” as the extent to which one’s physical and facial appearance which evokes agreeable feedbacks from others. physical attractiveness is generally quantitatively rated from low (unattractive) to high (very attractive). While considering a person’s overall attractiveness, facial

attractiveness is regarded as the predominantly notable element of significance (Dickey-Bryant et al., 1986). The countenance or the face is absorbing, communicative, and revealing and is used by people to make judgements about others. Patzer (1985) claims that facial features accord with some personality traits, and the face is a faultless measure of a person's attributes (Liggett, 1974). Several researches have revealed that physical appearance has got this huge considerable impact on recruiting decision. however, they have not considered the applicant's skills, experience, and sex type.

Detailed comprehensive studies have been undertaken to investigate the impact of the attractiveness bias in employment-related cases. It was first initiated in the 1970s and continued through the 1990s. A CD Rom search found that close to 400 essays and articles about physical appearance were published in 1990–9. Good-looking handsome people find more eminent occupations, earn more money, consider themselves merrier and healthier, and have much better social skills and are more co-operative (Mehrabian and Blum, 1997; Mulford et al., 1998; Shackelford and Larsen, 1999; Umberson and Hughes, 1987). Furthermore, attractive men and women seem to be more convincing than unattractive ones (Chaiken, 1979).

The undertaken researches about facial/physical attractiveness show that there exists a strong attractiveness bias in all areas of human judgement. Physical appearance has been found to be an advantage in recruitment process, placement and promotion decisions. It also makes impressions in job interviews (Cash and Janda, 1984; Ilkka, 1995), and these authors postulate that even experienced managers may not be able to circumvent the bias by selecting the attractive over less attractive candidates. good-

looking and handsome candidates are judged to be more eligible than unattractive applicants (Cash et al., 1977; Drogosz and Levy, 1996; Jackson et al., 1995; Marlowe et al., 1996), and are greatly favored when attractiveness is relevant to the job and are suggested for higher salaries (Dipboye et al., 1977; Jackson, 1983). However, some other studies have shown that attractiveness was not positively related to the employment selection (Cash et al., 1977; Gilmore et al., 1986; Heilman and Saruwatari, 1979).

2.5 Gender Inequality in Academia

According to Pew Research Center, despite all the remarkable significant progress women have achieved on their way to fight for equality, they still have remained underrepresented in all major political offices and top business leadership positions. This under-representation of women is increasingly intensifying in academia and is globally concede as a critical issue, even by prevailing organizations (UNESCO, 1996; ETAN, 1999; Nature, 1999; Fogelberg et al., 1999).

Researches have revealed that women in higher academic levels have achieved considerable advancements in overcoming the barriers and climbing the corporate ladder to the executive levels; still and all, despite all these improvements, there exist social, organizational, legislative, and cultural hurdles that obstruct several women in higher education from achieving their complete potential. For instance, in January 2004, John Curtis, director of research in the Association of American University Professors' (AAUP), collected data related to gender issues and presented to the US Congress based on gender inequalities existing in faculties which unveiled that females receive less compared to their males' counterpart. At full professor rank, women's

salaries were 88 percent of men's; and for associate professor, they were 93 percent; when it came to assistant professor, they were 92%.

In a quite similar study ("Off Our Backs", 2003) in academia undertaken by research institution in Washington, the investigators affirmed that males as yet preponderate over their female counterparts in high ranking positions and earn more money. At the academic level, men comprise almost 60 percent of the members and the remaining are women. As reported by the researchers, wage discrimination still remains to be an issue in all the studied institutions. Much the same studies were administrated in the UK and the outcomes are similar to those in the US. The Association of University Teachers (AUT) in the UK, in 2004 showed that the number of female academic staff in British academia has raised by 43 percent to 56,500 between 1995-1996 and 2000-2003 (BBC, 2004). Also, the number of men in higher education has raised by only 4 percent to 89,000. Based on the study, women in higher education in the UK account for almost 40 percent. nevertheless, they show more tendency to be in the lower ranks and are more involved in part-time teaching.

2.6 Perceived Gender Inequality

Perceived Inequality alludes to the feeling of being behaved unjustly merely due to belonging to a certain group (Mirage, 1994; Sanchez & Brock, 1996; Cho Gwang-ja, 2010). Perceived Inequality is a kind of deprivation which an individual experience when differentiates his/her situation to that of others. Shin Cheol-u and Jin Seon-yeong (2004) describes perceived Inequality in the workplace as the degree of discrimination felt by female employees in hiring, payment, promotion, evaluation, and layoff. Giddens (1973) claims that individuals must first perceive that there exists inequality,

and then decide to take action upon the perception. This consciousness includes the self-awareness of both genders.

Perceived gender inequality emerges from social and demographic factors such as gender, age, job status, etc. Accordingly, Davis and Greenstein (2009) claim that demographic characteristics might also effects the gender inequality perception. Some researchers reason that individuals' perception of gender and its relations with demographic backgrounds like families, work, politics, religions or educational level are as much important as assessing the gender inequality in any given societies and that the impact might be different from one country to another (Davis and Greenstein 2009; Davis and Robinson 1991).

According to Shapiro's and Kirkman's (2001) individuals' perceptions are aligned with their schemata, which are of course based on their previous experience. The older one is, the more experienced he/she would be. Therefore, the likelihood that they experienced injustice increases. On the contrary, it is expected that the young people with less experience have less formed opinions and perception towards gender inequality. As a result, age, as a demographic variable, is supposed to influence individuals' and employees' perceptions towards gender inequality. Older employees are expected to perceive gender inequality to a greater extent compared to younger employees.

Gallic (2012) carried out a research based on outcomes of the study on gender discrimination in Zagreb conducted in 2009, focusing mainly on perceptions, experiences and attitudes on gender Inequality in different areas of the Croatian society, specifically at the labour market. His results revealed some differences in

perceptions and experiences about gender inequality in the labor market due to their different socio-demographic characteristics (sex / gender, age, education level, work experience and regional differences).

2.7 Hypothesis Development

Based on the results of the majority of the previous studies, the following hypotheses are developed:

H1: There are statistically significant differences among EMU male and female employees' perception regarding Gender Inequality.

H2: There are statistically significant differences among EMU employees' perception regarding Gender Inequality with respect to age group.

H3: There are statistically significant differences among EMU employees' perception regarding Gender Inequality with respect to Educational Level.

H4: There are statistically significant differences among EMU employees' perception regarding Gender Inequality with respect to Job Status.

H5: There are statistically significant differences among EMU employees' perception regarding Gender Inequality with respect to Work Experience.¹

¹ See Omwenga, Mukulu and kanali (2013) for more details.

Chapter 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter contains information vis-à-vis the adopted research methodology, the implemented design and framework, the chosen population, in addition to the thorough explanation concerning developing the questionnaire.

In this research, quantitative analysis is carried out to investigate the “employees’ perception regarding Gender Inequality in Eastern Mediterranean University.” The methods acquired to measure the study are Descriptive, Independent T-test and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). The Descriptive Analysis will be carried out by using questionnaires. The opinions of employees were measured on 5 point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagrees (1) to strongly agree (5).

Streiner (2003), stated that Alpha Cronbach must not be above 0.90 or it would be impractical. Besides, the Cornbrash’s alphas figure should be more than 0.6 (Nunnally, J. C ,1978). The statistical procedure "Analysis of Variances” or ANOVA test demonstrates if some variables have similar mean values in two or more populations.

Anova is similar to T-test and can show the crucial distinctions between means. With the help of these two statistical tests, we are going to see if any statistically significant

differences exist among the divided categories regarding their perception for each item in the questionnaire.

3.2 Research Design

The adopted method to collect data for this study is primary data. And the questionnaire was designed accordingly. According to Robert K. Yin the case study research method is an experiential investigation that explores a recent incident within its real-life context; in which the borders between the incident and context are hardly noticable; and also when multitudinous sources of cases are applied (Yin, 1984).

3.3 Sample and Data Collection

This study was undertaken in the city of Famagusta, North Cyprus. Convenience sampling method was conducted to collect data from population members who are conveniently available to participate in the study. Sample and data were collected from academic, administrative and operational staff in Eastern Mediterranean University. The questionnaires, topic and the aim of the study were fully explained to the respondents. And their consents were obtained before they fill out the questionnaires. And participants were assured that their responses would be both anonymous and confidential. A total number of 230 questionnaires were distributed and 180 questionnaires were collected. The first section of questionnaire was composed of 30 five-points Likert- scale items from strongly disagree to strongly agree. And the second section was demographic information of the respondents.

3.4 Questionnaire Development

Previous researches have been reviewed and employed while preparing the questionnaire for the present study. The questionnaire contains two parts. The first part consists of 30 Five-Likert items measuring the “employees’ perception regarding Gender Inequality in Eastern Mediterranean University”.23 out of 30 items were

derived from Manjula Chaudhary and Megha Gupta (2010) and have been rephrased. The remaining 7 items have been acquired and rephrased from Kirai MN and Elegwa Mukulu (2012). The second part of the survey is composed of five demographic questions. The Demographic questions in this study involve Gender, Age, Education level, Job Status, Work Experience and Monthly Income (US dollar) and it was derived from Daniel E. Gberville et. al (2014).

3.5 Data Analysis

SPSS statistical software was used to conduct the statistical analysis in order to inspect the “Employees’ Perception Regarding Gender Inequality”. Independent T-test Statistic was carried out and gender was used as the independent variable to see if any statistically significant differences will be observed among two genders in their perception concerning the given items. One-Way ANOVA test was used on SPSS to examine if any statistically significant differences will be observed among other sub groups.

3.6 Contribution of the Study

The main aim of this research is to find out the EMU employees’ perception regarding Gender Inequality in higher education. Therefore, we will be provided with the opportunity to examine similarities and differences in their perception towards gender inequality in EMU, North Cyprus. Since this issue has not received much attention in previous researches, so it has a further objective of contributing to the advancement of knowledge about gender inequality in work place, in this regard, academia, by bringing to light one example, especially from the developing country’s experience.

This study is conceived partly as an attempt to perceive, analyse, and voice out the employees’ perception of both genders in higher education environment. And there is

hope that this study can be the starting point for other similar studies, in different sectors and different cities in North Cyprus.

And most importantly, from a practical point of view, this study will provide significant contribution and can serve as a basis of information for administrative and legislatives and to a greater extend for the government to pass new laws or modify them if the country wants to achieve gender equality in the society.

Chapter 4

ANALYSES AND DISCUSSION OF EMPIRICAL RESULTS

4.1 Demographic Profile

A clear perception and desirable results were attained from our data analysis by the use of IBM Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Bellow, the outcome of study is described meticulously:

Table-1 discloses the frequency analysis of the respondents' demographic data. Out of 180 respondents, 42.2% (n=76) were females and 57, 8% (n=104) were males. Evidently, male respondents outweighed female respondents.

19.4% (n=35) were aged between 18-27, 32.8 % (n=59) were aged between 28-37, 32.2% (n=58) were aged between 38-47 and 15.6% (n=28) of the respondents were aged between 48-57. So most respondents were aged between 28-47.

Regarding Educational level, 2.29% (n=4) of the respondents had high school diploma.9.4% (n=17) held AD, 36.1% (n=65) held BD, 23.9% (n=43) held MD and 28.3% (n=51) of respondents had PHD.

Concerning the job status, 43.9% (n=79) of the participants were academic staff while 47.8% (n=86) were managerial/administrative staff and the remaining 8.3% (n=15) were operational.

The respondents' work experience shows that 32.8% (n=59) of them had between 1-4 years of experience. 16.1% (n=29) of them had work experience of 4-7 years. 24.4% (n=44) have been working in EMU for 7-10 years. The remaining 26.7% (n=48) have worked for more than 10 years.

Regarding the respondents' income, 35.6% (n=64) of them was less than 1000\$, 46.1% (n=83) of them was between 1001\$-5000\$, 17.8% (n=32) of them was between 5001-10000 and the remaining 0.6% (n=1) was more than 10001\$.

Table 1. Respondents Demographic Profile

Variables	Frequency	Percent
<i>Gender</i>		
Male	104	57,8
Female	76	42,2
<i>Age</i>		
18-27	35	19,4
28-37	59	32,8
38-47	58	32,2
48-57	28	15,6
<i>Education level</i>		
High school	4	2,3
Associate Degree	17	9,4
B.A/B.S. Degree	65	36,1
M.A/M.S. Degree	43	23,9
Doctoral Degree	51	28,3
<i>Job Status</i>		
Academic	79	43,9
Managerial/Administrative	86	47,8
Operational	15	8,3
<i>Work Experience</i>		
1-4 years	59	32,8
4-7 years	29	16,1
7-10 years	44	24,4
more than 10 years	48	26,7
<i>Income</i>		
Less than 1000\$	64	35,6
1001-5000\$	83	46,1
5001-10000\$	32	17,8
more than 10001\$	1	0,6
<i>N</i>	<i>180</i>	

4.2 Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive analysis of the variables was also undertaken as shown on tables 2.

Respondents were asked to provide a score for each of the 30 items, ranging from 1 to

5. The highest mean item is:

- Female employees feel secure at work place. With ($M = 4.45$, $SD = .71$), which suggests that the average respondents quite agree that Female employees feel secure at work place.

And the lowest mean items are:

- You have faced any types of sexual harassment in university. ($M = 1.81$, $SD = 1.003$) which suggests that average respondents strongly disagree with it.
- Physical appearance is emphasized more compared to intelligence in university. ($M = 2.05$, $SD = 0.941$), meaning that average respondents disagree with it.
- Student and their families cause more issues for female employees. ($M = 2.07$, $SD = 0.931$) indicating that the average respondents disagree with it.
- The university prefers females and discriminates against men. ($M = 2.08$, $SD = 0.918$) which suggests that the average respondents nearly fully disagree with the item.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics Summary

Items	N	Min	Max	Mean	SD
Male and female employees are being treated equally.	180	1	5	3.48	0.936
There exist gender inequalities against women because of patriarchal society.	180	1	5	2.92	1.038
The gender inequality is due to the quality of work in universities.	180	1	5	2.15	0.906
The university prefers females and discriminates against men.	180	1	5	2.08	0.918
Females are hired more at lower levels.	180	1	5	2.62	1.047

Table 2 (cont.)

Items	N	Min	Max	Mean	SD
Female employees are mostly seen in visible sectors like front office.	180	1	5	3.53	1.121
Female employees are hired more in areas with less physical work.	180	1	5	3.57	0.964
University favours young and single women.	180	1	5	2.61	0.954
Physical appearance is emphasized more compared to intelligence in university.	180	1	5	2.05	0.941
Payment is equal for both male and female employees.	180	1	5	3.82	0.808
There exists equal performance evaluation..	180	1	5	3.54	0.977
promotional opportunities is equal for men and women employees.	180	1	5	3.63	0.969
Both genders get the same retirement benefits.	180	1	5	3.58	0.871
Female employees get fewer fringe benefits compared to male employees.	180	1	5	2.65	0.977
Female employees feel secure at work place.	180	1	5	4.14	0.846
Female employees feel comfortable with night shifts.	180	1	5	2.95	0.97
Women employees encounter sexual harassment at work.	180	1	5	2.39	1.126
Female employees can easily deal with long working hours in the university regardless of responsibilities.	180	1	5	3.48	0.918
Management believes that female employees cannot perform executive roles along with family responsibilities.	180	1	5	2.88	0.999
Men are comfortable if they work for a woman manager.	180	1	5	2.92	1.049
Female employees do not receive support from male juniors.	180	1	5	2.36	0.844
Student and their families cause more issues for female employees.	180	1	5	2.07	0.931
University prefers single women to married women at recruiting level.	180	1	5	2.74	1.13
Women need to go through more efforts to prove their qualification compared to men.	180	1	5	2.75	1.138
Management picks men for managerial positions compared to female employees.	180	1	5	2.91	1.137
Men employees are in charge of most of positions in the University.	180	1	5	2.85	1.193
Women employees who don not participate in social gathering of university will have less growth opportunities.	180	1	5	2.62	0.959
You have faced any type of sexual harassment in university.	180	1	5	1.81	1.003
Men seniors harass female employees.	180	1	5	2.23	0.991
Part time women or female trainees are more harassed.	180	1	5	2.12	1.021
Valid N (listwise)	180				

4.3 Reliability Test

In order to test the reliability of the items, Cronbach's Alpha was run. The scale reliability accepted threshold is 0.70 (Nunnally, 1978).²

The number of items on the research is 30 and the Cronbach's alpha coefficient is .709, which is above 0.7. Therefore, the scale used for this study can be considered reliable.

4.4 Independent Sample T-test

T-test was run to determine if there exist any statistically significant differences between male and female perception regarding each of thirty items in questionnaire.

Issues both genders agree on:

1. Both genders disagree that the discrimination is because of quality of work in universities.
2. Both males and females disagree that the university prefers women and discriminates against men.
3. Both genders disagree that physical appearance is emphasized more compared to intelligence in university.
4. Both disagree that students and their families cause more issues for female employees but the degree of disagreement differs.
5. Both females and males disagree that female employees do not receive support from male juniors. but the degree is different.
6. Both genders disagree that women employees encounter sexual harassment at work.
7. Both female and male employees disagree that men seniors harass female employees.

² See Cortina, J.M. (1993) and Miller, M.B. (1995). for more details.

8. Both male and female respondents strongly disagree that they have faced any type of sexual harassment in university.
9. Both female and male employees disagree that part time women or female trainees are more harassed.
10. Both men and women disagree that women employees who don not participate in social gathering of university will have less growth opportunities.
11. Both genders agree that female employees feel secure at work place.
12. Both respondents disagree that uuniversity favours young and single women.

Issues the two genders disagree on:

1. Female respondents seem to be slightly neutral about the item “women are treated equally with men” while male respondents partially agree on the issue.
2. While women respondents are neutral about the item that “there exist gender inequalities against women because of patriarchal society”, male respondents disagree on that.
3. Female respondents quite agree that female employees are mostly seen in visible sectors like front office, while male respondents disagree on that.
4. While men disagree with the item that university prefers single women to married women at recruiting level, women are neutral about it.
5. Females are neutral about equal payment for both male and female employees whereas males partially agree on that.
6. Male respondents disagree with the issue management believes that female employees cannot perform executive roles along with family responsibilities. While female respondents are neutral.
7. Male respondents agree that promotional opportunities are equal for men and women employees, while female respondents are neutral about it.

8. While females are neutral about the item “Men employees are in charge of most of positions in the University”, males quite disagree with it.
9. Females partly agree that female employees can easily deal with long working hours in the university regardless of responsibilities, however male respondents remain neutral considering the issue.
10. While female respondents seem to be neutral about the equal performance evaluation for both genders, males somewhat agree on that.
11. Female respondents are neutral about the item women need to go through more efforts to prove their qualification compared to men, however male respondents disagree.
12. Women respondents disagree on the issue that female employees feel comfortable with night shifts, while men seem to be neutral.
13. Female respondents are neutral about the item “Management picks men for managerial positions compared to female employees” while male respondents disagree.
14. While men quite disagree that females are hired more at lower levels. Women seem to be neutral about it.
15. Men disagree on the issue that female employees get fewer fringe benefits compared to male employees. However, women are neutral about it.
16. Women disagree that men are comfortable if they work for a woman manager, while men seemed neutral about it.

Issues both genders are neutral about:

1. Female employees are hired more in areas with less physical work.
2. There is equality of retirement benefits for men and women.

In Table 3, the results are displayed in details and it can be inferred that:

Independent T-test results for 30 items with “Gender” as the independent variable revealed that 26 statistically significant differences out of 30 items exist between female and male respondents regarding their perception towards each given item. The statistically significant ones are as follows:

1. Female respondents (M=3.21, SD=0.970) seem to be slightly neutral about the item “women are treated equally with men” while male respondents (M=3.67, SD=0.864) partially agree on the issue (t (178) =3.367 p < .05 sig. =0.001, Mean difference=0.463).
2. While women respondents (M=3.29, SD=1.043) are neutral that There exist gender inequalities against women because of patriarchal society, male respondents (M=2.65, SD=0.953) disagree on that (t (178) =4.246, p < .05 sig. =0.000, Mean difference=0.636).
3. While men (M=2.25, SD=0.879) quite disagree that females are hired more at lower levels, women (M=3.13, SD=1.050) seem to be neutral about it. (t (143.940) =5.953, p < .05 sig.=0.000 Mean difference=0.882).
4. Female respondents (M=4.13, SD=0.838) quite agree that female employees are mostly seen in visible sectors like front office, while male respondents (M=3.10, SD=1.102) disagree on that. (t (177.692) =7.160, p < .05 sig. =0.000 Mean difference=1.035).
5. While male respondents (M=2.35, SD=0.911) quite entirely disagree with the item “University favours young and single women”, females (M=2.96, SD=0.901) partially disagree. (t (178) =4.489, p < .05 sig. =0.000 Mean difference=0.614).

6. While both male and female respondents disagree that physical appearance is emphasized more compared to intelligence in university, however, there is difference in the degree of disagreement. Male respondents (M=1.86, SD=0.897) strongly disagree with it whereas females (M=2.32, SD=0.941) somehow partly disagree with it ($t(178) = 3.329, p < .05, sig. = 0.001$ Mean difference=0.460).
7. Females (M=3.59, SD=0.751) are neutral about equal payment for both genders whereas males (M=3.98, SD=0.812) partially agree on that ($t(178) = 3.272, p < .05, sig. = 0.001$, Mean difference=0.389).
8. While female respondents (M=3.11, SD=0.873) seem to be neutral about the equal performance evaluation for both genders, males (M=3.86, SD=0.929) somewhat agree on that ($t(178) = 5.491, p < .05, sig. = 0.000$, Mean difference=0.751).
9. Male respondents (M=3.97, SD=0.830) agree that there is equity in promotional opportunities for both genders while female respondents (M=3.16, SD=0.953) are neutral about it ($t(148.040) = 5.968, p < .05, sig. = 0.000$, Mean difference=0.813).
10. Both male (M=3.72, SD=0.897) and female respondents (M=3.39, SD=0.801) are neutral about equality of retirement benefits for men and women, but the degree of difference makes it significant. Women are slightly neutral and men are strongly neutral ($t(178) = 2.521, p < .05, sig. = 0.013$, Mean difference=0.326).
11. Men (M=2.30, SD=0.954) disagree on the issue that female employees get fewer fringe benefits compared to male employees. However, women

- (M=3.13, SD=0.789) are neutral about it .t (175.233) =6.403, p < .05 sig. =0.000, Mean difference=0.834).
12. Men respondents (M=4.30, SD=0.749) entirely agree that female employees feel secure at work place, while women (M=3.93, SD=0.929) partly agree on that. (t (178) =2.907, p < .05 sig. =0.004, Mean difference=0.364).
 13. Women respondents (M=2.70, SD=1.020) disagree on the issue that female employees feel comfortable with night shifts while men (M=3.13, SD=0.893) seem to be neutral. (t (148.581) =2.992, p < .05, sig. =0.003, Mean difference=0.437).
 14. While female respondents (M=2.78, SD=1.053) partially disagree that women employees encounter sexual harassment at work, male respondents (M=2.12, SD=1.100) strongly disagree on that (t (178) =4.053, p < .05 sig. =0.000, Mean difference=0.661).
 15. Females (M=3.86, SD=0.919) partly agree that female employees can easily deal with long working hours in the university regardless of responsibilities, however male respondents (M=3.20, SD=0.817) remain neutral considering the issue (t (178) =5.024, p < .05 sig. =0.000, Mean difference=0.653).
 16. Male respondents (M=2.64, SD=0.913) disagree with the issue that Management believes that female employees cannot perform executive roles along with family responsibilities. (M=3.21, SD=1.024) are neutral. (t (178) =3.904, p < .05 sig. =0.000, Mean difference=0.566).
 17. Women (M=2.39, SD=0.881) disagree that men are comfortable if they work for a woman manager, while men (M=3.31, SD=0.996) seemed neutral about it (t (178) =6.375, p < .05 sig. =0.000, Mean difference=0.913).

18. Both female (M=2.64, SD=0.828) and male (M=2.15, SD=0.798) respondents disagree that female employees do not receive support from male juniors but the degree is different. Male respondents strongly disagree while female ones slightly disagree. (t (178) =4.013, p < .05 sig. =0.000 Mean difference=0.491).
19. Both men (M=1.93, SD=0.851) and women (M=2.25, SD=1.008) disagree that students and their families cause more issues for female employees but the degree differs. While men strongly disagree on that, women slightly disagree. (t (178) =2.285, p < .05 sig. =0.028, Mean difference=0.317).
20. While men (M=2.33, SD=1.047) disagree with the item that university prefers single women to married women at recruiting level, women (M=3.30, SD=0.994) are neutral about it. (t (178) =6.309, p < .05 sig. =0.000, Mean difference=0.976).
21. Female respondents (M=3.16, SD=1.033) are neutral about the item “Women need to go through more efforts to prove their qualification compared to men”, however male respondents (M=2.45, SD=1.122) disagree. (t (178) =4.308, p < .05, sig. =0.000 Mean difference=0.706).
22. Female respondents (M=3.49, SD=0.916) are neutral about the item “Management picks men for managerial positions compared to female employees” while male respondents (M=2.48, SD=1.097) disagree. (t (174.771) =6.689, p < .05 sig. =0.000, Mean difference=1.006,).
23. While females (M=3.46, SD=0.999) are neutral about the item “Men employees are in charge of most of positions in the University”, males (M=2.40, SD=1.128) quite disagree with it. (t (178) =6.510, p < .05 sig. =0.000, Mean difference=1.057).

24. Both men (M=2.41, SD=0.931) and women (M=2.89, SD=0.932) disagree that “Women employees who don not participate in social gathering of university will have less growth opportunities” but the degree differs (t (178) =3.424, p < .05 sig. =0.001, Mean difference=0.481).
25. Both female (M=2.57, SD=0.929) and male (M=1.98, SD=0.965) employees disagree that “Men seniors harass female employees.” but the degree is different. Men strongly disagree while women party disagree (t (178) =4.081, p < .05 sig. =0.000, Mean difference=0.585).
26. Both female (M=2.46, SD=0.958) and male (M=1.87, SD=0.996) disagree that part time women or female trainees are more harassed. But the degree is different. Men strongly disagree while women party disagree (t (178) =4.024, p < .05 sig. =0.000, Mean difference=0.595).

Insignificant ones:

1. The gender inequality is due to the quality of work in universities.
2. The university prefers women and discriminates against men.
3. Female employees are hired more in areas with less physical work.
4. You have faced any type of sexual harassment in university.

Table 3. Independent Sample T- test

Items	Gender	N	Mean	T	sig(2-tailed)
Male and female employees are being treated equally.	Female	76	3.21	3.367	0.001
	Male	104	3.67		
There exist gender inequalities against women because of patriarchal society.	Female	76	3.29	4.246	0.000
	Male	104	2.65		
The gender inequality is due to the quality of work in universities.	Female	76	2.26	1.437	0.153
	Male	104	2.07		
The university prefers females and discriminates against men.	Female	76	2.04	0.477	0.634
	Male	104	2.11		
Females are hired more at lower levels.	Female	76	3.13	5.953	0.000
	Male	104	2.25		
Female employees are mostly seen in visible sectors like front office.	Female	76	4.13	7.16	0.000
	Male	104	3.1		

Table 3 (cont.)

Items	Gender	N	Mean	T	sig(2-tailed)
Female employees are hired more in areas with less physical work.	Female	76	3.51	0.62	0.536
	Male	104	3.61		
University favours young and single women.	Female	76	2.96	4.489	0.000
	Male	104	2.35		
Physical appearance is emphasized more compared to intelligence in university.	Female	76	2.32	3.329	0.001
	Male	104	1.86		
Payment is equal for both male and female employees.	Female	76	3.59	3.272	0.001
	Male	104	3.98		
There exists equal performance evaluation.	Female	76	3.11	5.491	0.000
	Male	104	3.86		
promotional opportunities is equal for men and women employees.	Female	76	3.16	5.968	0.000
	Male	104	3.97		
Both genders get the same retirement benefits.	Female	76	3.39	2.521	0.013
	Male	104	3.72		
Female employees get fewer fringe benefits compared to male employees.	Female	76	3.13	6.403	0.000
	Male	104	2.3		
Female employees feel secure at work place.	Female	76	3.93	2.907	0.004
	Male	104	4.3		
Female employees feel comfortable with night shifts.	Female	76	2.7	2.992	0.003
	Male	104	3.13		
Women employees encounter sexual harassment at work.	Female	76	2.78	4.053	0.000
	Male	104	2.12		
Female employees can easily deal with long working hours in the university regardless of responsibilities.	Female	76	3.86	5.024	0.000
	Male	104	3.2		
Management believes that female employees cannot perform executive roles along with family responsibilities.	Female	76	3.21	3.904	0.000
	Male	104	2.64		
Men are comfortable if they work for a woman manager.	Female	76	2.39	6.375	0.000
	Male	104	3.31		
Female employees do not receive support from male juniors.	Female	76	2.64	4.013	0.000
	Male	104	2.15		
Student and their families cause more issues for female employees.	Female	76	2.25	2.285	0.024
	Male	104	1.93		
University prefers single women to married women at recruiting level.	Female	76	3.3	6.309	0.000
	Male	104	2.33		
Women need to go through more efforts to prove their qualification compared to men.	Female	76	3.16	4.308	0.000
	Male	104	2.45		
Management picks men for managerial positions compared to female employees.	Female	76	3.49	6.689	0.000
	Male	104	2.48		
Men employees are in charge of most of positions in the University.	Female	76	3.46	6.51	0.000
	Male	104	2.4		
Women employees who don not participate in social gathering of university will have less growth opportunities.	Female	76	2.89	3.424	0.001
	Male	104	2.41		
You have faced any type of sexual harassment in university.	Female	76	1.95	1.629	0.105
	Male	104	1.7		
Men seniors harass female employees.	Female	76	2.57	4.081	0.000
	Male	104	1.98		
Part time women or female trainees are more harassed.	Female	76	2.46	4.024	0.000
	Male	104	1.87		

Chaudhary and Gupta (2010) carried out a study on “Gender Equality in Indian Hotel Industry –a study of perception of male and female employees”. They ran t tests to see the perception of male and female employees on gender equality in Indian hotel industry and their results revealed that there was only one issue “women don’t get same fringe benefits as men” that have significant difference at the 95% confidence interval of the difference for equality of means male and female hotel employees.

Their results are not parallel with the present study. This study found 26 significant differences. Therefore, my findings are not in congruent with Chaudhary and Gupta (2010) studies. Only the one they found significant “women don’t get same fringe benefits as men” supports mine.

4.5 Analyses of Variance

Analyses of Variance (ANOVA) test was carried out to investigate the potential differences between our respondents’ subset groups, which are Age, Education Level, Job Status, Work Experience and Monthly Income.

4.5.1 ANOVA for Age Group

The first round of ANOVA test we ran consisted in looking for significant differences between our Age Groups regarding the survey items. the results provide evidences of statistically significant difference between groups as shown by the significance level in table 4.

Among four age groups, except for four items, there seemed to be no statistically significant differences in participants’ perception. The items with statistically significant differences at ($p < .05$) are:

1. The Gender Inequality is due to the quality of work in universities. ($F=6.833$, $\text{sig.}=0.000$). The post hoc analysis results also confirms that the difference exists between the age groups 18-27 and 28-37 ($M=0.669$, $\text{Std. Error} =0.185$, $\text{sig}=0.002$) showing that the age group between 18-27 believe that the quality of work in universities can be the reason for inequality in university more than the age group 28-37.

Also between age groups 18-27 and 38-47($M=0.789$, $\text{Std. Error} =0.185$, $\text{sig}=0.000$) showing that the age group between 18-17 believes that the quality of work in universities can be the reason for gender inequality more than the age group 38-47.

2. Payment is equal for both male and female employees. ($F=3.535$, $\text{sig.}=0.016$). The post hoc analysis results also confirm that between age groups 28-37 and 18-27 there exists a difference ($m=0.548$, $\text{Std. Error} =0.169$, $\text{sig}=0.008$) showing that the age group between 28-37 believes that the Payment is equal for both male and female employees more than age group 18-27.

3. Physical appearance is emphasized more compared to intelligence in university. ($F=4.366$, $\text{sig.}=0.005$). The post hoc analysis results also confirms that there exist statistically significant differences between age groups 18-27 and 48-57. Also between 28-37 and 48-57.

- 18-27 and 48-57 ($m=0.664$, $\text{Std. Error} =0.232$, $\text{sig}=0.024$)
- 28-37 and 48-57($m=0.559$, $\text{Std. Error} =0.210$, $\text{sig}=0.042$)

Signifying that age between 18-27 believe that “Physical appearance is emphasized more compared to intelligence in university” more than age group 48-57. Also age group 28-37, compared to 48-57 age group, believe more in physical appearance emphasis in university.

4. Student and their families cause more issues for female employees. (F=3.930, sig.=0.010). The post hoc analysis results also confirms that there exist statistically significant differences between age groups 18-27 and three other groups.

- 18-27 and 28-37 (m=0.514, Std. Error =0.194, sig=0.043)
- 18-27 and 38-47(m=0.514, Std. Error =0.195, sig=0.044)
- 18-27 and 48 -57(m=0.729, Std. Error =0.230, sig=0.01)

Meaning that the age group 18-27 believes that Student and their families cause more issues for female employees more than other age groups.

Table 4. One-Way ANOVA for Age

Items	group	N	Mean	F	sig.
Male and female employees are being treated equally.	18-27	35	3.29	1.197	0.312
	28-37	59	3.54		
	38-47	58	3.6		
	48-57	28	3.32		
	Total	180	3.48		
There exist gender inequalities against women because of patriarchal society.	18-27	35	3	0.911	0.437
	28-37	59	2.98		
	38-47	58	2.74		
	48-57	28	3.07		
	Total	180	2.92		
The gender inequality is due to the quality of work in universities.	18-27	35	2.69	6.833	0.000
	28-37	59	2.02		
	38-47	58	1.9		
	48-57	28	2.29		
	Total	180	2.15		
The university prefers females and discriminates against men.	18-27	35	2.34	1.599	0.191
	28-37	59	1.97		
	38-47	58	1.98		
	48-57	28	2.18		
	Total	180	2.08		
Females are hired more at lower levels.	18-27	35	2.8	0.415	0.743
	28-37	59	2.58		
	38-47	58	2.59		
	48-57	28	2.57		
	Total	180	2.62		
Female employees are mostly seen in visible sectors like front office.	18-27	35	3.74	1.051	0.371
	28-37	59	3.58		
	38-47	58	3.5		
	48-57	28	3.25		
	Total	180	3.53		

Table 4 (cont.)

Items	group	N	Mean	F	sig.
Female employees are hired more in areas with less physical work.	18-27	35	3.54	1.966	0.121
	28-37	59	3.75		
	38-47	58	3.57		
	48-57	28	3.21		
	Total	180	3.57		
University prefers young and single women.	18-27	35	2.97	2.176	0.093
	28-37	59	2.53		
	38-47	58	2.52		
	48-57	28	2.5		
	Total	180	2.61		
Physical appearance is emphasized more compared to intelligence in university.	18-27	35	2.34	4.366	0.005
	28-37	59	2.24		
	38-47	58	1.86		
	48-57	28	1.68		
	Total	180	2.05		
Payment is equal for both male and female employees.	18-27	35	3.49	3.535	0.016
	28-37	59	4.03		
	38-47	58	3.81		
	48-57	28	3.79		
	Total	180	3.82		
There exists equal performance evaluation.	18-27	35	3.51	0.286	0.835
	28-37	59	3.46		
	38-47	58	3.62		
	48-57	28	3.57		
	Total	180	3.54		
promotional opportunities is equal for men and women employees.	18-27	35	3.49	1.007	0.391
	28-37	59	3.58		
	38-47	58	3.64		
	48-57	28	3.89		
	Total	180	3.63		
Both genders get the same retirement benefits.	18-27	35	3.34	2.127	0.990
	28-37	59	3.69		
	38-47	58	3.5		
	48-57	28	3.82		
	Total	180	3.58		
Female employees get fewer fringe benefits compared to male employees.	18-27	35	2.69	0.983	0.402
	28-37	59	2.53		
	38-47	58	2.81		
	48-57	28	2.54		
	Total	180	2.65		
Female employees feel secure at work place.	18-27	35	3.91	1.226	0.302
	28-37	59	4.2		
	38-47	58	4.16		
	48-57	28	4.29		
	Total	180	4.14		
Female employees feel comfortable with night shifts.	18-27	35	2.77	1.106	0.348
	28-37	59	2.86		
	38-47	58	3.1		
	48-57	28	3.04		
	Total	180	2.95		

Table 4 (cont.)

Items	group	N	Mean	F	sig.
Women employees encounter sexual harassment at work.	18-27	35	2.74	1.842	0.141
	28-37	59	2.32		
	38-47	58	2.21		
	48-57	28	2.5		
	Total	180	2.39		
Female employees can easily deal with long working hours in the university regardless of responsibilities.	18-27	35	3.4	0.883	0.451
	28-37	59	3.36		
	38-47	58	3.59		
	48-57	28	3.61		
	Total	180	3.48		
Management believes that female employees cannot perform executive roles along with family responsibilities.	18-27	35	3.11	0.94	0.422
	28-37	59	2.9		
	38-47	58	2.78		
	48-57	28	2.79		
	Total	180	2.88		
Men are comfortable if they work for a woman manager.	18-27	35	2.89	1.394	0.246
	28-37	59	2.88		
	38-47	58	2.81		
	48-57	28	3.29		
	Total	180	2.92		
Female employees do not receive support from male juniors.	18-27	35	2.49	1.659	0.178
	28-37	59	2.46		
	38-47	58	2.33		
	48-57	28	2.07		
	Total	180	2.36		
Student and their families cause more issues for female employees.	18-27	35	2.51	3.93	0.010
	28-37	59	2		
	38-47	58	2		
	48-57	28	1.79		
	Total	180	2.07		
University prefers single women to married women at recruiting level.	18-27	35	3.06	1.494	0.218
	28-37	59	2.71		
	38-47	58	2.55		
	48-57	28	2.79		
	Total	180	2.74		
Women need to go through more efforts to prove their qualification compared to men.	18-27	35	2.86	0.525	0.666
	28-37	59	2.85		
	38-47	58	2.66		
	48-57	28	2.61		
	Total	180	2.75		
Management picks men for managerial positions compared to female employees.	18-27	35	3.03	0.569	0.636
	28-37	59	2.81		
	38-47	58	3		
	48-57	28	2.75		
	Total	180	2.91		
Men employees are in charge of most of positions in the University.	18-27	35	3.11	1.26	0.290
	28-37	59	2.88		
	38-47	58	2.81		
	48-57	28	2.54		
	Total	180	2.85		

Table 4 (cont.)

Items	group	N	Mean	F	sig.
Women employees who don not participate in social gathering of university will have less growth opportunities.	18-27	35	2.97	2.406	0.069
	28-37	59	2.54		
	38-47	58	2.45		
	48-57	28	2.68		
	Total	180	2.62		
You have faced any type of sexual harassment in university.	18-27	35	2.09	2.068	0.106
	28-37	59	1.73		
	38-47	58	1.62		
	48-57	28	2		
	Total	180	1.81		
Men seniors harass female employees.	18-27	35	2.46	0.896	0.445
	28-37	59	2.12		
	38-47	58	2.19		
	48-57	28	2.25		
	Total	180	2.23		
Part time women or female trainees are more harassed..	18-27	35	2.43	1.715	0.166
	28-37	59	2.07		
	38-47	58	1.95		
	48-57	28	2.18		
	Total	180	2.12		

Davis (2005) carried out a study on “Gender Inequality in Law Enforcement and Males’ Attitudes and Perceptions toward Women Working in Law Enforcement”. Their studies revealed that age does not have any significant difference when it comes to the male’s perception of women working in law enforcement, which does not support this study’s findings in which four significant differences were observed.

4.5.2 ANOVA for Educational level

Afterwards, ANOVA test was carried out for Educational level. No significance differences were observed among the Educational level groups. the results are shown on table 5.

Table 5. ANOVA Table for Educational Level

Items	Education Level	N	Mean	F	Sig.
Male and female employees are being treated equally.	High school	4	3.5	1.26	0.287
	Associate Degree	17	3.88		
	B.A/B.S. Degree	65	3.54		
	M.A/M.S. Degree	43	3.33		
	Doctoral Degree	51	3.39		
	Total	180	3.48		

Table 5 (cont.)

Items	Education Level	N	Mean	F	Sig.
There exist gender inequalities against women because of patriarchal society.	High school	4	2.25	1.78	0.136
	Associate Degree	17	2.71		
	B.A/B.S. Degree	65	3		
	M.A/M.S. Degree	43	2.7		
	Doctoral Degree	51	3.14		
	Total	180	2.92		
The gender inequality is due to the quality of work in universities.	High school	4	1.75	1.32	0.264
	Associate Degree	17	1.88		
	B.A/B.S. Degree	65	2.23		
	M.A/M.S. Degree	43	2		
	Doctoral Degree	51	2.29		
	Total	180	2.15		
The university prefers females and discriminates against men.	High school	4	2	1.72	0.147
	Associate Degree	17	1.82		
	B.A/B.S. Degree	65	2.28		
	M.A/M.S. Degree	43	2.12		
	Doctoral Degree	51	1.88		
	Total	180	2.08		
Females are hired more at lower levels.	High school	4	2	1.21	0.308
	Associate Degree	17	2.71		
	B.A/B.S. Degree	65	2.8		
	M.A/M.S. Degree	43	2.58		
	Doctoral Degree	51	2.45		
	Total	180	2.62		
Female employees are mostly seen in visible sectors like front office.	High school	4	4.25	0.88	0.476
	Associate Degree	17	3.18		
	B.A/B.S. Degree	65	3.54		
	M.A/M.S. Degree	43	3.6		
	Doctoral Degree	51	3.53		
	Total	180	3.53		
Female employees are hired more in areas with less physical work.	High school	4	3.75	0.22	0.927
	Associate Degree	17	3.59		
	B.A/B.S. Degree	65	3.49		
	M.A/M.S. Degree	43	3.56		
	Doctoral Degree	51	3.65		
	Total	180	3.57		
University favours young and single women.	High school	4	2.5	1	0.408
	Associate Degree	17	2.24		
	B.A/B.S. Degree	65	2.55		
	M.A/M.S. Degree	43	2.7		
	Doctoral Degree	51	2.73		
	Total	180	2.61		
Physical appearance is emphasized more compared to intelligence in university.	High school	4	2.25	0.49	0.746
	Associate Degree	17	1.82		
	B.A/B.S. Degree	65	2.09		
	M.A/M.S. Degree	43	2.14		
	Doctoral Degree	51	1.98		
	Total	180	2.05		
Payment is equal for both male and female employees.	High school	4	4.25	1.46	0.216
	Associate Degree	17	3.88		
	B.A/B.S. Degree	65	3.91		
	M.A/M.S. Degree	43	3.58		
	Doctoral Degree	51	3.84		
	Total	180	3.82		
There exists equal performance evaluation.	High school	4	3	1.62	0.171
	Associate Degree	17	3.76		
	B.A/B.S. Degree	65	3.57		
	M.A/M.S. Degree	43	3.28		
	Doctoral Degree	51	3.69		
	Total	180	3.54		

Table 5 (cont.)

Items	Education Level	N	Mean	F	Sig.
promotional opportunities is equal for men and women employees..	High school	4	3.5	0.25	0.912
	Associate Degree	17	3.65		
	B.A/B.S. Degree	65	3.69		
	M.A/M.S. Degree	43	3.51		
	Doctoral Degree	51	3.65		
	Total	180	3.63		
Both genders get the same retirement benefits.	High school	4	3.25	0.68	0.606
	Associate Degree	17	3.47		
	B.A/B.S. Degree	65	3.58		
	M.A/M.S. Degree	43	3.49		
	Doctoral Degree	51	3.73		
	Total	180	3.58		
Female employees get fewer fringe benefits compared to male employees.	High school	4	3	0.95	0.438
	Associate Degree	17	2.53		
	B.A/B.S. Degree	65	2.6		
	M.A/M.S. Degree	43	2.51		
	Doctoral Degree	51	2.84		
	Total	180	2.65		
Female employees feel secure at work place.	High school	4	4	0.35	0.846
	Associate Degree	17	4.24		
	B.A/B.S. Degree	65	4.17		
	M.A/M.S. Degree	43	4.21		
	Doctoral Degree	51	4.04		
	Total	180	4.14		
Female employees feel comfortable with night shifts.	High school	4	3.75	1	0.41
	Associate Degree	17	2.94		
	B.A/B.S. Degree	65	2.88		
	M.A/M.S. Degree	43	3.07		
	Doctoral Degree	51	2.88		
	Total	180	2.95		
Women employees encounter sexual harassment at work.	High school	4	2.75	0.93	0.447
	Associate Degree	17	2.12		
	B.A/B.S. Degree	65	2.42		
	M.A/M.S. Degree	43	2.6		
	Doctoral Degree	51	2.25		
	Total	180	2.39		
Female employees can easily deal with long working hours in the university regardless of responsibilities.	High school	4	3	2.35	0.056
	Associate Degree	17	3.71		
	B.A/B.S. Degree	65	3.68		
	M.A/M.S. Degree	43	3.21		
	Doctoral Degree	51	3.41		
	Total	180	3.48		
Management believes that female employees cannot perform executive roles along with family responsibilities.	High school	4	2	1.58	0.182
	Associate Degree	17	2.65		
	B.A/B.S. Degree	65	2.83		
	M.A/M.S. Degree	43	2.91		
	Doctoral Degree	51	3.08		
	Total	180	2.88		

Table 5 (cont.)

Items	Education Level	N	Mean	F	Sig.
Men are comfortable if they work for a woman manager.	High school	4	3.25	0.71	0.584
	Associate Degree	17	3.29		
	B.A/B.S. Degree	65	2.88		
	M.A/M.S. Degree	43	2.86		
	Doctoral Degree	51	2.88		
	Total	180	2.92		
Female employees do not receive support from male juniors.	High school	4	2.25	0.29	0.882
	Associate Degree	17	2.35		
	B.A/B.S. Degree	65	2.45		
	M.A/M.S. Degree	43	2.28		
	Doctoral Degree	51	2.33		
	Total	180	2.36		
Student and their families cause more issues for female employees.	High school	4	2	0.4	0.807
	Associate Degree	17	1.82		
	B.A/B.S. Degree	65	2.05		
	M.A/M.S. Degree	43	2.14		
	Doctoral Degree	51	2.12		
	Total	180	2.07		
University prefers single women to married women at recruiting level.	High school	4	3	0.23	0.919
	Associate Degree	17	2.65		
	B.A/B.S. Degree	65	2.71		
	M.A/M.S. Degree	43	2.67		
	Doctoral Degree	51	2.84		
	Total	180	2.74		
Women need to go through more efforts to prove their qualification compared to men.	High school	4	3	0.18	0.949
	Associate Degree	17	2.59		
	B.A/B.S. Degree	65	2.78		
	M.A/M.S. Degree	43	2.79		
	Doctoral Degree	51	2.71		
	Total	180	2.75		
Management picks men for managerial positions compared to female employees.	High school	4	3.5	2.22	0.069
	Associate Degree	17	2.24		
	B.A/B.S. Degree	65	3.06		
	M.A/M.S. Degree	43	2.81		
	Doctoral Degree	51	2.96		
	Total	180	2.91		
Men employees are in charge of most of positions in the University.	High school	4	3.5	1.08	0.367
	Associate Degree	17	2.35		
	B.A/B.S. Degree	65	2.89		
	M.A/M.S. Degree	43	2.86		
	Doctoral Degree	51	2.9		
	Total	180	2.85		
Women employees who don not participate in social gathering of university will have less growth opportunities.	High school	4	2.75	0.16	0.958
	Associate Degree	17	2.76		
	B.A/B.S. Degree	65	2.57		
	M.A/M.S. Degree	43	2.6		
	Doctoral Degree	51	2.63		
	Total	180	2.62		
You have faced any type of sexual harassment in university	High school	4	2.5	1.51	0.202
	Associate Degree	17	1.76		
	B.A/B.S. Degree	65	1.82		
	M.A/M.S. Degree	43	2		
	Doctoral Degree	51	1.59		
	Total	180	1.81		
Men seniors harass female employees.	High school	4	2.75	1.89	0.115
	Associate Degree	17	1.88		
	B.A/B.S. Degree	65	2.42		
	M.A/M.S. Degree	43	2.26		
	Doctoral Degree	51	2.04		
	Total	180	2.23		
Part time women or female trainees are more harassed.	High school	4	2.5	1.86	0.119
	Associate Degree	17	1.76		
	B.A/B.S. Degree	65	2.17		
	M.A/M.S. Degree	43	2.37		
	Doctoral Degree	51	1.92		
	Total	180	2.12		

Pološki Vokić, Sinčić Ćorić and Obadić (2016) undertook a study on “To be or Not to be a Woman? – Highly Educated Women’s Perceptions of Gender Equality in the Workplace”. Their findings showed that “In comparison to other groups, women with Bachelor’s degree experienced their male colleagues to be paid better for the same job more often (60.8%), while women with doctoral degree experienced the situation rarely (19.5%).”

This study results are not aligned with Pološki Vokić, Sinčić Ćorić and Obadić (2016) results where no significance differences among the Educational level groups was found.

4.5.3 ANOVA for Job Status

The ANOVA results for Job Status is shown on table 6. The results reveal that among the thirty items, there are two in which statistically significant differences were observed.

1.Management believes that female employees cannot perform executive roles along with family responsibilities. ($F=4.415$, $\text{sig.}= 0.013$). Tukey test results show that the difference exists among the academic group and managerial group. mean difference is ($M=0.417$, $\text{std. error}=0.153$, $\text{sig.}=0.019$) meaning that the academic group believes that Management believes that female employees cannot perform executive roles along with family responsibilities.

2.Men are comfortable if they work for a woman manager. ($F=3.676$, $\text{sig.}= 0.027$). Tukey analysis shows that the operational group believes that “Men are comfortable if they work for a woman manager.” more than academic group ($M=0.774$, $\text{std. error}=0.291$, $\text{sig.}=0.023$).

Table 6. ANOVA Table for Job Status

Items	Groups	N	Mean	F	Sig.
Male and female employees are being treated equally.	Academic	79	3.46	0.3	0.718
	Managerial/Administrative	86	3.47		
	Operational(worker)	15	3.67		
	Total	180	3.48		
There exist gender inequalities against women because of patriarchal society.	Academic	79	3.09	1.9	0.157
	Managerial/Administrative	86	2.78		
	Operational(worker)	15	2.87		
	Total	180	2.92		
The gender inequality is due to the quality of work in universities.	Academic	79	2.3	2.2	0.117
	Managerial/Administrative	86	2.01		
	Operational(worker)	15	2.13		
	Total	180	2.15		
The university prefers females and discriminates against men.	Academic	79	2.04	0.7	0.477
	Managerial/Administrative	86	2.15		
	Operational(worker)	15	1.87		
	Total	180	2.08		
Females are hired more at lower levels.	Academic	79	2.58	0.2	0.806
	Managerial/Administrative	86	2.67		
	Operational(worker)	15	2.53		
	Total	180	2.62		
Female employees are mostly seen in visible sectors like front office.	Academic	79	3.54	0	0.955
	Managerial/Administrative	86	3.51		
	Operational(worker)	15	3.6		
	Total	180	3.53		
Female employees are hired more in areas with less physical work.	Academic	79	3.62	0.3	0.764
	Managerial/Administrative	86	3.51		
	Operational(worker)	15	3.6		
	Total	180	3.57		
University favours young and single women.	Academic	79	2.77	2.8	0.061
	Managerial/Administrative	86	2.43		
	Operational(worker)	15	2.73		
	Total	180	2.61		
Physical appearance is emphasized more compared to intelligence in university.	Academic	79	2.18	1.4	0.259
	Managerial/Administrative	86	1.97		
	Operational(worker)	15	1.87		
	Total	180	2.05		
Payment is equal for both male and female employees.	Academic	79	3.76	0.6	0.566
	Managerial/Administrative	86	3.88		
	Operational(worker)	15	3.73		
	Total	180	3.82		
There exists equal performance evaluation.	Academic	79	3.57	1.2	0.299
	Managerial/Administrative	86	3.45		
	Operational(worker)	15	3.87		
	Total	180	3.54		
promotional opportunities is equal for men and women employees.	Academic	79	3.49	1.4	0.261
	Managerial/Administrative	86	3.73		
	Operational(worker)	15	3.73		
	Total	180	3.63		
Both genders get the same retirement benefits.	Academic	79	3.53	0.3	0.766
	Managerial/Administrative	86	3.62		
	Operational(worker)	15	3.67		
	Total	180	3.58		
Female employees get fewer fringe benefits compared to male employees.	Academic	79	2.81	2.9	0.056
	Managerial/Administrative	86	2.58		
	Operational(worker)	15	2.2		
	Total	180	2.65		
Female employees feel secure at work place.	Academic	79	3.97	3.1	0.050
	Managerial/Administrative	86	4.26		
	Operational(worker)	15	4.4		
	Total	180	4.14		
Female employees feel comfortable with night shifts.	Academic	79	2.8	2.5	0.089
	Managerial/Administrative	86	3.12		
	Operational(worker)	15	2.8		
	Total	180	2.95		

Table 6 (cont.)

Items	Groups	N	Mean	F	Sig.
Women employees encounter sexual harassment at work.	Academic	79	2.47	0.6	0.557
	Managerial/Administrative	86	2.37		
	Operational(worker)	15	2.13		
	Total	180	2.39		
Female employees can easily deal with long working hours in the university regardless of responsibilities.	Academic	79	3.32	2.4	0.095
	Managerial/Administrative	86	3.58		
	Operational(worker)	15	3.73		
	Total	180	3.48		
Management believes that female employees cannot perform executive roles along with family responsibilities.	Academic	79	3.13	4.4	0.013
	Managerial/Administrative	86	2.71		
	Operational(worker)	15	2.6		
	Total	180	2.88		
Men are comfortable if they work for a woman manager.	Academic	79	2.76	3.7	0.027
	Managerial/Administrative	86	2.97		
	Operational(worker)	15	3.53		
	Total	180	2.92		
Men are comfortable if they work for a woman manager.	Academic	79	2.42	0.5	0.618
	Managerial/Administrative	86	2.34		
	Operational(worker)	15	2.2		
	Total	180	2.36		
Student and their families cause more issues for female employees.	Academic	79	2.2	2.9	0.059
	Managerial/Administrative	86	2.02		
	Operational(worker)	15	1.6		
	Total	180	2.07		
Student and their families cause more issues for female employees.	Academic	79	2.2	2.9	0.059
	Managerial/Administrative	86	2.02		
	Operational(worker)	15	1.6		
	Total	180	2.07		
University prefers single women to married women at recruiting level.	Academic	79	2.87	1.2	0.306
	Managerial/Administrative	86	2.66		
	Operational(worker)	15	2.47		
	Total	180	2.74		
Women need to go through more efforts to prove their qualification compared to men.	Academic	79	2.78	0.1	0.936
	Managerial/Administrative	86	2.72		
	Operational(worker)	15	2.73		
	Total	180	2.75		
Management picks men for managerial positions compared to female employees.	Academic	79	2.99	2.7	0.072
	Managerial/Administrative	86	2.94		
	Operational(worker)	15	2.27		
	Total	180	2.91		
Men employees are in charge of most of positions in the University.	Academic	79	2.95	0.8	0.434
	Managerial/Administrative	86	2.81		
	Operational(worker)	15	2.53		
	Total	180	2.85		
Women employees who do not participate in social gathering of university will have less growth opportunities.	Academic	79	2.75	1.8	0.173
	Managerial/Administrative	86	2.48		
	Operational(worker)	15	2.73		
	Total	180	2.62		
You have faced any type of sexual harassment in university.	Academic	79	1.84	0.1	0.937
	Managerial/Administrative	86	1.78		
	Operational(worker)	15	1.8		
	Total	180	1.81		
Men seniors harass female employees.	Academic	79	2.22	0.5	0.598
	Managerial/Administrative	86	2.28		
	Operational(worker)	15	2		
	Total	180	2.23		
Part time women or female trainees are more harassed..	Academic	79	2.16	1.6	0.204
	Managerial/Administrative	86	2.15		
	Operational(worker)	15	1.67		
	Total	180	2.12		

Pološki Vokić, Sinčić Ćorić and Obadić (2016) undertook a study on “To be or Not to be a Woman? – Highly Educated Women’s Perceptions of Gender Equality in the Workplace”. Their results revealed that “in comparison to other groups, women in lower and middle level management positions experienced to be described as less feminine (around 30% in each group) and to be left out from social gatherings because of family duties more often (around 28% in each group).

The findings of this study are not aligned with Pološki Vokić, Sinčić Ćorić and Obadić (2016) results and two statistically significant differences among operational and academic groups were observed.

4.5.4 ANOVA for Work Experience

ANOVA results undertaken for Work Experience is shown in table 7. Seven significant differences were observed among the thirty items. Tukey test was also run to identify where exactly the differences are:

1. The gender inequality is due to the quality of work in universities. ($F= 4.93$, $\text{sig.}=0.003$). Employees with 1-4-year-old experience think that “The gender inequality is more because if the quality of work in universities” compared to the employees with 7-10-year-old experience ($M= 0.634$, $\text{sig.}= 0.002$).
2. University favours young and single women. ($F= 4.215$, $\text{sig.}=0.007$). Employees with 1-4-year-old experience believe that “University favours young and single women.” more than employees with more than 10-year experience ($M= 0.595$, $\text{sig.}= 0.007$).
3. Female employees get fewer fringe benefits compared to male employees. ($F=2.821$, $\text{sig.}=0.040$). Tukey results reveal that employees with 7-10-year-old experience think that “Female employees get fewer fringe benefits compared

to male employees” more than employees with more than 10-year experience (M= 0.561, sig.=0.030).

4. Female employees feel comfortable with night shifts. (F= 4.702, sig.=0.003).

Tukey results signifies that employees with more than 10-year-old experience think that “Female employees feel comfortable with night shifts” more than employees with 1-4 and 4-7-year-old experience.

- More than 10 years and 1-4 years (M=.563, sig.=0.013)
- More than 10 years and 4-7 years (M=.671, sig.=0.015)

5. Female employees do not receive support from male juniors. (F=0.595, sig.=0.007). Based on Tuckey results employees with 1-4-year-old experience think that “Female employees do not receive support from male juniors more than employees with 4-7 and more than 10 years of experience:

- 1-4-year-old experience and 4-7-year-old experience (M=.541, sig.=0.022)
- 1-4-year-old experience and more than 10-year experience (M=.436, sig.=0.036)

6. Student and their families cause more issues for female employees. (F=8.721, sig.=0.000). Tuckey results show that employees with 1-4- year-old experience think that Student and their families cause more issues for female employees more than employees with 4-7, 7-10, and more than 10 years of experience:

- 1-4-year-old experience and 4-7-year-old experience (M=.784, sig.=0.001)
- 1-4-year-old experience and 7-10-year-old experience (M=.679, sig.=0.001)
- 1-4-year-old experience and more than 10-year experience (M=.688, sig.=0.000)

7. You have faced any type of sexual harassment in university ($F=3.188$, $Sig.=0.025$). Tukey results show that employees with more than 10 years of experience believe they have encountered any type of sexual harassment in university more in comparison to employees with 7-10 years old of experience ($M=0.549$, $Sig.=0.041$).

Table 7. ANOVA Table for Work Experience

Items	Groups	N	Mean	F	Sig.
Male and female employees are being treated equally.	1-4 years	59	3.46	0.446	0.720
	4-7 years	29	3.45		
	7-10 years	44	3.39		
	more than 10 years	48	3.6		
	Total	180	3.48		
There exist gender inequalities against women because of patriarchal society.	1-4 years	59	2.98	0.258	0.856
	4-7 years	29	2.93		
	7-10 years	44	2.95		
	more than 10 years	48	2.81		
	Total	180	2.92		
The gender inequality is due to the quality of work in universities.	1-4 years	59	2.47	4.937	0.003
	4-7 years	29	1.97		
	7-10 years	44	1.84		
	more than 10 years	48	2.15		
	Total	180	2.15		
The university prefers females and discriminates against men.	1-4 years	59	2.17	0.379	0.768
	4-7 years	29	2		
	7-10 years	44	2.09		
	more than 10 years	48	2		
	Total	180	2.08		
Females are hired more at lower levels.	1-4 years	59	2.68	1.79	0.151
	4-7 years	29	2.72		
	7-10 years	44	2.8		
	more than 10 years	48	2.33		
	Total	180	2.62		
Female employees are mostly seen in visible sectors like front office..	1-4 years	59	3.59	0.937	0.424
	4-7 years	29	3.55		
	7-10 years	44	3.68		
	more than 10 years	48	3.31		
	Total	180	3.53		
Female employees are hired more in areas with less physical work.	1-4 years	59	3.78	2.547	0.058
	4-7 years	29	3.59		
	7-10 years	44	3.59		
	more than 10 years	48	3.27		
	Total	180	3.57		
University favours young and single women.	1-4 years	59	2.95	4.215	0.007
	4-7 years	29	2.48		
	7-10 years	44	2.5		
	more than 10 years	48	2.35		
	Total	180	2.61		
Physical appearance is emphasized more compared to intelligence in university.	1-4 years	59	2.31	2.677	0.049
	4-7 years	29	2.1		
	7-10 years	44	1.86		
	more than 10 years	48	1.88		
	Total	180	2.05		

Table 7 (cont.)

Items	Groups	N	Mean	F	Sig.
Payment is equal for both male and female employees.	1-4 years	59	3.75	0.404	0.750
	4-7 years	29	3.83		
	7-10 years	44	3.8		
	more than 10 years	48	3.92		
	Total	180	3.82		
There exists equal performance evaluation.	1-4 years	59	3.61	0.398	0.755
	4-7 years	29	3.52		
	7-10 years	44	3.41		
	more than 10 years	48	3.58		
	Total	180	3.54		
promotional opportunities is equal for men and women employees.	1-4 years	59	3.54	2.309	0.078
	4-7 years	29	3.48		
	7-10 years	44	3.5		
	more than 10 years	48	3.94		
	Total	180	3.63		
Both genders get the same retirement benefits.	1-4 years	59	3.47	1.365	0.255
	4-7 years	29	3.59		
	7-10 years	44	3.5		
	more than 10 years	48	3.79		
	Total	180	3.58		
Female employees get fewer fringe benefits compared to male employees.	1-4 years	59	2.66	2.821	0.040
	4-7 years	29	2.52		
	7-10 years	44	2.98		
	more than 10 years	48	2.42		
	Total	180	2.65		
Female employees feel secure at work place.	1-4 years	59	3.9	2.546	0.058
	4-7 years	29	4.28		
	7-10 years	44	4.27		
	more than 10 years	48	4.25		
	Total	180	4.14		
Female employees feel comfortable with night shifts.	1-4 years	59	2.73	4.703	0.003
	4-7 years	29	2.62		
	7-10 years	44	3.09		
	more than 10 years	48	3.29		
	Total	180	2.95		
Women employees encounter sexual harassment at work.	1-4 years	59	2.54	1.326	0.267
	4-7 years	29	2.45		
	7-10 years	44	2.45		
	more than 10 years	48	2.13		
	Total	180	2.39		
Female employees can easily deal with long working hours in the university regardless of responsibilities.	1-4 years	59	3.32	1.16	0.327
	4-7 years	29	3.66		
	7-10 years	44	3.59		
	more than 10 years	48	3.46		
	Total	180	3.48		
Management believes that female employees cannot perform executive roles along with family responsibilities.	1-4 years	59	2.97	1.24	0.297
	4-7 years	29	2.97		
	7-10 years	44	2.98		
	more than 10 years	48	2.65		
	Total	180	2.88		
Men are comfortable if they work for a woman manager.	1-4 years	59	2.76	2.077	0.105
	4-7 years	29	2.93		
	7-10 years	44	2.8		
	more than 10 years	48	3.23		
	Total	180	2.92		
Female employees do not receive support from male juniors..	1-4 years	59	2.64	3.848	0.011
	4-7 years	29	2.1		
	7-10 years	44	2.32		
	more than 10 years	48	2.21		
	Total	180	2.36		

Table 7 (cont.)

Items	Groups	N	Mean	F	Sig.
Student and their families cause more issues for female employees.	1-4 years	59	2.54	8.721	0.000
	4-7 years	29	1.76		
	7-10 years	44	1.86		
	more than 10 years	48	1.85		
	Total	180	2.07		
University prefers single women to married women at recruiting level.	1-4 years	59	2.9	1.448	0.230
	4-7 years	29	2.9		
	7-10 years	44	2.7		
	more than 10 years	48	2.48		
	Total	180	2.74		
Women need to go through more efforts to prove their qualification compared to men.	1-4 years	59	2.97	1.798	0.149
	4-7 years	29	2.79		
	7-10 years	44	2.75		
	more than 10 years	48	2.46		
	Total	180	2.75		
Management picks men for managerial positions compared to female employees.	1-4 years	59	2.98	0.191	0.902
	4-7 years	29	2.86		
	7-10 years	44	2.82		
	more than 10 years	48	2.92		
	Total	180	2.91		
Men employees are in charge of most of positions in the University.	1-4 years	59	3.12	2.428	0.067
	4-7 years	29	3.03		
	7-10 years	44	2.61		
	more than 10 years	48	2.63		
	Total	180	2.85		
Women employees who do not participate in social gathering of university will have less growth opportunities.	1-4 years	59	2.76	2.295	0.080
	4-7 years	29	2.69		
	7-10 years	44	2.7		
	more than 10 years	48	2.31		
	Total	180	2.62		
You have faced any type of sexual harassment in university.	1-4 years	59	1.9	3.188	0.025
	4-7 years	29	1.97		
	7-10 years	44	1.41		
	more than 10 years	48	1.96		
	Total	180	1.81		
Men seniors harass female employees.	1-4 years	59	2.25	0.554	0.646
	4-7 years	29	2.41		
	7-10 years	44	2.18		
	more than 10 years	48	2.13		
	Total	180	2.23		
Part time women or female trainees are more harassed.	1-4 years	59	2.31	1.446	0.231
	4-7 years	29	2.21		
	7-10 years	44	1.93		
	more than 10 years	48	2		
	Total	180	2.12		

Omwenga, Mukulu and Kanali (2013) carried out a study on “Business Networking and Performance of Women-Led Enterprises: An Empirical Investigation in Nairobi County, Kenya”. They ran Anova and regression tests and they result was aligned with the findings of this study and supports them.

Chapter 5

CONCLUSION, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS, LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

5.1 Conclusion

The collected data from participants who were exclusively the academic, administrative and operational staff of the Eastern Mediterranean University in Famagusta City, North Cyprus, revealed a rather vivid picture which helps us better apprehend the “Men and women employees’ perception regarding Gender Inequality in Eastern Mediterranean University”.

Frequency analysis of demographic data showed that out of 180 respondents, 42.2% (n=76) were females and 57, 8% (n=104) were males. In order to determine if there exist any statistically significant differences between male and female groups regarding each of thirty items in questionnaire, Independent sample T-test statics was carried out.

There were no statistically insignificant differences for four bellow items:

1. The inequality is because of quality of work in universities.
2. The university prefers females and discriminates against men.
3. Female employees are hired more in areas with less physical work.

4. You have faced any type of sexual harassment in university.

The undertaken T-test results revealed that 26 statistically significant differences exist between female and male respondents regarding their perception towards each given item:

Male respondents partially agree on items bellow while Female respondents are being slightly neutral:

- women are treated equally with men.
- Payment is equal for both male and female employees.
- There exists equal performance evaluation.
- promotional opportunities are equal for men and women employees.

Men respondents quite disagree over the bellow items while women respondents are neutral about them:

- There are gender inequalities against women due to patriarchal society.
- Females are hired more at lower levels.
- Female employees get fewer fringe benefits.
- Management believes that female employees cannot perform executive roles along with family responsibilities.
- University prefers single women to married women at recruiting level.
- Women need to go through more efforts to prove their qualification.
- Management picks men for managerial positions.
- Men employees are in charge of most of positions in the University.
- Women employees who don not participate in social gathering of university will have less growth opportunities.
- Men seniors harass female employees.

- Part time women or female trainees are more harassed.

Both male and female respondents disagree on the subsequent items. However, they differ in the degree of this disagreement. Male respondents strongly disagree whereas females somehow partly disagree on them:

- Physical appearance is emphasized more compared to intelligence in university.
- Women employees encounter sexual harassment at work.
- Female employees do not receive support from male juniors but the degree is different.
- Student and their families cause more issues for female employees.
- University favours young and single women.

Women respondents disagree on the following items while men seem to be neutral:

- Female employees feel comfortable with night shifts.
- Men are comfortable if they work for a woman manager.

both female and male respondents have neutral point of view towards the items that both genders get the same retirement benefits.

Men respondents entirely agree that Female employees feel secure at work place while women partly agree on that. Furthermore, women partially agree that Female employees can easily deal with long working hours in the university regardless of responsibilities, still men respondents remain neutral. In addition, females quite agree that Female employees are mostly seen in visible sectors like front office, while males disagree on that.

In order to investigate the potential differences between our respondents' subset groups, which are Age, Education Level, Job Status, Work Experience, Analyses of Variance (ANOVA) Test was carried out.

ANOVA results for age revealed that among four selected age groups, except for four of the items, there exist no statistically significant differences in their perception towards the items.

ANOVA test for Educational level reveals that no statistically significance differences were observed among Educational the level category. And ANOVA results for Job Status displays that among the thirty items, there are two in which statistically significant differences were observed.

ANOVA results for Work Experience revealed that seven statistically significant differences were observed among the thirty items.

5.2 Implications and Recommendation

The outcomes deduced from this research, carries significant implications for administrators in the Eastern Mediterranean University.

Female respondents at some points believed there exists discrimination, at some points they didn't believe that they were being discriminated and for some items they were neutral.

Regarding the neutral responses, for either genders, it can be inferred that maybe they thought the question is not relevant to them, or they do not feel they have enough information to make an informed choice, or they might think of reasons to be positive

and reasons to be negative, but can't make up their mind. Such neutral options provide an easy out for respondents who are less inclined to express their opinion. And prefer to choose middle-of-the-road" or conservative. In addition, due to personal reasons, some prefer to remain conservative when it comes to controversial issues like this.

Although the discriminatory organization cultures that favor men and reinforce the patriarchal culture was not perceived in EMU, Findings of this study can provide institutional leaders, university and college administrators, and human resources professionals with key information that would enable them to lessen or even eliminate any possible perception or misperception regarding gender issues in EMU.

From administrative and management perspective, they can:

- hold committees in order to resolve any possible dispute or conflict among the employees or between management and employees within the organizations.
- have regular meetings to listen to the employees and they find the opportunity to share the ideas and goals with their management.
- Empower both genders at their level equally by assigning the different tasks as well as providing equal promotion and employment opportunities within which Male and Female easily get the opportunity without any discrimination and policy must be abide for both genders equally.

Also senior management vacant positions should be for all qualified candidates equal and Human Resources' programs should provide equal opportunities for all employees on gender-neutral bases. Furthermore, establishing an affordable, satisfactory

childcare houses in work places will be tremendously helpful for female employees with children.

The government should also take affirmative actions and develop a legal framework for executing the policy of hiring a certain percentage of women. The government should also acknowledge women roles in social and economic development.

5.3 Limitation of the Study

This study like other researches inevitably was faced with different limitations. First, this research is a small-scale study which focuses on only one university (EMU) in North Cyprus; Still and on, it is essential to conduct further studies and extend it to other universities in other cities and countries and in greater details. Moreover, marital status could be a significant independent variable among the demographic variables for this study but it was not measured in this study.

Also this research mainly focused on academic environment where you less expect to see discriminatory behaviours as the result revealed. However, the results would differ dramatically if it were carried out in other sectors and different work environments.

Also Type of questionnaire, model, methodology and statistical techniques could be improved to get more useful results.

REFERENCES

- Adeniji, and A. O. Osibanjo, (2012), Human Resource Management: *Theory and Practice*. Pumark Nigeria Limited, Lagos. Pages 234 – 292.
- ABC of Women Worker's Rights and Gender Equality, ILO, 2000. p. 48.
- Avinash and Gulzar Saba (2016). “*Workplace Conflict, Gender Discrimination, Interpersonal Communication and Their Impact On Employees Performance*”. *Journal of Contemporary Issues in Business Research*,5(1), *Journal of Contemporary Issues in Business Research*. 26-34.
- Adams, J.S. (1965), “*Inequity in Social Exchange*”, in Berkowitz, L. (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 2, Academic Press, New York, NY, pp. 267-99. Aggarwal AP, Gupta MM. (2000). *Sexual Harassment in the Workplace*, 3rd edition. Vancouver, BC: Butterworths.
- Aitchison, C., Jordan, F., Brackenridge, C. (1999). *Women in Leisure Management: A Survey of Gender Equity*. *Women in Management Review*, V14 (4), 121-127.
- Albrecht, J., Borland, A., & Vroman, S. (2003). *Is There a Glass Ceiling in Sweden?* *Journal of Labour Economics*, 21(1), 145-77.
- Antecol H, Cobb-Clark D. (2003). *Does Sexual Harassment Training Change Attitudes?* A view from the federal level. *Social Science Quarterly*, 84, 826–842.

Association of American University Professors AAUP (2004), "*Research Director on Gender Gap*", *Academe*, Vol. 90 No. 3, pp. 26-7.

AUT (2004), "*The Unequal Academy*", London, available at: www.aut.org.uk/media/pdf/j/n/equalitiesnews1104.pdf

Barak A. (1997). Cross-cultural perspectives on sexual harassment. In O'Donohue W (Ed.), *Sexual harassment: Theory, research, and treatment*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

BBC NEWS (2004), "*Glass Ceiling Traps Academics: Women Academics Are Being Discriminated Against in Terms of Money and Promotion, Lecturers Claim*", 1 October, available at: <http://news.bbc.co.uk/go/pr/fr/-/1/hi/education/3706852.stm> (accessed 5 November 2004).

Bilimoria, D., Liang, X. (2011). *Gender Equity in Science and Engineering: Advancing Change in Higher Education. Routledge Studies in Management, Organizations and Society*. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group. 7625 Empire Drive, Florence, KY 41042.

Blau F., Ferber M., Winkler. A. (2001), "*The Economics of Women, Men, and Work*", Fourth Edition.

Brant, C, Too, Y (1994) *Rethinking Sexual Harassment*. London: Pluto Press. Google Scholar

Brant, C, Too, Y (1994) *Rethinking Sexual Harassment*. London: Pluto Press. Google Scholar

Britannica, Inc. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/gender-identity>

Brown, C., (1990). "*Firm's Choice of Method of Pay.*" *Industrial and Labour Relations Review*, 43, pp. 165-82.

Butler, Judith, "*Sex and Gender in Simone de Beauvoir's Second Sex*" in *Yale French Studies*, No. 72 (1986), pp. 35–49.

Can, T.: 1995, 'The Existence of Sexual Harassment in China', *Chinese Education and Society* V 28, 615.

Cash, T.F. and Janda, L.H. (1984) '*The Eye of the Beholder: Attractive People Are Preferred for Dates, Jobs and Friendships: But There Are Some Thorns on the Rose of Beauty*', *Psychology Today*, 18(12): 46–52.

Cash, T.F., Gillen, B. and Burnes, D.S. (1977) '*Sexism and "Beautyism" in Personnel Consultant Decision Making*', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 62(3): 301–10.

Cash, T.F., Gillen, B. and Burnes, D.S. (1977) '*Sexism and "Beautyism" in Personnel Consultant Decision Making*', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 62(3): 301–10.

Chaiken, S. (1979) '*Communicator Physical Attractiveness and Persuasion*', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37(8): 1387–97.

- C. I. Tongo, (2005) “*An Agenda for Gender Equality in Globalized Economies.*”
International Journal of Violence and Related Studies. Vo. 1 (1). pp. 53-64.
- Corrice, A. (2009). *Unconscious Bias in Faculty and Leadership Recruitment: A Literature Review*. AAMC Analysis in Brief, August 2009(9). Available at:
<http://www.aamc.org/download/102364/data/aibvol9no2.pdf>, last access
21/07/2015.
- Cotter, D. A., DeFiore, J., Hermsen, J. M., Kowalewski, B., & Vanneman, R. (1997).
All Women Benefit: The Macro Level Effect of Occupational Integration on Gender Earnings Equality. American Sociological Review, V 62, 714- 734
- Cortina, J.M. (1993). What is coefficient alpha? An examination of theory and applications. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 98-104.
- Crosen, R., Gneezy, U., 2009. *Gender Difference in Preferences*. *Journal of Economic Literature* 47 (2), 448–474
- Davis Shanon N, Theodore Greenstein 2009. “*Gender Ideology: Components, Predictors, and Consequences.*” *Annual Review Sociology* Vol 35:87-105.
- Davis, T. A. (2006), *Gender Inequality in Law Enforcement and Males’ Attitudes and Perceptions toward Women Working in Law Enforcement*. Dissertating Abstract International (UMI NO.1430662).

De Paola, M., Scoppa, V. (2015). *Gender Discrimination and Evaluators' Gender: Evidence from the Italian Academia. Economica*, 82(325), 162–188

“*Despite Gains, Women Remain Underrepresented Among U.S. Political and Business Leaders, 2017.*” Pew Research Centre, Washington, D.C. (MARCH 20, 2017).
<http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2017/03/20/despite-gains-women-remain-underrepresented-among-u-s-political-and-business-leaders/>

Dickey-Bryant, L., Lautenschlager, G.J., Mendoza, J.L. and Abrahams, N. (1986) ‘*Facial Attractiveness and Its Relation to Occupational Success*’, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(1):16–19.

Dipboye, R.L., Arvey, R.D. and Terpstra, D.E. (1977) ‘*Sex and Physical Attractiveness of Raters and Applicants as Determinants of Resume Evaluations*’, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 62(3): 288–94.

Drogosz, L.M. and Levy, P.E. (1996) ‘*Another Look at the Effects of Appearance, Gender, a Job Type on Performance-based Decisions*’, *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 20(3): 437–45.

Encyclopædia Britannica, (2013), Gender identity. Encyclopædia

Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. (2005). *Sexual Harassment Charges: EEOC & Fair Employment Practice Agencies Combined: FY 1992 – FY 2004.*
Available at: <http://www.eeoc.gov/stats/harassment.html>.

ETAN (European Technology Assessment Network) (2000), *Science Policies in The European Union. Promoting Excellence Through Mainstreaming Gender Equality*. A Report from the ETAN Network on Women and Science, Brussels: European Commission, Research Directorate-General.

Fitzgerald LF, Shullman SL, Bailey N, Richards M, Swecker J, Gold Y, et al. (1988). *The Incidence and Dimensions of Sexual Harassment in Academia and the Workplace*. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 32, 152–175.

Fogelberg, Paul, Jeff Hearn, Liisa Husu and Teija Mankkinen (Eds.) (1999), *Hard Work in the Academy*. Research and Interventions on Gender Inequalities in Higher Education, Helsinki: Helsinki University Press.

Galic, B. (2012). *International Conference Addressing Quality of Work in Europe* Sofia, Bulgaria 18-19 October 2012, Some sociological aspects on gender discrimination at work in Croatia.

Gelfand MJ, Fitzgerald LF, Drasgow F. (1995). *The Structure of Sexual Harassment: A Confirmatory Analysis Across Cultures and Settings*. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 47, 164–177.

Giddens, Anthony. 1973. *“The Class Structure of the Advanced Societies”*. New York: Barnes and Noble.

- Gilmore, D.C., Beehr, T.A. and Love, K.G. (1986) '*Effects of Applicant Sex, Applicant Physical Attractiveness, Type of Rater and Type of Job on Interview Decisions*', *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 59(2): 103–9.
- Greenberg, J. (1988), "*Equity and Workplace Status: A Field Experiment*", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 73, pp. 606-13.
- Greenberg, J. (1988). *Equity and Workplace Status: A Field Experiment*. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 4, 606-613.
- Greenhalgh, C. (1980), *Male-Female Differentials in Great Britain: Is Marriage an Equal Opportunity?* *Economic Journal*, vol. 90, pp. 751-775.
- Gruber J. (2003). Sexual harassment in the public sector. In PaludiM, PaludiCA, Jr. (Eds.), *Academic and Workplace Sexual Harassment: A Handbook of Cultural, Social Science, Management, And Legal Perspectives*. Westport, CT: Praeger/Greenwood.
- Güven Lisaniler, Fatma. (2006). Gender Equality in North Cyprus (Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus). *Quaderns de la Mediterrània = Cuadernos del Mediterráneo*, ISSN 1577-9297, N°. 7, 2006 (Ejemplar dedicado a: Women in the Mediterranean Mirror).
- Halpin, T. and Johnston, C. (2004), "*Academia Has a Lot to Learn on Pay Equality*", *The Times*, 2 September, p. 13

Heilman, M.E. and Saruwatari, L.R. (1979) '*When Beauty Is Beastly: The Effects of Appearance and Sex on Evaluations of Job Applicants for Managerial and Non-Managerial Jobs*', *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 23(3): 360–72.

Hemmati, M. (1999). *Gender and Tourism: Women's Employment and Participation in Tourism*, UNED-UK's.

Heywood and Jirjahn, Uwe, (2002). "*Payment Schemes and Gender in Germany.*" *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 56(1), pp. 44-64

Heywood; Siebert, W.S. and Wei, X., (1997). "*Payment by Results Systems: British Evidence.*" *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 35, pp. 1-22.

Hwang, Mi-ra (2010). *The Impact of Female Workers' Work-Family Balance on Life Satisfaction*, Master's Thesis at Korea University.

Ilkka, R.J. (1995) '*Applicant Appearance and Selection Decision-making: Revitalizing Employment Interview Education*', *Business Communication Quarterly*, 58(3): 11–18.

International Labor Organization (2007), *International Labor Organization Gender and Development*. www.ilo.org

International Labor Office (ILO, 2004). *Switzerland Facts on The Hotel, Catering and Tourism Industry*, www.ilo.org

International Labor Organization (2007), International Labor organization Gender and Development. www.ilo.org

Jackson, L.A., Hunter, J.E. and Hodge, C.N. (1995) '*Physical Attractiveness and Intellectual Competence: A Meta-Analytic Review*', *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 58(2): 108–22.

Jackson, L.A. (1983) '*The Influence of Sex, Physical Attractiveness, Sex Role, and Occupational Sex-Linkage on Perception of Occupational Suitability*', *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 13: 31–44.

Jeong, M. (2013) "*Factors affecting female workers' perceived discrimination in the workplace: an analysis using the Korean Longitudinal Survey of Women and Family*". *GSPR* 2013 Vol.6,76-80.

Kasanita, S. (2008). *Decent work, gender equality, International Labor organization*.
www.ilo.org

Kemp, A.: 1994, *Women's Work: Degraded and Devalued* (Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ).

Kirai, M.N. & Mukulu, E. (2012). *Perceived Organization Barriers to Women Career Progression in Kenya's Civil Service. International Journal of Advances In Management And Economics*, 1. (6) November-December, 2012.

- Krieg.R. (2006). *The Situation and Perceptions of Female Managers in German invested enterprises in China*. *Asia Europe Journal*.4(1).59-75.
- Korabik, K: 1993, '*Managerial Women in the People's Republic of China*', *International Studies of Management in Organization*, V 23(4), 47-64.
- Leggatt, J. (1974) *The Human Face*. New York: *Stein and Day*.
- Li, L. & Leung, R.W. (2001). *Female managers in Asian hotels: Profile and career challenges*. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 13(4), 189-196.
- Maatman, G L., Jr.: 2000, '*Harassment, Discrimination Laws Go Global*', *National Underwriter*, V 104(37), 34-35
- MacKinnon, C (1979) *the Sexual Harassment of Working Women*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. Google Scholar.
- Marlowe, C.M., Schneider, S.L. and Nelson, C.E. (1996) '*Gender and Attractiveness Biases in Hiring Decisions: Are More Experienced Managers Less Biased?*', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(1): 11–21.
- (Massey, 2007). Douglas S. 2007.*Catehrically unequal: The American Stratification System*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation

- McGuire, L. K., Bergen, M. R., Polan, M. L. (2004). *Career advancement for women faculty in a US school of medicine: perceived needs*. *Academic Medicine*, 79(4), 319-325.
- Mehrabian, A. and Blum, J.S. (1997) '*Physical Appearance, Attractiveness, and the Mediating Role of Emotions*', *Current Psychology: Developmental, Learning Personality Social*, 16(1): 20–42.
- Miller, P. W. (1987), '*The Wage Effect of the Occupational Segregation of Women in Britain*', *The Economic Journal*, 97, 885–896.
- Miller, M.B. (1995). *Coefficient alpha: A basic introduction from the perspectives of classical test theory and structural equation modelling*. *Structural Equation Modelling*, 2(3), 255-273.
- Mitra, (2003) *Women's Development Goals: Reshaping Globalization*. Delhi: Author press.
- Morrow, Paula, C. (1990), "*Physical Attractiveness and Selection Decision Making*," *Journal of Management*, 16 (1),45–60.
- Moss-Racusin, C. A., Dovidio, J. F., Brescoll, V. L., Graham, M. J., Handelsman, J. (2012). Science faculty's subtle gender biases favor male students. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 109(41), 16474-16479.

Mulford, M., Orbell, J., Shatto, C. and Stockard, J. (1998) '*Physical Attractiveness, Opportunity, and Success in Everyday Exchange*', *American Journal of Sociology*, 103(6): 1565–92.

Muli, K., J. Peters and A. Wolper (ed.) (1995). '*Help Me Balance the Load*': *Gender Discrimination in Kenya*', *Women's Rights, Human Rights: International Feminist Perspectives*.

Muli, K., J. Peters and A. Wolper (ed.) (1995). '*Help Me Balance the Load*': *Gender Discrimination in Kenya*', *Women's Rights, Human Rights: International Feminist Perspectives*.

Nature (1999), *How to Boost the Careers of Women in Science?* Nature Web debate, <http://helix.nature.com/debates/women/>. September 1999.

Niederle M, Vesterlund L. 2007. *Do women shy away from competition? Do men compete too much?* Q. J. Econ. 122:1067–101

Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric Theory* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

OAXACA, R. (1973), *Male-female Wage Differentials in Urban Labor Markets*, *International Economic Review*, vol. 14, pp. 693-709.

OECD. (2014). *Main science and technology indicators*. OECD Science, Technology and R&D Statistics (database),. doi:10.1787/data-00182-en.

Off Our Backs, Vol. 33, No. 9/10 (September-October 2003), pp. 33-38

Omwenga, J. Q., Mukulu, E., & Kanali, C. (2013a). *Towards improving the performance of women entrepreneurs in small and medium enterprises in Nairobi County, Kenya: Policy recommendations*. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*. 4(9), 312-316.

On the implementation of the principle of equal treatment for men and women ... (76/207/EEC)", Council of the European Economic Communities, 9 February 1976. Amended 23 September 2002.

Patzer, G.L. (1985) *The Physical Attractiveness Phenomena*. New York: Plenum Press. Sarno, J.A. and Alley, T.R. (1997) 'Attractiveness and the Memorability of Faces: Only a Matter of Distinctiveness?', *American Journal of Psychology*, 110(1): 81–92.

Poloski Vokic, Nina & Sinčić Ćorić, Dubravka & Obadić, Alka. (2017). *To be or not to be a woman? - Highly educated women's perceptions of gender equality in the workplace*. *Revija Za Socijalnu Politiku*. 24. 253-276. 10.3935/rsp.v24i3.1432.

Rotbart, H. A., McMillen, D., Taussig, H., Daniels, S. R. (2012). *Assessing gender equity in a large academic department of pediatrics*. *Academic Medicine*, 87(1), 98-104.

R.T Sparrowe, K.M. Iverson Cracks in the glass ceiling? An empirical study of gender differences in income in the hospitality industry *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research*, 23 (1) (1999), pp. 4-20.

Shackelford, T.K. and Larsen, R.J. (1999) '*Facial Attractiveness and Physical Health*', *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 20(1): 71–6.

Shaffer, M. A., Joplin, J. R. W., Bell, M. P., Lau, T., & Oguz, C. (2000). Gender Discrimination and Job-Related Outcomes: A Cross-Cultural Comparison of Working Women in the United States and China. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 57(3), 395-427. DOI: 10.1006/jvbe.1999.1748

Shapiro, D. and B. Kirkman, (2016). Anticipatory injustice: *The consequences of expecting injustice in the workplace*. In J. Greenberg and R. Cropanzano, eds, *Advances in organizational justice*. Lexington, MA: New Lexington, 152-178.

Sharma, S. P. (2006) *Women Education and Women Rights in India*, Vista International Publishing House Delhi, pp 22-24

Shin, Cheol-u and Jin, Seon-yeong (2004). "*The Impact of Female Workers' Perceived Discrimination on Organizational Effectiveness*," *The Korean Journal of Business Administration*, 47: 2783-2803.

SPO, TRNC State Planning Organization, 15 November Population Census, Social and Economic Characteristics of Population, Nicosia, TRNC SPO, 1999.

Streiner, D. L. (2003). *Being Inconsistent about Consistency: When Coefficient Alpha Does and Doesn't Matter*. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 80(3), 217-222.

Umberson, D. and Hughes, M. (1987) '*The Impact of Physical Attractiveness on Achievement and Psychological Well Being*', *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 50(3): 227–36

UNESCO (1996), *World Science Report 1996*, Paris: UNESCO.

United States Merit Systems Protection Board. (1988). *Sexual harassment in the federal workplace: An update*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Wayne, F. C. (1995). *Managing Human Resource, Productivity, Quality of Work Life, Profits*, McGraw Hill Internationals (4th edition)

"*What Do We Mean by "Sex" And "Gender"?*". World Health Organization. Archived from the original on 30 January 2017. Retrieved 26 November 2015.

World Bank. (2001). *Engendering Development: Through Gender Equality in Rights, Resources, and Voice*. Washington D.C, Oxford University Press and World Bank.

women benefit: *The Macro Level Effect of Occupational Integration On Gender Earnings Equality*. *American Sociological Review*, V 62, 714- 734

Wright, A. L., Schwindt, L. A., Bassford, T. L., Reyna, V. F., Shisslak, C. M., Germain, P. A. S., Reed, K. L. (2003). *Gender Differences in Academic Advancement: Patterns, Causes, And Potential Solutions in One US College of Medicine*. *Academic Medicine*, 78(5), 500-508.

Yin, R.K., (1984). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. Beverly Hills, Calif: *Sage Publications*.

Yang, Geon-mo; Choi, Sun-yeong; and Cho, Yeong-mi (2010). “*The Impact of Perceived Gender Discrimination among Public Servants on their Work Attitudes*,” presented at the Korean Association for Public Administration Summer Academic Conference.

Zalk, S (1990) *Men in The Academy: A Psychological Profile of Harassment*. In: Paludi, M (ed.) *Ivory Power: Sexual Harassment on Campus*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 141–75. Google Scholar

APPENDIX

Appendix A: Questionnaire

Thank you in advance for taking the time to complete this survey to help us evaluate “Employees’ Perception Regarding Gender Inequality in Eastern Mediterranean University”. The survey will take you at most 10 to 15 minutes. Your correct and full responses will help us understand the abovementioned topic. We respect your privacy, and want to assure you that your responses are both anonymous and confidential.

Thank you very much for your time.

I. STAGE- Please answer the following questions by marking the best response.

- (1) Strongly disagree
- (2) Disagree
- (3) Undecided
- (4) Agree
- (5) Strongly agree

ID	QUESTIONS	LIKERT'S SCALE
1	Male and female employees are being treated equally.	1 2 3 4 5
2	There exist gender inequalities against women because of patriarchal society.	1 2 3 4 5
3	The gender inequality is due to the quality of work in universities.	1 2 3 4 5
4	The University prefers females and discriminates against men.	1 2 3 4 5
5	Females are hired more at lower levels.	1 2 3 4 5
6	Female employees are mostly seen in visible sectors like front office.	1 2 3 4 5
7	Female employees are hired more in areas with less physical work.	1 2 3 4 5
8	University favours young and single women.	1 2 3 4 5
9	Physical appearance is emphasized more compared to intelligence in university.	1 2 3 4 5

10	Payment is equal for both male and female employees.	1	2	3	4	5
11	There exists equal performance evaluation.	1	2	3	4	5
12	Promotional opportunities are equal for men and women employees.	1	2	3	4	5
13	Both genders get the same retirement benefits.	1	2	3	4	5
14	Female employees get fewer fringe benefits compared to male employees.	1	2	3	4	5
15	Female employees feel secure at work place.	1	2	3	4	5
16	Female employees feel comfortable with night shifts.	1	2	3	4	5
17	Women employees encounter sexual harassment at work.	1	2	3	4	5
18	Female employees can easily deal with long working hours in the university regardless of responsibilities.	1	2	3	4	5
19	Management believes that female employees cannot perform executive roles along with family responsibilities.	1	2	3	4	5
20	Men are comfortable if they work for a woman manager.	1	2	3	4	5
21	Female employees do not receive support from male juniors.	1	2	3	4	5
22	Student and their families cause more issues for female employees.	1	2	3	4	5
23	University prefers single women to married women at recruiting level.	1	2	3	4	5
24	Women need to go through more efforts to prove their qualification compared to men.	1	2	3	4	5
25	Management picks men for managerial positions compared to female employees.	1	2	3	4	5
26	Men employees are in charge of most of positions in the University.	1	2	3	4	5
27	Women employees who don not participate in social gathering of university will have less growth opportunities.	1	2	3	4	5
28	You have faced any type of sexual harassment in university.	1	2	3	4	5
29	Men seniors harass female employees.	1	2	3	4	5
30	Part time women or female trainees are more harassed.	1	2	3	4	5

II. STAGE- DEMOGRAPHIC

Gender

Female ()

Male ()

Age

18-27 ()

28-37 ()

38-47 ()

48-57 ()

Education Level

High school ()

Associate degree ()

B.A/B.S degree ()

M.A/M.S degree ()

Doctoral degree ()

Job status

Academic ()

Managerial/Administrative ()

Operational (Worker) ()

Work Experience

1 - 4 years ()

4 - 7 years ()

7 - 10 years ()

More than 10 years ()

Your monthly Income

Less than 1000\$ () 001-5,000 \$ () 5,001-10,000\$ () more than 10,001\$ ()

Important Note: This questionnaire has been modified by employing the following articles
Manjula Chaudhary and Megha Gupta (2010)
Kirai MN and Elegwa Mukulu (2012)
Daniel E. Gberville et. al (2014)