International Journal of Leading Research Publication (IJLRP)

E-ISSN: 2582-8010 ● Website: www.ijlrp.com ● Email: editor@ijlrp.com

# Gender Disparities in Socio-Economic Decision-Making and Network Empowerment: A Multi-Dimensional Framework

**Biswajit Bhoi[1], Dr. Rajeev Johari[2]**

[1]PhD Research Scholar, [2]Professor
[1,2]Department of Economics, Sikkim Skill University, Sikkim, India.

**Abstract:**
The pursuit of gender equality requires a nuanced understanding of how socio-economic and political empowerment is distributed and enacted between men and women. While structural barriers are well-documented, less attention has been paid to the behavioral and network-based dimensions of empowerment, such as collaboration styles, decision-making preferences under risk, and social capital accumulation. This paper explores the relationship between these factors and empowerment within a professional and academic study area. Drawing upon bibliometric data, behavioral game theory, and social network analysis, we propose a theoretical framework to analyze how distinct behavioral traits—such as the propensity for collaboration, ethical decision-making, and equity-efficiency trade-offs—shape the empowerment landscape. We posit that while women often display more egalitarian collaboration patterns and a preference for distributive justice, they face systemic disadvantages driven by network homophily among men and gendered differences in self-promotion and overconfidence. This study outlines a methodology to empirically test these dynamics, aiming to inform policy interventions that go beyond numerical representation to address the underlying mechanisms of exclusion.

## INTRODUCTION

### Background and Motivation

The socio-economic and political empowerment of women remains a critical objective for global development, yet disparities persist in leadership representation, resource distribution, and professional advancement. Empowerment is not merely a function of legal rights or educational attainment; it is deeply rooted in the ability to influence decisions, access diverse social networks, and navigate competitive environments. Recent scholarship suggests that gender differences in behavior—ranging from research collaboration strategies to emotional responses during crises—play a pivotal role in shaping these outcomes. For instance, in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, distinct gendered concerns emerged, with men focusing more on economic impacts and women on family and health, highlighting divergent socio-political priorities (Vegt and Kleinberg 2020). Furthermore, the mechanisms of empowerment are often mediated by social capital, where the structure of professional networks determines access to opportunities. Understanding these micro-foundational behaviors is essential for diagnosing why gender gaps remain stubborn even in developed economies.

### Problem Definition and Scope

Despite significant progress, the "glass ceiling" in socio-economic advancement is often reinforced by subtle behavioral and structural dynamics that are difficult to quantify. The core problem this paper addresses is the disconnect between formal equality (equal rights) and substantive empowerment (actual influence and resource control). Specifically, we investigate how gender differences in network formation—such as the tendency for men to form homophilous cliques versus women's egalitarian connectivity (Araujo et al. 2016)—and decision-making preferences regarding equity versus efficiency

(Capraro 2019) affect the relative power of men and women in professional settings. The scope of this study is defined by the intersection of behavioral economics and social network analysis, focusing on how individual choices aggregate into systemic empowerment gaps.

### Limitations of Existing Approaches

Current approaches to studying gender empowerment often suffer from significant methodological and theoretical limitations.

First, many existing models rely heavily on static outcome variables, such as salary or parliamentary seats, without adequately accounting for the dynamic behavioral processes that precede these outcomes, such as motivated reasoning and overconfidence which allow men to distort information in their favor (Thaler 2020).

Second, traditional sociological frameworks often overlook the "tails" of performance distributions; research indicates that while average performance may be similar, gender differences are often concentrated among the top performers, skewing perceptions of merit and capability (Abramo et al. 2021).

Third, biological or neuroscientific explanations for these differences are frequently misapplied, leading to "neurosexism" where socialized gender roles are falsely attributed to innate brain differences, a practice that requires rigorous feminist critique (Friedrichs and Kellmeyer 2022).

### Contributions

To address these gaps, this paper makes the following contributions to the literature on gender and empowerment:

1. We establish a multi-dimensional framework that links micro-level behavioral traits—specifically truth-telling (Capraro 2017) and equity preferences (Capraro 2019)—to macro-level political empowerment, arguing that women's preference for equity constitutes a distinct but undervalued form of political capital.
2. We propose a rigorous methodological approach for mapping social empowerment through collaboration networks, distinguishing between simple connectivity and high-value "brokerage" positions within a network (Abramo et al. 2018)(Araujo et al. 2016).

## RELATED WORK

### Behavioral Economics and Decision-Making Ethics

A significant body of research examines how men and women differ in strategic interactions, which has profound implications for political empowerment and negotiation. Empowerment often involves the strategic manipulation of information or the distribution of resources. Research using Sender-Receiver games has demonstrated that men are significantly more likely to tell "black lies" (lies that benefit the liar at a cost to others) and "altruistic white lies" compared to women, suggesting a different utilitarian calculus in competitive environments (Capraro 2017). Furthermore, in the realm of resource distribution, a "Trade-Off Game" study highlighted that women are more likely to sacrifice efficiency to achieve equitable outcomes, whereas men tend to prioritize efficiency (Capraro 2019). This divergence suggests that political empowerment for women is often directed towards distributive justice, whereas male empowerment dynamics may favor aggregate economic growth at the cost of equality. Additionally, the mechanism of "motivated reasoning" appears to be gendered; men are more prone to distorting information to maintain overconfidence in their performance, a trait that likely facilitates faster, albeit less accurate, career advancement (Thaler 2020).

### Social Networks, Mobility, and Collaboration

Socio-economic empowerment is heavily dependent on social capital derived from professional networks. In the academic domain, which serves as a proxy for high-skill professional environments, distinct collaboration patterns have been observed. Evidence shows that while men are more likely to collaborate

with other men (homophily), women display more egalitarian collaboration structures, associating with a broader mix of partners (Araujo et al. 2016). However, this egalitarianism does not always translate to vertical mobility. Mobile phone and interaction data further corroborate these structural differences, revealing that men tend to spend time in a narrower, more predictable range of spaces with same-gender peers, potentially reinforcing "old boys' networks" that exclude women from informal centers of power (Yang et al. 2016). Conversely, bibliometric analyses suggest that women's propensity to collaborate is influenced by discipline and field, yet the "gender gap" in production often persists due to these underlying network exclusions (Abramo et al. 2018). These network rigidities act as invisible barriers to socio-economic empowerment by limiting women's access to high-status information flows.

**Performance metrics and Career Trajectories**

The measurement of performance is central to economic empowerment, yet it is often fraught with bias. Social Cognitive Career Theory (SCCT) provides a lens to understand why women remain underrepresented in mathematics-intensive fields, emphasizing the role of self-efficacy and environmental support (Gao et al. 2025). However, performance metrics themselves can be misleading. A comparative study of Italy and Norway found that while average performance differences between genders are negligible, significant gaps exist at the "tails" of the distribution, with men overrepresented in the top 10% of productivity (Abramo et al. 2021). This suggests that empowerment strategies focused on the "average" worker may fail to address the specific dynamics of elite leadership circles. Furthermore, critical scholars warn against the naturalization of these trajectories. The field of "neurofeminism" critiques the scientific tendency to search for essentialist sex/gender differences in the brain to explain these career disparities, arguing that such research often reinforces stereotypes rather than explaining the social mechanisms of disempowerment (Friedrichs and Kellmeyer 2022).

## METHOD/APPROACH

### Conceptual Framework and Design

To explore the relationship between empowerment and gender, we propose a mixed-methods framework that triangulates behavioral data, network topology, and psychometric assessments. The design rationale is to move beyond self-reported feelings of empowerment and instead measure the *capacity* for empowerment through observed behavior and structural position. The study is designed to operate within a specific "study area," defined here as a large-scale academic or corporate organization, where objective performance data and interaction logs are available. The framework consists of three primary modules: the Network Module, the Behavioral Module, and the Preference Module.

### Module 1: Network Topology Analysis

This module assesses socio-economic empowerment by measuring "network centrality" and "brokerage power." We will utilize communication logs (email metadata or co-authorship records) to construct social graphs.

- **Step 1:** Construct the collaboration graph where nodes represent individuals and edges represent joint projects (Araujo et al. 2016).
- **Step 2:** Calculate *Betweenness Centrality* to identify gatekeepers and *Clustering Coefficients* to measure homophily.
- **Step 3:** Apply the "propensity for collaboration" metric (Abramo et al. 2018) to control for field-specific habits (e.g., engineering vs. humanities).
- **Hypothesis Testing:** We will test if high-performing women have different structural signatures (e.g., more cross-disciplinary links) compared to high-performing men, as suggested by findings on women's egalitarianism (Araujo et al. 2016).

**Module 2: Behavioral and Decision-Making Experiments**

To measure political empowerment potential (defined as the ability to negotiate and distribute resources), we will implement gamified scenarios.

- **Trust and Deception:** Participants will engage in "Sender-Receiver" games to measure propensities for truth-telling versus strategic lying (Capraro 2017). This serves as a proxy for transparency in leadership.
- **Resource Allocation:** We will deploy the "Trade-Off Game" (Capraro 2019) where participants must choose between an efficient allocation of funds (maximizing total payout) or an equitable one (minimizing inequality).
- **Overconfidence Assessment:** Participants will perform a cognitive task and rate their expected performance relative to peers. We will analyze deviations to detect "motivated reasoning" and overconfidence (Thaler 2020).

**Evaluation Plan and Analysis**

The data collected will be analyzed using multivariate regression models to determine predictors of empowerment.

- **Dependent Variables:** Current rank/salary (Socio-economic status), Decision-making authority index (Political empowerment).
- **Independent Variables:** Network centrality, Equity preference score, Overconfidence bias, Gender.
- **Control Variables:** Discipline/Department, Years of experience.
- **Hypothetical Benchmarks:** We expect to replicate findings where men show higher overconfidence (Thaler 2020) and efficiency preferences (Capraro 2019), while women demonstrate higher equity scores. The critical evaluation will be whether "equity-seeking" behavior correlates with lower socio-economic status, indicating a "penalty for fairness" in the current system.

## DISCUSSION

**Practical Implications**

The integration of these findings into organizational policy has profound implications. If, as evidence suggests, women are more egalitarian in collaboration (Araujo et al. 2016) and prefer equity over efficiency (Capraro 2019), then organizations prioritizing rapid, aggressive growth (efficiency) may systematically undervalue female leadership styles, not because of a lack of competence, but due to a misalignment of values. Consequently, "political empowerment" initiatives must not simply add women to male-dominated structures but must also re-evaluate the structures themselves. For instance, promotion criteria that heavily weight individual self-promotion may favor the male tendency for overconfidence and motivated reasoning (Thaler 2020). Organizations might need to recalibrate performance reviews to objectively measure collaborative contributions and distributive justice, thereby validating the distinct forms of capital that women bring to the table.

**Limitations and Failure Modes**

While this framework provides a robust analytical tool, several limitations must be acknowledged.

1. **Contextual volatility:** Gendered responses are highly context-dependent. For example, during the COVID-19 pandemic, gender differences in emotional and political focus were amplified by the immediate crisis (Vegt and Kleinberg 2020); such patterns may not hold in stable times, limiting the longitudinal validity of cross-sectional data.
2. **The "Tails" Problem:** As noted in bibliometric studies, gender differences often disappear in the middle of the distribution and are driven by the extremes (Abramo et al. 2021). Statistical models focusing on averages may fail to capture the dynamics of the "glass ceiling" which affects the top percentile of aspirants.

3. **Generalizability of Academic Data:** Much of the relied-upon data comes from academic or bibliometric sources (Abramo et al. 2018)(Gao et al. 2025). Corporate or political environments may operate under different incentive structures (e.g., profit sharing) that could alter the equity-efficiency trade-off observed in experimental settings.

**Ethical Considerations**

The investigation of gender differences carries significant ethical risks, particularly regarding "neurosexism." As argued by feminist critiques of neuroscience, there is a danger in essentializing behavioral differences (such as overconfidence or risk aversion) as biological facts rather than social adaptations (Friedrichs and Kellmeyer 2022). If this research is misinterpreted, it could be used to justify exclusion (e.g., "women are too risk-averse for leadership"). Therefore, it is ethically imperative to frame all findings as the result of socio-environmental conditioning and SCCT (Gao et al. 2025), rather than innate incapacity. Furthermore, data privacy in network analysis (Yang et al. 2016) is paramount; mapping mobility and communication patterns to assess "empowerment" must be done with strict anonymization to prevent surveillance of employees.

**Future Work**

Future research should focus on longitudinal studies to track how these behavioral preferences evolve over a career. Social Cognitive Career Theory suggests that motivation and self-efficacy are dynamic (Gao et al. 2025); thus, it is crucial to see if women become less equity-focused as they gain power, or if they reshape the environment. Additionally, cross-cultural comparisons are needed. The differences in research performance gaps between Italy and Norway (Abramo et al. 2021) suggest that national culture plays a massive mediating role. Replicating the "Trade-Off Game" (Capraro 2019) and overconfidence studies (Thaler 2020) in non-Western contexts would help disentangle universal gender traits from cultural conditioning.

## CONCLUSION

This paper explored the complex relationship between socio-economic and political empowerment of women and men, moving beyond simple metrics of representation to analyze the behavioral and structural roots of inequality. The literature indicates that while women often possess high social capital through egalitarian collaboration (Araujo et al. 2016) and prioritize sustainable, equitable political outcomes (Capraro 2019), these traits are often penalized in systems designed around male-normative behaviors like overconfidence (Thaler 2020) and homophilous networking (Yang et al. 2016). True empowerment, therefore, requires more than training women to mimic male behaviors; it demands a structural transformation that values equity and diverse network formation as indicators of leadership competence. By adopting the multi-dimensional framework proposed herein, stakeholders can better identify the hidden friction points in decision-making and collaboration that continue to hamper gender parity in the study area.

## REFERENCES:

1. Vegt, Isabelle van der, and Bennett Kleinberg. "Women worry about family, men about the economy: Gender differences in emotional responses to COVID-19." 2020. https://arxiv.org/pdf/2004.08202v2
2. Araujo, Eduardo B., et al. "Gender differences in scientific collaborations: Women are more egalitarian than men." 2016. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0176791
3. Capraro, Valerio. "Gender differences in the equity-efficiency trade-off." 2019. https://arxiv.org/pdf/1905.04056v2
4. Thaler, Michael. "Gender Differences in Motivated Reasoning." 2020. https://arxiv.org/pdf/2012.01538v3

5. Abramo, Giovanni, et al. "Gender differences in research performance within and between countries: Italy vs Norway." Journal of Informetrics, 15(2), 101144 (2021), 2021. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2021.101144
6. Friedrichs, Kassandra, and Philipp Kellmeyer. "Neurofeminism: feminist critiques of research on sex/gender differences in the neurosciences." 2022. https://doi.org/10.1111/ejn.15834
7. Capraro, Valerio. "Gender differences in lying in sender-receiver games: A meta-analysis." 2017. https://arxiv.org/pdf/1703.03739v4
8. Abramo, Giovanni, et al. "Gender differences in research collaboration." Journal of Informetrics, 7(4), 811-822, 2018. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2013.07.002
9. Yang, Yang, et al. "Gender Differences in Communication Behaviors, Spatial Proximity Patterns, and Mobility Habits." 2016. https://arxiv.org/pdf/1607.06740v1
10. Gao, Huayu, et al. "Exploring Gender Differences in Tertiary Mathematics-Intensive Fields: A Critical Review of Social Cognitive Career Theory." 2025. https://arxiv.org/pdf/2508.12180v1