# DISCRIMINATION BY THE GENDER IN ROMANIA

**Dobre Mihaela Hrisanta**

*Academy of Economics Studies, Faculty of Economics, mihaelah.dobre@gmail.com, 0722461378*

**Trască Daniela Livia**

*Academy of Economics Studies, Faculty of Economics, daniela.trasca@gmail.com, 0721441446*

*Generally discrimination appears when some individuals that have a certain feature (for instance belong to religion, race, gender, etc) are discriminated against because of this no matter what their labor productivity might be. Discrimination emerges also when two individuals with the same productivity are paid differently and these differentials correspond to some non-economic features (age, gender, nationality etc). According to the 'Global Report on Gender Discrimination' 2006 published by World Economic Forum total equality between men and women still reaches low levels. From 115 countries included in the top ranking, Romania is on the 46th with the same score as Ukraine, Uganda and Trinidad-Tobago. Romania is ok regarding education and health. In this paper we analyse the main differences between women and men, and also the measures which must be taking for eliminate these disfunctions from european integration point of view.*

The main literature in this field analised the way in which the gender divide the power between men and women taking in account the age, race or other variables (H.L.Moore), in a firm frame, to explain or understand the role of the culture diversity (U Hannerz 1992, M Gullestad, 1991) or the interdependences between cultural and political representations.

By discrimination one understands any distinction, exclusion, restriction, preference, different treatment that puts a person or a group to disadvantage when compared to other persons /groups in similar situations. The discrimination reasons are several: race, nationality, ethnicity, religion, gender, sexual orientation, language, age, handicap, etc. In this case we speak of multiple discrimination.("Ethnographical research showing multiple discrimination", 2007, ANES). Regardless of its basis, discrimination is forbidden by law in Romania as well as in the other European countries.

Discrimination is a general feature of social life and it is rooted into preconception. By preconception one understands rejecting the "other" as member of a group which is invested with negative feelings. Allport (1954) defined preconception as a negative attitude towards a group or towards its members, attitude that stems from a rigid and erred generalization. The social groups defined in terms of "us" versus "them" are the product of one of the most fundamental processes of the human being, namely: the social categorization (Taijfel, 1981). Discrimination is to be considered from both sides: the one of the worker who is discriminated against and the one of the employer who does the discrimination.

Modern economic theory of discrimination started with Becker (1971) and was later developed by Arrow (1974). They consider that people have certain *attitudes towards their co-workers, towards people they supervise and also towards people they buy things from. Consequently they demand some sort of compensation for working with the members of the discriminated group.*

Arrow and Phelp (1972) were the first to study statistical discrimination which is founded on the imperfect information in the labour market, determined by the employer's inability to know exactly how productive his workers are ( that means that two people with the same productivity level but belonging to two different ethnicities will develop differently from a professional point of view.) This particular idea was later on developed by Arrow (1998).

Special attention must be paid to the *discrimination model proposed by Welch*, (1967). He considered that coloured and white workers are hired together due to the complementarity of production. Thus, cooperation among workers of different ethnicities imply a fixed cost that depends only on the number of members in each group and can be influenced by certain discrimination preferences of any group members and by communication problems. The cooperation costs are paid by the minority race and the efficiency of

education is decreased among the minority workers if they are hired together with majority workers. Consequently, the educated minority workers will tend to work with members of the same group only. D.J. Aigner and C.G Cain (1977) consider that discrimination based on ethnicity and on gender is a consequence of group discrimination and the latter is inevitable among the individuals of any group. The two researchers define discrimination as the situation in which *average salaries are not proportional to average productivity*, in other words: *the groups with the same average productivity do not receive the same average compensation*. Since different salaries are paid to different groups in which the educational standards are identical (by educational standards we refer to the level of training that the workers have before entering the labour market) the balance in the labour market is a discriminative one.

Statistical discrimination models are used for explain the inequality from the group. The main vision is that the race or gender can be a sign of productivity taking in account that, productivity is noticed imperfectly and correlated with the identity of the group. Also, if the workers are impatient and they are improving their productivity through the investments in human capital, than the groups which are similar with exception of observable identity of the group can be treat differently at equilibrium. (P. Norman, 2003). In those models this aspect is explain through the fact that workers in minority are hamper because the firms think that, is very probably that those workers to have low skills and because of this the firms will invest lower in human capital because they think that the workers are hamper on the labor market.

The discrimination by the gender can be parse also from the anthropology point of view. So, the british anthropologist H.L. Moore(2002) state that according with the feminist anthropology, in different social context the differences are important.

Taking in account the eurobarometer realized by the European Comission in july 2006 in Romania, the most prevalent forms of discrimination is due to *hindrances (48%),* folowed by the *sexual orientation* (47%) and the last is due to the religion or faith (25%). In European Union, the most important shape of discrimination is due to race (64%), followed by that based on hindrances (53%).

### The main shapes of discrimination in EU and Romania

|  | EU | Romania |
|---|---|---|
| Race | 64% | 39% |
| Hindrances | 53% | 48% |
| Sexual orientation | 50% | 47% |
| Age | 46% | 46% |
| Religion or faith | 44% | 25% |
| Gender | 40% | 32% |

Source: www.eurostat.org

As regarding the life expectancy at birth, we see from the table below that women live much more than men and differences between the two genders declined in period 1998-2005 from 7, 8 years (1998) at 7,3 years (2005).

### The life expectancy at birth

| Year | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Women | 73.3 | 73.7 | 74.2 | 74.8 | 74.9 | 74.8 | 75.1 | 75.5 |
| Men | 65.5 | 66.1 | 67 | 67.7 | 67.6 | 67.4 | 67.7 | 68.2 |
| differences between women and men | 7.8 | 7.6 | 7.2 | 7.1 | 7.3 | 7.4 | 7.4 | 7.3 |

Source: HDR, 2007

98

As regarding the gross enrolment ratio for secondary and tertiary education, from the table below we can see that as well in the tertiary education as in the secondary education, women record a high level of enrolment in education. The growth of enrolment ratio for tertiary education is due to growth of educational supply from tertiary private education and also to the high skills enforce on the labor market. In last years, the number of students from the technical education declined.

### Gross enrolment ratio for  education

| | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Gross enrolment ratio for  secondary education (%) | | | | | | | | |
| women | 69 | 70.8 | 73 | 76.9 | 77.1 | 76.4 | 78.3 | 76.2 |
| men | 66.6 | 68 | 70.4 | 73.4 | 73 | 73 | 75.1 | 74.4 |
| index | 1.04 | 1.04 | 1.04 | 1.05 | 1.06 | 1.05 | 1.04 | 1.02 |
| Gross enrolment ratio for tertiary education (%) | | | | | | | | |
| women | 27.9 | 30.8 | 35.7 | 39.6 | 44.9 | 46.8 | 49 | 54 |
| men | 23.1 | 25.2 | 28.4 | 30.8 | 34.1 | 30 | 37 | 40.9 |
| index | 1.21 | 1.22 | 1.26 | 1.29 | 1.32 | 1.56 | 1.32 | 1.32 |

Source: HDR, 2007

As regarding the employment rate, we can see from the table that for the women this indicator is much lower.

### Employment rate

| | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| women | 63.5 | 61.5 | 63.5 | 61.7 | 60.9 | 58.7 | 58.1 | 59 |
| men | 66.6 | 68.9 | 70.4 | 73.4 | 73 | 73 | 75.1 | 74.4 |

Source:UNDP.org

United Nations Development Programme calculate a gender-related development index (GDI) taking in account three indicators: life expectancy at birth, education level and the level of wages. This index is between 0 and 1. The index 1-GDI measure the gap toward a real equality between gender.

| Year | GDI | 1-GDI |
|---|---|---|
| 1998 | 0.761 | 0.239 |
| 1999 | 0.758 | 0.242 |
| 2000 | 0.765 | 0.235 |
| 2001 | 0.778 | 0.222 |
| 2002 | 0.787 | 0.213 |
| 2003 | 0.791 | 0.209 |
| 2004 | 0.8 | 0.2 |
| 2005 | 0.801 | 0.199 |

Source: UNDP and own calculations

We can see that the distance that our country has to cover declined in the period 1998 and 2005.

According to the 'Global Report on Gender Discrimination'[13] 2006 published by World Economic Forum total equality between men and women still reaches low levels. From 115 countries included in the top ranking, Romania is on the 46th with the same score as Ukraine, Uganda and Trinidad-Tobago. Romania is ok regarding education and health. But women' representation in politics reaches low levels and Romania's country profile shows that the ratio between a woman's wage and a man's wage is 0.64.

Within the EU opportunity equality between women and men was marked in 2006 by two major events: the adoption by the Commission of a framework to follow for equality 2006-2010 and the adaptation by European Committee of an agreement for opportunity equality between women and men.

In the spring of 2006 the European Committee highlighted that its policies aimed at opportunities equality between women and men are essential instruments for economic growth, prosperity and competitivity. In this way they have in mind:

- swiping out gender differentials in labor market;
- favoring a better equilibrium between women and men by sharing private and family responsibilities;
- warranting total support for the policies of opportunities equality between women and men by cohesion and rural development policies;
- warranting the enforcement of the law framework that will swipe out discrimination in labor market.

## Bibliography:

1. Becker, G. (1957), The Economics of Discrimination, Chicago, University of Chicago Press;
2. Baudelot and A. Lebaupin, Wages from 1950 to 1975, Economics et Statistics, July,1979;
3. Dennis J. Aigner, Glen G. Cain , Statistical Theories of Discrimination in Labor Markets, Industrial and Labor Relations Review, Vol. 30, No. 2., 1977;
4. Kevin Lang, A Language Theory of Discrimination, The Quarterly Journal of Economics, Vol. 101, No. 2. , 1986;
5. Kenneth J. Arrow, What Has Economics to Say about Racial Discrimination?, The Journal of Economic Perspectives, Vol. 12, No. 2., 1998;
6. Norman P., Statistical Discrimination and Efficiency, The Review of Economic Studies, Vol. 70, No. 3., Jul., 2003;
7. J.M. Plassard, Discrimination sur le marche du travail et information imparfaite, Editions du CNRS, 1987 ;
8. Perrot. A , Les nouvelles theories du marche du travail, Edition. Decouverte, Paris. 1992;
9. http://www.weforum.org/pdf/AnnualReport/2006/
10. http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_263_sum_fr.pdf-la discrimination dans l'Union Europeenne.
11. www.pnud.org

---

[13] http://www.weforum.org/pdf/AnnualReport/2006/