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#### Abstract

Studies on gender disparities reflects that participation of women have increased at all level of education, hence they are still behind men at all level especially when it comes to Technical/Professional education and with private education providers the situation looks more vulnerable. In fact women are a major conventionally marginalized section in terms of accessing private professional education. Article analyses the participation pattern of engineering students in Uttar Pradesh in terms of gender and effect of their caste categories on their participation rate.
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## Introduction

In last two decades engineering education of Uttar Pradesh has increased its capacity and opportunities to study, and this phenomenal growth is mainly due to private sector. But with these increasing opportunities still there are gender disparities in participation pattern of students in higher education especially in professional/engineering education. Our Constitution provides provisions for upliftment of weaker sections, and also for protection of the marginalized sections from social injustice and social exploitation. But the question is- Do the private education providers follow the basic spirit and thrust of the Constitution? To know this, there is need to study what is the degree of equality of opportunity available to women in terms of actual access to engineering education. Article comparatively analyses the participation of women students in engineering education and their percent share in population of Uttar Pradesh to examine the degree of equality in access to engineering education.

## Methodology

Study analyses the participation of women students in degree level engineering education i.e. B.Tech in Uttar Pradesh. To analyze the trend of women students participation in engineering education, enrollment data has been collected from Uttar Pradesh Technical University, Uttar Pradesh from year 2000 to 2012.

## Gender Participation in Engineering Education

Table 1 reveals that women participation varied from about $11 \%$ to $18 \%$ in engineering education whereas men students has always been in overwhelming majority participation with more than $82 \%$ during various years.

Table1: Gender-wise Participation of Students in B.Tech Course during Various Years

| Year | Men Students |  | Women Students |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | $\%$ | Number | $\%$ | Number | $\%$ |
| 2000 | 9695 | 88.33 | 1281 | 11.67 | 10976 | 100 |
| 2001 | 13833 | 88.62 | 1776 | 11.38 | 15609 | 100 |
| 2002 | 18719 | 84.83 | 3348 | 15.17 | 22067 | 100 |
| 2003 | 16612 | 84.49 | 3049 | 15.51 | 19661 | 100 |
| 2006 | 27799 | 82.65 | 5837 | 17.35 | 33636 | 100 |
| 2007 | 36426 | 82.29 | 7837 | 17.71 | 44263 | 100 |
| 2008 | 49326 | 81.22 | 11407 | 18.78 | 60733 | 100 |
| 2009 | 54848 | 82.09 | 11968 | 17.91 | 66816 | 100 |
| 2010 | 58287 | 82.04 | 12758 | 17.96 | 71045 | 100 |
| 2011 | 28146 | 84.41 | 5200 | 15.59 | 33346 | 100 |
| 2012 | 32118 | 84.71 | 5797 | 15.29 | 37915 | 100 |

Source: UPTU (compiled from raw enrollment data).

## Gender-wise Participation of

## Students based on Caste Categories

Women participation is highly affected by their caste category as participation of women from disadvantaged caste group i.e. from OBC, SC and ST caste category is not worth mentioning. Within women category (see Table 2) participation of General caste category women is highest followed by OBC and SC whereas ST women have lowest participation, almost negligible in total enrollment in engineering education in Uttar Pradesh. Caste category wise participation of students shows that students from backward castes have lower access to engineering education. Participation of OBC and SC is lower than General caste category. Percentage increase of women participation for all caste categories i.e. SC, ST, OBC and General caste category has been almost minimal as compared to the total enrollment over the years in the State.

Table 2: Gender-wise Participation of Students based on Caste categories in Degree Level Engineering Education (B.Tech) in Uttar Pradesh

| year | Caste and Gender-wise Participation of Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  | Grand Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | SC |  | ST |  | OBC |  | General |  |  |  |  |
|  | Men | Women | Men | Women | Men | Women | Men | Women | Men | Women |  |
| 2000 | $\begin{gathered} 1026 \\ (9.35) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 101 \\ (0.92) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 68 \\ (0.62) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ (.07) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2190 \\ (19.95) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 196 \\ (1.79) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6411 \\ 58.40 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 976 \\ (8.89) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9695 \\ (88.33) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1281 \\ (11.67) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10976 \\ (100) \end{gathered}$ |
| 2001 | $\begin{gathered} 1343 \\ (8.60) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 107 \\ (0.69) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 66 \\ (0.42) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 17 \\ (0.11) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3518 \\ (22.53) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 234 \\ (1.5) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8906 \\ (57.06) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1418 \\ (9.08) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 13833 \\ (88.62) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1776 \\ (11.38) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 15609 \\ (100) \end{gathered}$ |
| 2002 | $\begin{gathered} 1586 \\ (7.19) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 193 \\ (0.87) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 49 \\ (0.22) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 11 \\ (0.05) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4431 \\ (20.08) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 486 \\ (2.20) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 12653 \\ (57.34) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2658 \\ (12.05) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 18719 \\ (84.83) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3348 \\ (15.17) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 22067 \\ (100) \end{gathered}$ |
| 2003 | $\begin{gathered} 2636 \\ (13.40) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 270 \\ (1.37) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 74 \\ (0.38) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11 \\ (0.06) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4401 \\ (22.38) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 620 \\ (3.15) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9501 \\ (48.32) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2148 \\ (10.93) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16612 \\ (84.49) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3049 \\ (15.51) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 19661 \\ & (100) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| 2006 | $\begin{gathered} 3855 \\ (11.46) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 548 \\ (1.63) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 123 \\ (0.37) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16 \\ (0.05) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8235 \\ (24.48) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1216 \\ (3.62) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 15586 \\ (46.34) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 4057 \\ (12.06) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 27799 \\ (82.65) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5837 \\ (17.35) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 33636 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 2007 | $\begin{gathered} 5576 \\ (12.6) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 786 \\ (1.78) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 171 \\ (0.39) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 28 \\ (0.06) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 11172 \\ (25.24) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1874 \\ (4.23) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19507 \\ (44.07) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5149 \\ (11.63) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 36426 \\ (82.29) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7837 \\ (17.71) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 44263 \\ (100) \end{gathered}$ |
| 2008 | $\begin{gathered} \hline 6692 \\ (11.02) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1058 \\ (1.74) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 227 \\ (0.37) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 26 \\ (0.04) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 16665 \\ & (27.44) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2827 \\ (4.65) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 25742 \\ (42.39) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7496 \\ (12.34) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 49326 \\ (81.22) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11407 \\ (18.78) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 60733 \\ (100) \end{gathered}$ |
| 2009 | $\begin{gathered} \hline 7647 \\ (11.44) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1058 \\ (1.58) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 297 \\ (0.44) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 55 \\ (0.08) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 15641 \\ (23.41) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2427 \\ (3.63) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 31263 \\ (46.79) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 8428 \\ (12.61) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 54848 \\ (82.09) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11968 \\ (17.91) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 66816 \\ (100) \end{gathered}$ |
| 2010 | $\begin{gathered} 5852 \\ (8.24) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1165 \\ (1.64) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 239 \\ (0.34) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 36 \\ (0.05) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 14084 \\ & (19.82) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2770 \\ & (3.9) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 38112 \\ (53.64) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8787 \\ (12.37) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 58287 \\ (82.04) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 12758 \\ (17.96) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 71045 \\ (100) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 2011* | $\begin{gathered} 7175 \\ (21.52) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 718 \\ (2.15) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 229 \\ (0.69) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 30 \\ (0.09) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8694 \\ (26.07) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1287 \\ (3.86) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 12048 \\ (36.13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3165 \\ (9.49) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 28146 \\ (84.40) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5200 \\ (15.59) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 33346 \\ (100) \end{gathered}$ |
| 2012* | $\begin{gathered} \hline 8916 \\ (23.52) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 821 \\ (2.17) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 267 \\ (0.70) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 39 \\ (0.10) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 10708 \\ (28.24) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1610 \\ (4.25) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 12227 \\ (32.25) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3327 \\ (8.77) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 32118 \\ (84.71) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5797 \\ (15.29) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 37915 \\ & (100) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |

## Source: UPTU (compiled from raw enrollment data).

Note: a) Enrollment data of 2011 and 2012 is only of GBTU, as UPTU was bifurcated in to GBTU and MTU and MTU enrollment data was not available.
b) Figures in parenthesis indicate percentage.

## Women Percentage Share in Population of Uttar Pradesh

Table 3: Gender-wise distribution of Population in Uttar Pradesh

| Total population <br> (in number) | Gender participation |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Men | Women |
| 199812341 <br> $(100)$ | 104480510 <br> $(52.3)$ | 95331831 <br> $(47.7)$ |

Source: Uttar Pradesh at a Glance, Economics and Statistics Division, Uttar Pradesh. Note: Figures in parentheses indicate percentages.

Table 3 indicates that percentage share of Women (47.7\%) is about $48 \%$ in population of Uttar Pradesh but their percentage share in engineering education does not cover even $1 / 5^{\text {th }}$ of the total enrollment, whereas besides having about half ( $52.3 \%$ ) of the population by men, they cover more than $82 \%$ of enrollment. The comparative analysis reflects that women students do not have equitable access in engineering education.

## Concluding Observations

Analysis of women participation in engineering education reveals that they do not have equitable access in engineering education. And caste factor plays an important role; their participation is less than men in all caste categories. And within women category also, participation is higher for General caste category whereas participation women students from OBC, SC is not significant, and women from ST caste category is almost negligible in engineering education.

The existing policies of State do not denied the access of professional education to any person, community or group based on gender, caste, class. There have been several policies including legislature of India which promote equitable access to education for all sections of society. Despite the legal equitable access in education to all sections of society, participation of women in professional education is far from satisfactory and it is worst when it comes to participation of women from double disadvantaged sections in terms of caste i.e. women from $\mathrm{ST}, \mathrm{SC}, \mathrm{OBC}$.

In fact there are many government schemes of scholarship and free-ships available for scheduled castes, scheduled tribes, other backward classes, and women for higher education. In spite of a surfeit of schemes, the representation of women in engineering education is not satisfactory. Their lower participation indicates that policies of Government are inadequate to provide equitable access and financial support for women in private engineering education.

The participation pattern of women in engineering education shows that increasing private sector share in engineering education in Uttar Pradesh has contributed in a very limited way to the social equity and justice in the Indian society.

The recent dominant trend of rapid expansion of high fee charging privately-owned-andmanaged professional educational institutions, the central problem which requires in-depth study is to empirically find out the nature and extent of access women to professional education. Also There is need to find out whether the increasing share of private sector in engineering education is widening the gender gap and promoting social inequality.
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