

# Towards Gender Equity in Physics in India: Initiatives, Investigations and Questions

P. Shastri<sup>1,a)</sup>, A. Kurup<sup>2</sup>, L. Resmi<sup>3</sup>, R. Ramaswamy<sup>4</sup>, S. Ubale<sup>5</sup>, S. Bagchi<sup>6</sup>,  
S. Rao<sup>6</sup> and S. Narasimhan<sup>7</sup>.

<sup>1</sup>Indian Institute of Astrophysics, Bangalore, India; <sup>2</sup>National Institute of Advanced Studies, Bangalore, India; <sup>3</sup>Indian Institute of Space Technology, Thiruvananthapuram, India; <sup>4</sup>University of Hyderabad, Hyderabad, India; <sup>5</sup>D.D.M. Science College, Nagpur, India; <sup>6</sup>Harish Chandra Research Institute, Allahabad, India; <sup>7</sup>J.N. Centre for Advanced Research, Bangalore, India.

<sup>a)</sup>Corresponding author: prajval.shastri@gmail.com

**Abstract.** Initiatives towards gender parity in the sciences in India have occurred both at national, governmental as well as local, institutional levels. A gender gap persists in physics, but data suggest that this is neither due to lack of interest in science nor lack of career goals in science among girls. We outline investigations that are important to pursue and recommendations that build on the existing science interest and the impact of initiatives so far.

## Current Trends, Policy Initiatives and Cultural Initiatives Towards Gender Parity

The fraction of female science faculty in higher education has plateaued at ~43% as of 2012 (DST-NSTMIS 2012). ~30% of science research projects funded by the Department of Science & Technology (DST) are by women principal investigators as of 2010 (DST-NSTMIS 2011). The numbers in the physical sciences are likely to be lower, however (*e.g.* Chaya Devi & Bambah).

The female fraction of the DST “INSPIRE” faculty and student fellowship awardees is ~33%, and 60% respectively, laying to rest claims that young girls lack an interest in science or that women lack scientific ability. Indeed in a sample of 44 female and 25 male scientists, 38% of women were rank-holders and only 9% had low academic rank compared to 24% and 36% respectively for the male scientists (Subramanian, 2014), suggesting that “fixing the women” by “building their skills” is not the need of the hour. There appears to be a trend for younger women scientists with scientist spouses to consciously choose institutions in smaller towns that may provide an equitable opportunity for both partners (Kurup 2014a).

The DST has awarded 223 career-break fellowships for women in the physical sciences to date, has proposed a “mobility scheme” to address constraints of women subjected to family relocations, and continues the CURIE programme to substantially support women’s universities. (DST 2013). The Indian Academy of Sciences (IAS) study (Kurup *et al* 2011) attracted the attention of the Indian Parliament. The Indian National Science Academy organised a workshop on women in science (Sept., 2013), and the Astronomical Society of India (ASI) had a session on gender issues in astronomy in its annual meeting for the first time (Meeting of the ASI, March 2014) thus strongly foregrounding the debate around gender in formal circles.

Mentoring is clearly extremely important: *e.g.*, of the 166 Indian respondents with declared gender of the Global Survey of physicists, 81% female physicists (26/32) reported having a female physics teacher, as opposed to 56% male physicists (69/123) (Ivie *et al* 2014). In this direction, *Lilavati’s Daughters* (by the IAS, *cf.*, Shastri *et al.* 2013) has now been translated into Hindi, Marathi, and Malayalam. *A Girls Guide to a Life in Science* (*cf.* Shastri *et al* 2013), has sold over 3000 copies and has been translated into Telugu, with Urdu, Tamil and Hindi versions forthcoming. The IAS has been running regular career workshops for women. *Vigyan Prasar*, the science communication wing of DST, has produced a TV series *Scientifically Yours* on 13 practicing Indian women scientists including two physicists. Local initiatives such as the network of Women in Physics in Nagpur undertake gender sensitisation and promote physics among young girls (Darisi & Ubale, these proceedings) which also play an important role.

## Persisting Concerns, Questions to be Investigated and Recommendations for the Future

Female scientist fractions in the elite research institutions, which purportedly set the national standards in academic excellence, work culture, and progressive institutional vision are telling: *e.g.*, the astrophysics institutes have a dismal median of ~ 10% (range 0%–20%; from data in Kharb 2014). Reasons quoted by managements such as lack of female applicants (*e.g.*, Kurup 2014a), are not backed up by evidence. Despite ~40% female fraction of science faculty in higher education, the female fraction in senior governance positions or academy membership remains disproportionately small; *e.g.*, women fellows of the IAS are a mere 7% (up from 3% in 1995), the female fraction of the International Astronomical Union is a mere 9% of Indian members) and only 14% of INSA Young Scientists Awardees are women (between 2008-2014).

There is strong resistance within the community to debate unconscious bias (e.g., Chaya Devi & Bambah). Elite institutions including government and funding agencies continue to resist gender audits, making it difficult to ascertain the changing nature of representation at different levels (PhD student, post-doc, faculty). Gender-related initiatives are seen as a means for women to get favours for themselves, and the “drumbeat” of discrimination persists (e.g. Shastri, 2014). The social expectation that “women can only be scientists if they can *manage care-giving and science practice*, while men *cannot* be the primary care givers” still weighs heavy; e.g., the Global Survey of Physicists has shown that while only 46% (16/35) females reported being married/in a long-term relationship as opposed to 62% males (79/127), and 43% females reported being a parent or guardian of a child as opposed to 75% males, as much as 77% females reported that their career changed their personal decisions about marriage or children, as opposed to 53% of the males (67/126) (Ivie et al 2014).

How has the gender fraction at different levels (PhD student, post-doc, faculty) changed over time in the elite physics institutions? Why is there resistance on the part of elite institutions to publicise employee gender statistics? Are science institutions able to substantiate their claims that they are free of gender bias in hiring, assessment and recognition with scientific evidence? (such as an equal gender distribution between the hired personnel and the applicant pool?) Does higher gender parity in institutions correlate with women-friendly workplaces, reduced sexual harassment, gender-neutral academic recognition, gender-neutral governance and assignment of responsibilities? Do physicists perceive their institutional processes such as recruitment, assessment and governance mechanisms as transparent, and do men and women, and women physicists not in the mainstream see these differently? Scientists in research positions see “family pressure” as a more important obstacle to a science career path compared to women scientists without jobs (Kurup et al 2011) - is this a consequence of social expectations? How do physicists perceive measures towards gender parity (such as the career-break fellowships and gender audits) and gender equity (such as mechanisms to address sexual harassment)? Is there a difference in the perception of men and women? How do women physics graduates from women’s universities fare in their careers compared to women and men from co-educational universities? Do policies merely address the short-term goal of gender parity or also the long-term goal of gender equity? The viewpoint of trained women scientists with and without jobs is clearly fractured with strong implications for policy (Kurup *et al* 2011), so there is a clear need to seek the opinion of trained women scientists who are not part of the mainstream, more so because they are not easily available in the public domain.

The recommendations outlined in the previous country report (Shastri et al. 2013) need to be pursued. Clearly the mechanisms that cause gender inequity in science practice in India are not well understood (Kurup 2014b). The gendering of institutional spaces (Kurup 2014b) as well as of the perceptions of competence and commitment (Subramaniam 2014) need investigation. It is essential to move from the traditional framework of family reasons being the overriding cause of the gender gap, to an alternative framework that focuses on formal spaces in institutions. It is time to evaluate policies for impact not only on gender parity, but also on gender equity, and on the long-term goal of gender-healthy workplaces.

## REFERENCES

1. G. Chaya Devi and B.A. Bambah, in preparation.
2. DST\_NSTMIS, “A faculty-wise enrolment of women in higher education from 1985-86 to 2011-12”, *DST NSTMIS, table 23*, [www.nstmis-dst.org/PDFTableNo23.pdf](http://www.nstmis-dst.org/PDFTableNo23.pdf) (2012).
3. DST\_NSTMIS, “Directory of extramural research & development projects approved for funding by selected central government agencies/departments (years 2004-2010), [www.nstmis-dst.org](http://www.nstmis-dst.org) (2011).
4. DST, “DST Annual Report 2012-13”, [dst.gov.in/about\\_us/ar12-13/annual-report-2012-13.pdf](http://dst.gov.in/about_us/ar12-13/annual-report-2012-13.pdf) (2013).
5. L R. Ivie et al, “Global Survey of Physicists”, *Statistical Research Center, American Institute of Physics*, (2014), private communication.
6. P. Kharb, “Current Statistics on Women in Indian Astronomy, presentation at the 32nd Meeting of the Astronomical Society of India”, [www.ncra.tifr.res.in:8081/~sushan/wasi/preeti\\_kharb.pdf](http://www.ncra.tifr.res.in:8081/~sushan/wasi/preeti_kharb.pdf) (2014).
7. A. Kurup, R. Maithreyi, B. Kantharaju and R. Godbole, “Trained Scientific Women Power: How much are we Losing and Why?”, **Indian Academy of Sciences** (2011).
8. A. Kurup *et al*, “Interrogating Higher Education: Changing Paradigms”, in *Engagements in Higher Education: Seminar Reports*, **NIAS publications, Bangalore**, (2014a), in press.
9. A. Kurup, “Gender, Science & Technology Education in India”, in *Women and Science: Critiques and Changing Perspectives in India*, eds, S. Krishna & G. Chadha, **Stree Samya** (2014b), in press.
10. P. Shastri, *et al*. “Gender diversity in physics in India: Interventions so far and recommendations for the future”, in *AIP Conference Proceedings 1517*, 106 (2013).
11. P. Shastri, “Gender Inequities in the Science Workplace”, in *Women and Science: Critiques and Changing Perspectives in India*, eds, S. Krishna & G. Chadha, **Stree Samya** (2014), in press.
12. J. Subramaniam, “Unraveling of the Gender=Merit Conundrum: Do women deserve to do science in India?”, *ibid*.