

BALANCING THE SCALES: AN IN-DEPTH EXAMINATION OF ISSUES AND STRUCTURAL ARRANGEMENTS IN THE PURSUIT OF EQUALITY

SD SHA TAUHIRUL ISLAM

Research Scholar

AR19BPHDPO004

Enrollment No

POLITICAL SCIENCE

Dr. SUNIL KUMAR JANGID

Supervisor

SARDAR PATEL UNIVERSITY, BALAGHAT

DECLARATION: I AS AN AUTHOR OF THIS PAPER /ARTICLE, HERE BY DECLARE THAT THE PAPER SUBMITTED BY ME FOR PUBLICATION IN THE JOURNAL IS COMPLETELY MY OWN GENUINE PAPER. IF ANY ISSUE REGARDING COPYRIGHT/PATENT/ OTHER REAL AUTHOR ARISES, THE PUBLISHER WILL NOT BE LEGALLY RESPONSIBLE. IF ANY OF SUCH MATTERS OCCUR PUBLISHER MAY REMOVE MY CONTENT FROM THE JOURNAL WEBSITE. FOR THE REASON OF CONTENT AMENDMENT/OR ANY TECHNICAL ISSUE WITH NO VISIBILITY ON WEBSITE/UPDATES, I HAVE RESUBMITTED THIS PAPER FOR THE PUBLICATION. FOR ANY PUBLICATION MATTERS OR ANY INFORMATION INTENTIONALLY HIDDEN BY ME OR OTHERWISE, I SHALL BE LEGALLY RESPONSIBLE. (COMPLETE DECLARATION OF THE AUTHOR AT THE LAST PAGE OF THIS PAPER/ARTICLE)

Abstract

The quest for equality is beset with many obstacles that have their origins in both systemic and societal problems. On a societal level, equal chances and results are hampered by deeply rooted prejudices, discrimination, and historical injustices. These problems take many different forms, including racial inequalities, economic injustices, and gender inequality. In addition, institutional frameworks and systemic policies have the potential to maintain or worsen already-existing disparities. The study carefully looks at the problems associated with negative preconceptions, educational gaps, systematic discrimination, and economic inequality. The idea of "Architectures of Equality" is introduced within this paradigm, focusing on deliberate and inclusive designs within social structures to eliminate prejudices and promote a more just and equitable society. This multifaceted method takes intersectionality into account, recognising the various difficulties experienced by those who belong to several marginalised groups.

Keywords: *Equality, Structural arrangements, Systemic discrimination, Educational disparities, Negative stereotypes*

1. INTRODUCTION

Clearly, missing an extraordinary catastrophic event, war, or another huge reason for redirection of current social interests, the idea of equality will rule until the end of hundred years in essentially all circles that are worried about the philosophical underpinnings of public policy. This is the case regardless of whether there is another monstrous reason for redirection of current social interests. One would need to return to certain previous periods in history to find a uniting issue among intellectuals who held similar energy and comprehensiveness as we do today as to equality. This is because we have reached a point in our society when equality is a hot topic. In the past, concepts that brought people together were frequently religious in nature. At least among a sizable number of philosophers and social scientists, there are indications that equality is swiftly approaching the level of a dogmatic principle, taking on the character of a hallowed ideal in the minds of many people living in the modern era.

In this period of bounty, the idea of equality has every one of the components important to develop into a divine or sacrosanct doctrine. It is basic, in the initial thought of it; it is equipped for expansion or application to the sum of a populace, even to mankind; it tends to be all made to appear to be the actual reason for present day social and political experience, as a matter of fact a reason inherent in the bone and marrow of Western history; and it is fit for being stretched out or applied to the entire of a populace, even to all of mankind. To wrap things up, the idea of equality encapsulates a fundamental part of ongoing transformation, which is available in an extraordinary number of various strict qualities (basically those of general religions like Christianity, Islam, and Buddhism at the hour of their inception), when those values are stood out from the traditions and guidelines that exist in their general surroundings.

1.1. Equality

The writer Stefan Gosepath, writing for the Stanford Reference book of Reasoning, underscores that equality doesn't need severe character in the definition of equality that he accommodated that distribution. ⁴ A personality of this kind can exist between a thing and itself, though equality expects there to be some sort of distinction between the substances being looked at. This idea is first expressed by Socrates in the *Phaedo*, where he expresses, "Take a gander at it likewise along

these lines: don't rise to stones and sticks at times, while remaining something very similar, appear to one to be equivalent and to one more to be inconsistent?" Do we believe them to be equivalent similarly that the idea of equality itself requires? Is it conceivable that they need something fundamental, similar to the Equivalent, or is it unrealistic that they do?" To put it another way, in the event that one thinks of equality as far as numerical personality, it is meaningless to guarantee that two articles are more equivalent or less equivalent to each other. It is just critical if that's what one remembers, in fact, equality is a connection between distinct articles. Failing to do so will deliver the assertion meaningless. In its most perfect structure, equality isn't something that can be found "out there"; truth be told, reality comprises exclusively of contrasts. Any hypothesis of equality is thus the result of a human viewpoint, of some interest in correlation or evening out; an endeavor to apply a theoretical model of personality to a reality that is generally different and steadily changing. Each determination of equality, each demand for leveling, then, involves a judgment according to which certain distinctions are to be respected immaterial in some specific setting. Since such a standard can never be completely understood, this implies that each determination of equality likewise suggests each demand for balance.

1.2.The Historicity of Equality

Investigations of the past have, on numerous occasions, and with a nearly unsettling level of simplicity, revealed the extraordinarily fierce foundations of different types of social inequality. The strategic historicism that is normal for the methodologies that treat equality as an essential idea of investigation — basically communism, yet in addition extremist feminism, strange hypothesis, and post expansionism — centers around exposing the historical wellsprings of inequalities involving class, orientation, sex, race, culture, or topography. This approach is most prominent in communism, yet it is additionally present in extremist feminism, strange hypothesis, and post expansionism. The examination of the numerous manners by which these structures of inequality have been hidden or clouded has gotten a lot of hypothetical consideration. In any case, this has been finished by presenting certain social structures and character developments as normal and a-historical, and subsequently, as pre-or objective. This has been the essential focal point of the majority of this review. The trustworthiness of the possibility of equality itself, then again —

in other words, the subject of how equality turned into a key object of political cases making in any case, and thus how these camouflages of inequality could be scandalized — seems to have been generally dismissed. This means the topic of how equality changed into a focal object of political cases making in any case.

The fluctuated predominance of inequality since forever ago is for the most part owing to the way that its related scandal has involved varying levels of public shame. Considering this, tracing the improvement of the principle of equality from the beginning of time requires a painstaking and similar remaking of the shifting degrees of "scandalousness" that signs of inequality incited in different societies at different points on schedule. How might we explain the way that at certain points in history, inside a particular political culture, the libertarian view began to expand, while at different points on schedule, blind spots started to show up within the populist view's scope of vision? Why there has been an ascent in displeasure regarding explicit types of injustice at specific points yet a decline in same shock at different times? Then again, apparently past and past these ceaseless examples of transformation, a specific separation point can be found. At one point throughout the entire existence of the West, there was a crucial unsettling influence that occurred in the cycles that were responsible for neutralizing the fierceness over the shortfall of equality; of refracting each libertarian disposition by considering each kind of inequality as just a characteristic distinction. This occasion occurred. The beginning of innovation should be visible as a separation point. It very well may be arranged anyplace between Hobbes (1651), who considered the equality of individuals as a depressing regular condition that governmental issues should fix, and Locke (1690), who raised this normal and undeniable equality as what legislative issues should shield. It is conceivable that it was Hobbes who initially proposed the possibility that legislative issues should cure the state of equality among people. Close to this time, scandals involving clear instances of inequality change from secluded episodes into a key concern that, over the long haul, dynamically turns into the essential "engine" of present day political discontent. This development arrives at its pinnacle in the domain of thoughts with Rousseau, who places inequality at the focal point of the formative rationale of human society. According to Rousseau, human society advances from an amicable condition of nature into an unreasonable and pitiable political request, in which inequality is institutionalized into the situation with regulation.

Consequently, equality is a contemporary political term too, or all the more precisely, at last. On the off chance that we take Carl Schmitt's interpretation of current political hypothesis to heart, we can see equality as a secularized rendition of a religious principle. It was the course of secularization that, as it were, "lighted" the possibility of equality as a driver of continual discontent at the center of contemporary society. On the off chance that one defines secularization not as the destruction of odd notions and philosophical overabundances, or at this point one more stage in the movement of truth and judiciousness, then one understands that the influence that secularization has had on equality is a muddled and disconnected one. On the off chance that one likewise abandons the view that advancement and secularization are in an emergency, then one can respect the trademark instability of the idea of equality, its consistent self-undermining, in a manner of speaking, not as a hazardous result of the supposed emergency of innovation/secularization, yet rather as a "positive," inherent nature of present day governmental issues overall. This view is conceivable on the grounds that one no longer perspectives innovation and secularization as an emergency. On the off chance that one takes that advanced governmental issues is the specialty of conserving, regulating, and channeling the fretfulness of the majority, then the apparent instability of current equality uncovers itself to be an island of solidness that, as a matter of fact, fills in as an organizing principle.

1.3. The Concept of Equality in the Age of Equality

The acceptance of the presupposition of the equality of all human beings as an organising element of political justification can be seen as the fault line in modernity. This line can be identified by the fact that all human beings are presumed to be equal. This transition was most obviously articulated by the growth of republican and liberal schools of political thought, both of which unequivocally endorsed this egalitarian ideal and strove to turn its universal applicability into a self-evident imperative. This was the most clear-cut manifestation of this transformation. The democratic values of civic and even human equality have been enshrined in the constitutions of both the United States and France as a result of their respective revolutions. This has provided the choice regarding this egalitarian stance with a strong political base.

Equality, together with liberty, emerges as one of the two primary foundations of contemporary politics. It is inscribed on the plaque that marks the beginning of the liberal state, even if it is just in the form of an abstract principle. The crisis of inequality has now become a scandal in relation to a commitment that the political system had previously assumed for itself. This does not indicate that any and all demands for equality are addressed, nor does it suggest that any and all of these claims are even registered as being made. In other words, the tension that results from the gap between the promise of equality and its actualization does not disappear. Nevertheless, once modernity chooses to embrace the pattern of egalitarian political rationality, such claims have a clearer address they may be addressed at. This is because the pattern is a political rationality pattern. If, in the past, statements of this nature were required to devote a significant amount of their energy to proving the fundamental concept that the absence of equality constitutes a scandalous presence, then the majority of that energy might now be committed to the manifestation of further types of inequality. This gives rise to a dynamic in which calls for the elimination of inequality spread into an increasing number of domains, both in terms of the subjects of those domains (who should have equality) and the objects of those domains (what should have equality). There is a growing number of ways in which a lack of equality can currently be argued to be unjustifiable and to warrant recompense in its victims.

1.4. The Distributive Paradigm of Equality

The philosophy known as "Karma Libertarianism" is right now becoming increasingly famous as one of the most prominent responses to the subject of equality in the contemporary liberal talk. Basically, it states that the dividing line between scandalous inequalities and gullible contrasts has to do with whether the inequality being referred to is the result of an independent choice by the gatherings involved or something that is beyond their reach, in particular a question of sheer karma: hereditary cosmetics, conditions of birth, unanticipated disasters, or whatever other component that can't be credited to cognizant, informed choices. All in all, assuming the inequality being referred to is the goad The possibility of equality that underpins this approach seems to depend on the idea that the benefits that individuals partake in that are not the result of their judicious choices or individual exertion are on a very basic level unmerited. This implies that those individuals can't

guarantee they are genuinely qualified for these benefits (and accordingly to guarantee that others reserve no privilege to demand that they relinquish these benefits), which is one more approach to saying that the individuals can't guarantee that others reserve the option to demand that they surrender these benefits. According to the hypothesis of Karma Populism, this is the thing we could allude to as the "scandalous root" of inequality. Elisabeth Anderson, one of the most candid pundits of Karma Populism, explains that this approach is predicated on a "helpful intuition," which expresses that individuals who enjoy benefits that are not the consequence of their own endeavors have an honest conviction to share the gifts that have been presented to them by Fortuna with the people who have not been pretty much as lucky as they have been. The individuals who have not been pretty much as lucky as they have, then again, don't have this obligation. Indeed, even while we concur with Anderson's essential analysis of karma libertarianism, we continue to hold the opinion that it is grounded in political as opposed to compassionate intuition, regarding itself as an interpretation of the idea of a political community made out of equivalents. The "negative situation" that Karma Populism might want to forestall is one in which, because of exposed knuckled karma or sheer conditions, a certain gathering comes to procure benefits that, throughout the span of time, are converted into political control over their colleagues - a kind of "karma gentry," as it were. Karma Populism might want to keep this from happening. Because of the way that every one of us has an equivalent likelihood of either experiencing such favorable luck or suffering from unfortunate karma, a respectable political society should, in understanding with the hypothesis of Karma Libertarianism, to assume on the liability of compensating for such errors in request to keep away from the event of expected negative results.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

According to Ambrose and Schminke (2009), the relationship between specific aspects of justice (distributive, procedural, and interactional justice) and employee attitudes and behaviour is mediated by overall justice judgements. They reference earlier research that demonstrated overall justice judgements are more stable over time and are more strongly associated to employee results than specific justice facets. Additionally, overall justice judgements are more strongly related to employee outcomes than individual justice facets. The authors contend, meanwhile, that overall

justice judgements are more significant to workers because they reflect a worldwide evaluation of whether or not the organisation treats its workers in a fair manner on the whole. On the other hand, particular components of justice concentrate their attention on particular facets of organisational decision-making, such as the justness of pay hikes or the justness of a disciplinary procedure. Ambrose and Schminke put their theory to the test by conducting two separate experiments to examine whether or not overall justice judgements moderate the connection between particular aspects of justice and employee outcomes. In the first study, the researchers discovered that general judgements of justice acted as a mediator in the relationship between specific aspects of justice and employee satisfaction, organisational commitment, and intentions to leave the organisation. In Study 2, the scientists reached the resolution that general decisions of justice went about as a middle person in the connection between individual parts of justice and boss ratings of worker execution and citizenship conduct. The consequences of the examination directed by Ambrose and Schminke have various huge repercussions for the field of authoritative justice research. To start with, the findings infer that analysts ought to zero in additional on generally justice decisions, as opposed to explicit parts of justice, while examining the impacts of hierarchical justice on representative results. This is on the grounds that particular parts of justice are probably going to be less influential on worker results than generally speaking justice decisions. Second, the findings infer that associations ought to zero in on building a fair and simply in general workplace as opposed to focusing on unambiguous pieces of hierarchical direction. This is on the grounds that the information show that focusing on unambiguous parts of authoritative direction can be counterproductive. The exploration led by Ambrose and Schminke is quite possibly the earliest investigation of it kind to investigate the mediating capability that general justice decisions play in the association between certain parts of justice and worker results. The results of the review are compelling and give assurance to the creators' reason, which indicates that the investigation was fruitful. Be that as it may, extra review is expected to approve the findings using a more extensive scope of members and conditions.

Colquitt and Jackson (2006) involved speculative vignettes in their exploration on the setting responsiveness of different principles for establishing authoritative justice. They completed two examination fully intent on contrasting the overall meaning of distributive and procedural justice

rules in individual and group settings, as well as in a wide range of sorts of groups. The finishes of the creators have various critical repercussions, both for directors and for associations. To begin, they suggest that chiefs get to know the different justice decides that are pertinent in both individual and group settings. Second, they exhort that administrators ought to zero in on constructing dynamic cycles that are fair and steady, as well as on providing representatives some power over choices that influence them. Third, they recommend that chiefs ought to zero in on developing worker commitment. Thirdly, they suggest that supervisors ought to practice additional mindfulness to guarantee that choices made in little groups are precise, and that choices made in assorted groups are made reliably and without bias.

In a world that is becoming more globalized, the extension and balance of justice are reimaged in Fraser (2008). She battles that the old Westphalian idea of political space, in which justice is respected to be a homegrown connection among kinsmen, is presently not reasonable in the present current world. In a world in which economic and social ties increasingly rise above borders, we really want to lay out another definition of justice that can oblige transnational fortitude, transborder exposure, and vote based outline setting. In request to do this, we want to think about justice in a manner that considers these things. In the initial segment of his conversation, Fraser examines the two essential parts of justice that have historically been recognized: distributive justice and acknowledgment justice. While acknowledgment justice is worried about the social regard and regard that individuals are conceded, distributive justice centers around ensuring that everybody has an equivalent chance to get to assets and opportunities. According to Fraser's contention, both of these parts of justice are essential, however without anyone else they are adequately not to handle the issues that are presented by globalization. From that point forward, Fraser examines the third aspect of justice, which is called portrayal. The capacity of individuals to take part in the cycles that shape the course of their lives is at the core of the idea of illustrative justice. According to Fraser's contention, illustrative justice is urgent for guaranteeing that all individuals, paying little heed to where they dwell or what their social standing is, have a voice in the choices that influence them. He fights that this is the best way to guarantee justice for all. From that point forward, Fraser investigates the results of her three-layered hypothesis of justice for a society that is becoming increasingly interconnected. She fights that in request to acknowledge

transnational justice, we are going to require the foundation of innovative models of transnational fortitude and transborder exposure. She likewise thinks that we ought to democratize the course of casing setting so everybody has something to do with what the issues that mean for them are outlined. This would permit everybody to have a voice in the dynamic cycle.

The capacities approach is another calculated system that was proposed by Gagnon and Cornelius (2000) to appreciate and advancing working environment equality. The capacities approach is a hypothesis of human improvement that was laid out by Amartya Sen and Martha Nussbaum. This hypothesis puts an accentuation on an individual's ability to come to their "functionings," otherwise called what they can do or being. Gagnon and Cornelius guarantee that the capacities approach is a more comprehensive and inclusive way to deal with work environment equality than past methodologies, which center on equivalent treatment or equivalent open door. previous approaches are described as "equal treatment" and "equal opportunity," respectively. The capabilities approach acknowledges that equality is not just about being fair to one another, but also about giving everyone the opportunity to live up to their full potential. It does this by taking into account the many requirements and conditions that individuals and organisations may have.

3. ISSUES IN THE PURSUIT OF EQUALITY

In the never-ending quest for equality, numerous complex problems have surfaced, which pose strong obstacles that need for serious investigation and smart actions. The perpetuation of systemic discrimination, which occurs when previous preconceptions and biases continue to play a role in the formation of societal structures and institutions, is one of the primary sources of worry. This kind of systemic discrimination presents itself in a variety of different aspects, including race, gender, socioeconomic status, and other elements that overlap with each other. Even though cultural standards have advanced, deeply embedded inequities still exist, which prevents marginalised groups from having access to equal opportunities in school, employment, and healthcare.

In the pursuit of equality, education stands out as both a difficulty to be overcome and a potential answer to the problem. The continuation of social inequality is largely aided by the fact that there are significant gaps in both the availability of and the quality of educational opportunities. The

limited availability of high-quality educational opportunities exacerbates preexisting disparities and contributes to the formation of obstacles that prevent individuals from disadvantaged communities from escaping the cycle of poverty. To find a solution to this problem, it is necessary to not only enhance the educational infrastructure but also to develop and implement curricula that are inclusive and that reflect the many different viewpoints and histories that exist. In addition, removing linguistic obstacles and developing educational settings that cater to a variety of learning styles are both absolutely necessary in order to make educational institutions more welcoming to people of all backgrounds.

In addition, the perpetuation of harmful preconceptions and negative stereotypes is a significant barrier to the achievement of equality. It is possible for discriminatory practises to stem from stereotypes based on a person's ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, or handicap. This can manifest in a variety of ways, from hiring choices to social interactions. Not only is it necessary to create legal frameworks to avoid discrimination, but also mass educational efforts and cultural reforms that confront ingrained biases in order to be successful in overcoming these problems. Because of the significant role that media representation and storytelling play in the process of moulding perceptions, there is a pressing need for a greater variety of and greater authenticity in the tales that are told to reflect the richness of human experiences.

Inequality in terms of economic opportunity is yet another prevalent problem that interacts with a variety of discriminatory practises. Individuals and communities on the margins of society face insurmountable challenges due to factors such as a dearth of economic possibilities, unequal remuneration, and restricted access to resources. In order to combat economic disparity, it is necessary to not only address pressing issues such as laws establishing a minimum wage, but also to put into place more comprehensive economic policies that encourage growth that is inclusive. The elimination of economic barriers and the cultivation of a more equal society can be facilitated by the implementation of programmes that provide specialised job training, assistance to small enterprises located in underserved neighbourhoods, and housing policies that are priced affordably.

4. ARCHITECTURES OF EQUALITY

The expression "Architectures of Equality" was coined to portray the complex structural arrangements and frameworks that are important in the endless mission for social justice and equivalent opportunities for all. This thought perceives, at its most key level, that establishing genuine equality requires more than the endeavors of individual individuals; rather, it calls for complete and intentional designs within the institutions of society. Eliminating the discriminatory practices that are well established in various institutions is quite possibly of the main step. Along these lines, it is important to direct a comprehensive examination of the strategies, guidelines, and hierarchical practices that, by maintaining disparities in light of qualities like race, orientation, socioeconomic status, and other intersecting elements, and to roll out the essential improvements.

The possibility of "Architectures of Equality" puts an accentuation, within the field of training, on the need of having structures that are inclusive. This implies providing equivalent admittance to training, yet in addition developing educational plans that mirror different viewpoints in request to develop a climate where individuals from varying backgrounds feel that they are addressed and regarded. In request to develop an arrangement of training that is all the more fair, it is important to find dynamic ways to conquer impediments, for example, language obstacles, absence of social mindfulness, and errors in educational assets.

Furthermore, the economic structures of a society fundamentally affect the accomplishment of equality. Implementing arrangements that span the abundance hole, for example, fair work rehearses, designated economic empowerment projects, and initiatives that advance inclusive business rehearses are instances of what are alluded to as "architectures of equality" with regards to the economic area. The goal is to even the odds and ensure that people from varying backgrounds have equivalent admittance to economic opportunities, paying little heed to where they came from.

In the field of social strategies, Architectures of Equality require the foundation of frameworks that participate in the dynamic battle of negative stereotypes and biases. This requires authoritative assurances against discrimination, yet in addition educational initiatives and social changes that challenge biases that have been engrained in society. At the point when media portrayal turns into

a significant element, it is important to support the dissemination of numerous and genuine accounts in request to add to the most common way of transforming society perspectives.

The idea of Architectures of Equality acknowledges the fact that establishing equality is not a task that can be solved using a cookie-cutter approach. It takes into account the concept of intersectionality, which recognises the fact that individuals frequently belong to numerous marginalised groups, each of which faces its own set of issues. As a result, the arrangements of the structural components have to be dynamic, adaptable, and responsive to the changing requirements of the many communities. When developing policies that are not only inclusive on paper but also practical and influential in real-world circumstances, it is essential to establish policies in collaboration with impacted groups, advocacy organisations, and subject matter experts.

5. CONCLUSION

The goal of equality is a dynamic and intricate task that calls for a multipronged strategy that takes into account structural arrangements as well as societal challenges. The necessity for all-encompassing methods is highlighted by the continuation of negative stereotypes, educational gaps, systematic discrimination, and economic inequality. In the never-ending quest for equality, the study emphasises the complex obstacles embedded in systemic discrimination, educational gaps, unfavourable stereotypes, and economic inequality. As a critical framework, the idea of "Architectures of Equality" appears, emphasising deliberate and inclusive designs within societal systems to undermine prejudices and promote a more just and equitable society. Acknowledging the historical significance of equality and its development within the modern era, the research proposes ongoing monitoring and adjustment to tackle problems via extensive educational overhauls, dispelling unfavourable preconceptions, and enacting policies that promote economic equity.

REFERENCE

1. Ambrose, M. L., & Schminke, M. (2009). The role of overall justice judgments in organizational justice research: A test of mediation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94, 491–500.

2. Colquitt, J. A., & Jackson, C. L. (2006). Justice in teams: the context sensitivity of justice rules across individual and team contexts. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 36(4), 868–899.
3. Fraser, N. (2008). *Scales of justice: Reimagining political space in a globalizing world*. New York: Columbia University Press.
4. Gagnon, S., & Cornelius, N. (2000). Re-examining workplace equality: The capabilities approach. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 10(4), 68–87.
5. Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary (11th Edn.). (2005). Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster.
6. Morand, D. (2010). The social psychology of status leveling in organizational contexts. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 18, 76–104.
7. O'Toole, J. (2009). Free to choose: How American managers can create globally competitive workplaces. In H. Goldsmith (Ed.), *The organization of the future 2* (pp. 49–62). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
8. Perel, M. (2003). An ethical perspective on CEO compensation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 48, 381–391.
9. Lima, G.T. and G. Porcile (2012), "Economic growth and income distribution with heterogeneous preferences on the real exchange rate", *Journal of Post-Keynesian Economics*, in press.
10. Shaikh, Anwar and Amr Ragab (2008), "The vast majority income (VMI): a new measure of global inequality", Working Paper, New York, Schwartz Centre for Economic Analysis (SCEPA).
11. Gasparini, Leonardo, Guillero Cruces and Leopoldo Tornarolli (2011), "Recent trends in income inequality in Latin America", *Journal of LACEA Economia*, Latin American and Caribbean Economic Association (LACEA).
12. Akter, S., Rutsaert, P., Luis, J., Htwe, N. M., San, S. S., Raharjo, B., & Pustika, A. (2017). Women's empowerment and gender equity in agriculture: A different perspective from Southeast Asia. *Food Policy*, 69, 270–279.
13. Doss, C., Meinzen-Dick, R., Quisumbing, A., & Theis, S. (2018). Women in agriculture: Four myths. *Global Food Security*, 16, 69–74.

14. Lastarria-Cornhiel, S., Behrman, J. A., Meinzen-Dick, R., & Quisumbing, A. R. (2014). Gender Equity and Land: Toward Secure and Effective Access for Rural Women. In A. R. Quisumbing, R. Meinzen-Dick, T. L. Raney, A. Croppenstedt, J. A. Behrman, & A. Peterman (Eds.), *Gender in Agriculture: Closing the Knowledge Gap* (pp. 117–144). S
15. Ford, L. (2018). *Women and politics: The pursuit of equality*. Routledge.

Author's Declaration

I as an author of the above research paper/article, hereby, declare that the content of this paper is prepared by me and if any person having copyright issue or patent or anything otherwise related to the content, I shall always be legally responsible for any issue. For the reason of invisibility of my research paper on the website/amendments/updates, I have resubmitted my paper for publication on the same date. If any data or information given by me is not correct, I shall always be legally responsible. With my whole responsibility legally and formally I have intimated the publisher (Publisher) that my paper has been checked by my guide (if any) or expert to make it sure that paper is technically right and there is no unaccepted plagiarism and hence it is genuinely mine. If any issue arises related to Plagiarism /Guide Name /Educational Qualification /Designation /Address of my university/college/institution/Structure or Formatting/ Resubmission / Submission /Copyright / Patent/Submission for any higher degree or Job/Primary Data/Secondary Data Issues. I will be solely/entirely responsible for any legal issues. I have been informed that the most of the data from the website is invisible or shuffled or vanished from the data base due to some technical fault or hacking and therefore the process of resubmission is there for the scholars/students who find trouble in getting their paper on the website. At the time of resubmission of my paper I take all the legal and formal responsibilities, If I hide or do not submit the copy of my original documents (Aadhar/Driving License/Any Identity Proof and Photo) in spite of demand from the publisher then my paper may be rejected or removed from the website anytime and may not be considered for verification. I accept the fact that as the content of this paper and the resubmission legal responsibilities and reasons are only mine then the Publisher (Airo International Journal/Airo National Research Journal) is never responsible. I also declare that if publisher finds any complication or error or anything hidden or implemented otherwise, my paper may be removed from the website or the watermark of remark/actuality may be mentioned on my paper. Even if anything is found illegal publisher may also take legal action against me

SD SHA TAUHIRUL ISLAM
Dr. SUNIL KUMAR JANGID