



Article

Gender Equality and Sustainability in Vietnamese Higher Education: Educators' Perspectives

Muhammad Qasim Rana ^{1,*} , Angela Lee ^{1,*} , Tran Van Ty ² and Dao Phong Lam ³

¹ School of Built Environment, University College of Estate Management, Reading RG1 4BS, UK

² Faculty of Water Resource Engineering, Can Tho University, Can Tho 900000, Vietnam; tvty@ctu.edu.vn

³ School of Foreign Languages, Can Tho University, Can Tho 900000, Vietnam; dplam@ctu.edu.vn

* Correspondence: m.rana@ucem.ac.uk (M.Q.R.); a.lee@ucem.ac.uk (A.L.)

Abstract: Gender inequality remains a critical challenge in Vietnamese higher education, particularly regarding how academic roles and advancement opportunities are distributed. Despite existing policies promoting gender equality, gaps persist in leadership and career development, potentially limiting women's representation and growth. This study examines Vietnamese educators' perspectives on gender equality in higher education, focusing on academic rank awareness and attitudes toward gender-related issues. A quantitative research design was employed, using a structured survey distributed among faculty members across different academic ranks, including lecturers, senior lecturers, associate professors, and professors. Data were analysed through statistical measures, including frequencies and percentages, mean scores, standard deviations, the Mann–Whitney U test, the Kruskal–Wallis H-test, and post hoc analysis to assess variations in perspectives on gender equality based on academic positions. The findings reveal significant differences in gender equality awareness across academic ranks. Educators in senior positions reported greater recognition of gender disparities, especially in leadership roles and promotion processes, than those in junior roles, who exhibited less awareness of such issues. This study's practical implications suggest that Vietnamese higher education institutions should adopt targeted interventions, such as gender awareness programs and transparent promotion processes, to foster a more inclusive environment. Additionally, mentorship programs for female academics could enhance their career advancement opportunities. This research contributes original insights into how the academic hierarchy affects gender equality perceptions within Vietnamese higher education, offering a basis for the development of policies that support equitable career pathways.

Keywords: gender equality; higher education; Vietnam; sustainability; educator perception



Received: 12 March 2025

Revised: 23 April 2025

Accepted: 24 April 2025

Published: 28 April 2025

Citation: Rana, M. Q., Lee, A., Ty, T. V., & Lam, D. P. (2025). Gender Equality and Sustainability in Vietnamese Higher Education: Educators' Perspectives. *Administrative Sciences*, 15(5), 164. <https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci15050164>

Copyright: © 2025 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

In the past decade, there has been an increasing focus on addressing discrimination and inequality, particularly in the context of gender, and promoting diversity management in higher education (Tardos & Paksi, 2024). However, according to Meri Crespo et al. (2024), policies promoting gender equality have paradoxically widened the gender gap, failing to encourage women's enrolment in certain fields of study effectively. Gender equality is crucial in sustainable development, enabling individuals from all backgrounds to participate in decision-making processes related to global challenges such as climate change, poverty, and education (Patel, 2024). A central element in fostering social empowerment and advancing toward a more inclusive society is the promotion of gender equality in

education (Kuteesa et al., 2024), which is not limited to developed nations or a given sector of the economy.

Gender disparities in academic leadership vary worldwide, but research on underrepresentation in Vietnamese higher education remains limited (Phuong et al., 2023). Many institutions have developed strategies to meet the United Nations' Sustainable Development Goal 5 to achieve gender equality (Merma-Molina et al., 2024). Despite these efforts, significant disparities remain, particularly for women, due to cultural norms, financial constraints, and limited resource access (Kuteesa et al., 2024). In Vietnam's higher education system, gender-related disparities affect both male and female educators (Sanfo et al., 2024). Although policy reforms have promoted gender inclusivity, inequalities persist at multiple levels, including curriculum design, teaching practices, and leadership roles (T. M. Vu & Yamada, 2024; M. T. Vu & Pham, 2023). While women are increasingly represented in academic positions, they remain underrepresented in leadership roles and face structural barriers such as biased recruitment processes and limited professional development opportunities (Hayden & Thi Ly, 2015; H. C. Nguyen et al., 2017). Interestingly, male educators also face challenges related to gender bias in Vietnam (Gegout, 2024; Feltham, 2020).

The absence of gender-sensitive professional development programs for female educators exacerbates these issues (T. H. Tran, 2022). National policies aimed at reducing gender inequality, such as those promoting equality in STEM, often lack adequate resources and proper implementation within higher education institutions (Luu et al., 2020). Previous studies have focused on student perspectives, leaving educators' experiences largely unexplored (Pasque & Nicholson, 2023; Fernández et al., 2023; Sigurdardottir et al., 2023). The limited availability of gender-sensitive training and policies contributes to ongoing inequalities in Vietnamese universities and calls for attention (Sanfo et al., 2024). A key gap in existing research is the lack of comprehensive insights into how these gender issues intersect with curriculum design and teaching methods. This study aims to fill these gaps by examining educators' perspectives on gender equality across various dimensions, including institutional policies, curriculum practices, professional development, training, and resources, which shape gender dynamics in the education sector. By focusing on educators, this study provides unique insights into how gender equality initiatives are implemented at the classroom and institutional levels, how policies are interpreted, and how efforts are put in place to mitigate gender-related issues in an academic environment. The findings contribute to a deeper understanding of how gender shapes education in Vietnam, support national and institutional efforts to create more inclusive and equitable learning environments, and offer practical recommendations for decision-makers.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Overview of Gender Equality

The debate over whether gender inequalities are more pronounced in countries that advocate for gender equality highlights the need for a thorough analysis (Balducci, 2023). The promotion of societal and economic development is intrinsically linked to gender equality, as demonstrated by the United Nations' Sustainable Development Goal No. 5 (Rana et al., 2024a; Sharif et al., 2024). According to the United Nations General Assembly (2015), gender equality is a fundamental human right and is essential in creating a more peaceful and sustainable future. Despite significant advancements, gender inequality continues to disproportionately affect women and girls worldwide (Kleven et al., 2024). Globally, women have progressed in political leadership but still represent only 23.7% of political offices (United Nations Women, 2018). Women's exclusion from leadership in both the public and private sectors perpetuates their societal marginalisation (World Economic Forum, 2022). Systemic inequality and discrimination persist, with women often denied

access to income and property (Love et al., 2024; Rana et al., 2024b). In education, gender segregation is evident, with girls overrepresented in subjects such as social sciences and humanities, which offer lower incomes and job prospects (Van de Werfhorst, 2017), while boys tend to choose STEM fields, which lead to high-paying, prestigious careers (Barone & Assirelli, 2020). However, women with post-secondary education earn higher wage premiums than men in cities (Gegout, 2024). Although educational disparities persist in rural areas (Rana et al., 2024a), women in developing nations, unlike their counterparts in industrialised nations, still face many challenges, indicating room for empowerment and opportunities to raise female leaders.

2.2. Curriculum and Teaching Practices

Gender inequality persists in education, even though men and women have equal access to higher education in some nations (Kuteesa et al., 2024). However, a pedagogical shift toward inclusive education has equipped educators with the confidence and skills to create more inclusive classrooms (Ghosh & Sankar, 2024). While men are overrepresented in STEM, women are concentrated in lower-status roles (Kollmayer et al., 2020). Gender disparities in education are largely maintained by social agents that propagate stereotypes. Educators' attitudes and teaching methods significantly influence student motivation and achievement, making them crucial in promoting gender equality (Yolcu & Sari, 2024). Research by Acar-Erdol and Gözütok (2018) shows that the Gender Equality Curriculum Draft (GECD) successfully integrates content, learning experiences, and assessment. It is recommended that gender equality curricula be implemented in education faculties until a broader societal understanding of gender equality is achieved. In higher education, student evaluations often reflect gender bias, which may affect female academics' promotion prospects (Sigurdardottir et al., 2023). McQuillan and Leininger (2023) report that professional development regarding gender diversity is valuable, yet only 30% of instructors receive such training. To address this, there is a need to promote continuous professional development (CPD) for educators to inspire creativity among both genders (Merayo & Ayuso, 2023). A. Nguyen (2021) observed that gender disparities persist in Vietnamese university curricula. L. Pham et al. (2022) noted that textbooks and teaching materials often marginalise women, reinforce stereotypes, and discourage female participation. Without conscious efforts to make curricula gender-inclusive, educators may unknowingly perpetuate gender biases (H. Tran & Le, 2023). Traditional teaching methods in Vietnamese higher education tend to be educator-centred, leaving little space for student engagement, often favouring male students (T. Le et al., 2022). Meanwhile, collaborative learning methods can help to break gender norms and create a more equitable learning environment (P. Doan & Nguyen, 2023). Thus, educators play a key role in fostering gender equality, but many Vietnamese educators lack training in gender-sensitive pedagogies (H. Le & Do, 2020a).

2.3. Training and Resources

Effective educator training on gender-sensitive pedagogy is crucial in addressing classroom inequalities, but this remains a challenge in Vietnam and other developing nations (Maheshwari, 2023). M. Pham et al. (2022) found that, while some gender training exists, it is often limited and optional, resulting in inconsistent implementation. Sanfo et al. (2024) argue that, while a theoretical understanding of gender equality is taught, practical classroom application resources are limited. Institutional support is also limited, discouraging educators from adopting gender-sensitive methods (Kuteesa et al., 2024). Schools that invest in resources and training foster a more inclusive environment for students and staff (Sigurdardottir et al., 2023). Opportunities such as workshops, conferences,

and peer learning sessions are crucial in equipping educators with the tools necessary for gender-sensitive teaching (H. Le & Do, 2020b). These lifelong learning platforms often provide educators with real-life examples and practical strategies that can be readily applied in classrooms (Barone & Assirelli, 2020). According to D. Nguyen and Le (2022), when educators are encouraged to collaborate and share their experiences, they are more likely to adopt innovative approaches to address gender biases. Many educators are not exposed to foundational gender concepts during their initial educator education programs, which results in a gap in their understanding of how to create inclusive learning environments (L. Pham et al., 2022). To address this, M. Pham et al. (2022) recommend the mandatory inclusion of gender studies in all educator preparation programs. Moreover, access to resources plays a pivotal role in the effectiveness of gender-sensitive teaching (T. Doan & Nguyen, 2023). Without adequate materials, such as textbooks that portray both male and female contributions equally or teaching aids that promote gender-neutral language, educators may inadvertently perpetuate gender biases (N. Hoang, 2022).

2.4. Institutional Policies and Culture

Institutional policies are critical in promoting or hindering gender equality in higher education (Alshdiefat et al., 2024a; Ghosh & Sankar, 2024). In Vietnam, many universities lack formal policies mandating gender-sensitive teaching (T. Nguyen & Phan, 2021), which leaves educators without adequate support (Sigurdardottir et al., 2023). Without clear policies, gender equality remains of low priority, perpetuating biases in curricula and teaching practices (T. M. Vu & Yamada, 2024; M. T. Vu & Pham, 2023). Traditional patriarchal values dominate the institutional culture, making the implementation of gender-sensitive reforms difficult (H. Le & Do, 2020b). Educators addressing gender issues may face opposition, further complicating these efforts (D. Vu, 2021). However, institutions prioritising gender equality through policy and culture realise more inclusive outcomes (L. Pham et al., 2022). Leadership is critical in driving these changes, as strong institutional leadership can shift the culture and prioritise gender equality (T. Doan & Nguyen, 2023). According to (N. Vu, 2021), one of the major challenges in higher education is the lack of explicit policies mandating gender-sensitive teaching practices. In response, H. C. Nguyen et al. (2017) suggest the need to adopt clear policies that incorporate gender equality as a core element of their mission, including dedicated budget allocations for gender training and gender resource development. Institutional leadership plays a crucial role in shaping the culture around gender equality (Barone & Assirelli, 2020). Leaders can set the tone by implementing gender-sensitive hiring and promotion practices, ensuring that women have equal opportunities to advance into leadership roles (H. Le & Do, 2020a).

2.5. Professional Development and Support

Professional development in gender-sensitive teaching is vital for continuous improvement yet remains limited in many developing nations (Sanfo et al., 2024). H. Tran and Le (2023) found that educators desire more in-depth professional development programs. Many educators struggle to incorporate gender-sensitive practices without sustained professional support (N. Hoang, 2022). Institutions must commit to fostering a culture of learning around gender equality, providing training, materials, and opportunities for collaboration (T. Nguyen, 2021). D. Vu (2021) highlights the importance of institutional networks in sharing resources and strategies, which can help to strengthen gender equality in higher education (T. H. Tran, 2022). Professional development programs must be dynamic, offering educators opportunities to engage in reflective practices, peer collaboration, and mentorship (Alshdiefat et al., 2024b; Sanfo et al., 2024).

Moreover, professional development opportunities focusing on gender equality should not be limited to single sessions (D. Vu, 2021). This ensures that educators can refine their teaching methods, adapt to new research, and address emerging gender issues (Küçükakın, 2024). P. Hoang (2022) notes that many educators, particularly those in rural areas, often feel isolated in their efforts to promote gender equality. Therefore, collaborative efforts are required for educators to share their successes and challenges and foster a community of practice that encourages the spread of gender-sensitive pedagogical techniques (H. Le & Do, 2020b). For example, partnerships between educators, education departments, gender studies programs, and external organisations to create richer professional development experiences can be helpful (A. Nguyen, 2021).

3. Research Methodology

3.1. Research Approach and Compilation of Educators' Perspectives on Gender Equality

This study investigates educators' perspectives on gender equality within higher education institutions in Vietnam, covering institutional policies, curriculum practices, professional development, and the available resources. These dimensions are critical in understanding how gender dynamics evolve within educational institutions. To capture these perspectives comprehensively, this study adopts a quantitative research approach (Haas & Hadjar, 2020). The research began with a systematic review of the existing literature to identify the key issues surrounding gender equality in education, specifically from the viewpoint of educators. This review helped to classify educators' opinions into four major areas—curriculum and pedagogy, training and resources, institutional policies and culture, and professional development and support—which reflect how gender equality is experienced and promoted within the educational context.

3.2. Respondent Selection and Sample Sizing Strategy

A well-defined sampling strategy was employed to ensure the robustness of the research findings (Nordgaard & Correll, 2018). The study population comprised educators actively teaching in higher education institutions across Vietnam. These institutions included public, private, and semi-public universities, thereby offering a broad representation of the Vietnamese higher education landscape. The research targeted full-time and part-time faculty members across various academic positions, such as lecturers, senior lecturers, associate professors, and professors. Based on annual reports from academic bodies, the total population of potential respondents was identified as 3780 members, comprising 1032 lecturers, 1000 senior lecturers, 1121 associate professors, and 627 in other positions. Using the Yamane formula for sample size calculation and applying a 5% margin of error, the sample size was determined to be 363 respondents. A total of 372 questionnaires were distributed to account for potential non-responses. In total, 132 valid responses were retrieved, yielding a response rate of 35.5%. Although this response rate might seem moderate, it is consistent with past research indicating that questionnaire-based studies with response rates exceeding 20% are considered satisfactory (Rana et al., 2024a). Therefore, the responses obtained were sufficient to conduct robust statistical analyses and draw valid conclusions.

3.3. Questionnaire Design and Data Collection Process

The questionnaire was developed based on the insights gained from the literature review. The structured questionnaire consisted of several sections, each focusing on one of the key dimensions of gender equality identified earlier: curriculum and pedagogy, training and resources, institutional policies and culture, and professional development and support. Respondents were asked to rate various statements related to these dimensions using a

five-point Likert scale, where 1 represented ‘strongly disagree’ and 5 represented ‘strongly agree’. This scale was designed to measure the respondents’ assessments of the importance of each dimension in promoting or hindering gender equality in higher education (Paap et al., 2024). The finalised questionnaire was distributed through Google Forms, a platform selected for its user-friendly interface and efficient data collection capabilities. The digital format allowed respondents to complete the questionnaire at their convenience, thus improving the response rates.

3.4. Data Analysis and Statistical Techniques

The collected data were meticulously analysed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) Version 27, a widely recognised software program for complex data analyses. Several statistical methods were employed to analyse the data and ensure that the study’s findings were reliable and meaningful. The demographic characteristics of the respondents were analysed using frequencies and percentages. These analyses provided insights into the gender distribution, years of teaching experience, academic positions, and ages within the respondent group, offering a detailed picture of the population under study. Furthermore, cross-tabulations were used to explore relationships between the demographic variables. Specifically, this study examined the relationship between gender and years of teaching experience, providing insights into how teaching experience varied across male and female respondents. The gender distribution across academic positions was analysed, identifying how males and females were represented at different academic ranks. The relationship between gender and age, considering the age demographics of male and female respondents across various age brackets, was also analysed using cross-tabulation. In addition, the Mann–Whitney U test was employed to assess differences in gender equality perceptions between male and female respondents. This non-parametric test is suitable for the analysis of ordinal data derived from Likert-scale responses. The Kruskal–Wallis H test compared respondents’ opinions on gender equality based on their academic positions and teaching experience. As a non-parametric test, it was chosen for its ability to handle non-normally distributed data and its suitability for the comparison of multiple groups. This test helped to determine whether significant differences existed between the opinions of lecturers, senior lecturers, and associate professors and between respondents with varying teaching experience. After this, a post hoc analysis was conducted to identify which groups differed. The Bonferroni correction was applied to adjust for multiple comparisons, ensuring that the results were statistically significant and reliable.

4. Results and Findings

4.1. Background Information of Respondents

Table 1 provides key background information about the respondents, shedding light on their gender distribution, age, years of teaching experience, and academic positions. The sample comprised 54.5% male and 45.5% female respondents, suggesting a relatively balanced gender representation. This close ratio of male to female respondents provided a fair basis for the evaluation of gender perspectives within the study. The age distribution shows that more than half of the respondents (53%) fell within the 35–44 years age bracket, followed by 34.1% in the 45–54 years range. A smaller proportion of the respondents, 8.3%, were younger (25–34 years), and only 4.5% were older than 54. Regarding teaching experience, a significant number of respondents, 38.6%, had been teaching for more than 20 years, followed by 28% with 16–20 years of experience. Those with fewer years of experience (0–15 years) represented a smaller proportion, indicating that most respondents were well established in their academic careers. Finally, regarding their academic positions,

most respondents (51.5%) held the rank of lecturer, while 34.1% were senior lecturers; none of the respondents held the role of professor.

Table 1. Background information of the respondents.

Background Information	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	72	54.5
	Female	60	45.5
Age	25–34 years	11	8.3
	35–44 years	70	53.0
	45–54 years	45	34.1
	More than 54 years	6	4.5
Year of teaching experience	0–5 years	7	5.3
	6–10 years	11	8.3
	11–15 years	26	19.7
	16–20 years	37	28.0
	More than 20 years	51	38.6
Academic position	Lecturer	68	51.5
	Senior lecturer	45	34.1
	Associate professor	13	9.8
	Others	6	4.5

4.2. Cross-Tabulation of Gender and Years of Teaching Experience of Respondents

Table 2 explores the relationship between gender and years of teaching experience. It reveals that male respondents generally had more teaching experience than females. For instance, 26 males (out of 72) had more than 20 years of teaching experience, compared to 25 females (out of 60). However, among the respondents with 0–5 years of teaching experience, females slightly outnumbered males (four females vs. three males). This suggests that male respondents tended to have more extensive teaching careers, while female respondents were somewhat more concentrated in the earlier stages of their academic careers.

Table 2. Cross-tabulation of gender and years of teaching experience of respondents.

		Years of Teaching Experience					Total
		0–5 Years	6–10 Years	11–15 Years	16–20 Years	More Than 20 Years	
Gender	Male	3	9	15	19	26	72
	Female	4	2	11	18	25	60
Total		7	11	26	37	51	132

4.3. Cross-Tabulation of Gender and Academic Positions of Respondents

Table 3 examines the gender distribution across different academic ranks. Most male and female respondents occupied the lecturer position, but the proportion was higher among males (41 males vs. 27 females). The gender representation was nearly balanced for senior lecturers, with 22 males and 23 females. Males were more represented in senior academic roles such as associate professors (seven males vs. six females). This indicates that, while female respondents held a fairly equal share of senior lecturer positions, male respondents were slightly more prevalent in higher academic roles.

Table 3. Cross-tabulation of gender and academic positions of respondents.

		Academic Position				Total
		Lecturer	Senior Lecturer	Associate Professor	Others	
Gender	Male	41	22	7	2	72
	Female	27	23	6	4	60
Total		68	45	13	6	132

4.4. Cross-Tabulation of Gender and Age of Respondents

Table 4 assesses the distribution of the respondents by gender and age. Respondents aged 35–44 were the most represented for both genders. Among younger respondents aged 25–34, females (six) outnumbered males (five), reflecting a stronger female presence in the earlier stages of their academic careers. In contrast, males dominated among the respondents aged 45–54 years and more than 54 years. The findings in Table 4 suggest that male respondents were generally older, while female respondents were more prevalent in the younger group.

Table 4. Cross-tabulation of gender and age of respondents.

		Age				Total
		25–34 Years	35–44 Years	45–54 Years	More Than 20 Years	
Gender	Male	5	41	21	5	72
	Female	6	29	24	1	60
Total		11	70	45	6	132

4.5. Opinions of Respondents on Gender Equality Based on Gender

Table 5 presents the respondents' views on gender equality in higher education in Vietnam, categorised into four sections: curriculum and pedagogy, training and resources, institutional policies and culture, and professional development and support. Each section includes items with mean scores reflecting the overall, male, and female perspectives, along with the results of the Mann–Whitney U test. The curriculum and pedagogy section reflects the inclusiveness of curriculum content, teaching materials, and classroom practices related to gender equality. The respondents generally believed that their curricula were gender-inclusive, with scores above 3.0 (neutral point). A significant gender difference was noted in 'encouraging equal participation (C7)', where female respondents rated this more highly than males ($p = 0.005$), indicating perceived greater encouragement for gender equality from the female perspective. Other items, such as 'gender bias in teaching materials (C5)', do not show statistically significant differences. The training and resources section reflects whether respondents felt adequately trained and resourced to promote gender equality. The overall mean scores for most items fluctuated around 3.5, reflecting moderate agreement. Male and female responses showed no significant differences, except for (T7), where the respondents indicated a need for more up-to-date resources regarding gender equality, with some variation between the genders ($p = 0.037$). This suggests that both male and female educators agree on the need for better and more relevant gender-related training content, but females particularly highlighted this.

Regarding institutional policies and culture, the respondents were asked about their institution's policies and practices regarding gender equality. The scores for items in this category, such as 'clear gender equality policy (E1)' and 'implementation of gender equality policies (E5)', showed general agreement, with means around 3.78–3.86. There were significant gender differences in 'essential gender equality training (E9)', with females rating this more highly ($p = 0.034$). This suggests that female respondents felt more strongly about the

necessity of gender equality training compared to their male counterparts. Another notable difference was in ‘comfort addressing gender issues in the classroom (E13)’, where females again showed a significantly higher comfort level ($p = 0.027$). The professional development and support section reflects opportunities for professional development regarding gender equality. The respondents expressed high agreement with ‘equal opportunities for professional development (P1)’, where both male and female respondents showed positive views. A significant difference was observed in male and female individuals regarding ‘equal opportunities to excel (P5)’, with females expressing more agreement ($p = 0.035$). This indicates that female educators feel more strongly about equal opportunities for students, possibly reflecting their own experiences within the academic system.

Table 5. Opinions of respondents on gender equality based on gender.

	Overall		Male		Female		M-W (Sig.)
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Curriculum and Pedagogy							
C1—The curriculum in my institution is gender inclusive.	3.53	1.07	3.43	1.15	3.65	0.97	0.331
C2—Vietnamese education promotes gender equality effectively.	3.54	0.87	3.53	0.95	3.55	0.77	0.845
C3—The curriculum and assignments I create are gender inclusive.	3.23	1.15	3.11	1.22	3.37	1.06	0.247
C4—The teaching course in Vietnam sufficiently covers gender equality.	3.19	0.93	3.29	0.98	3.07	0.84	0.166
C5—Teaching materials (textbooks, assignments) are free from gender bias.	3.95	0.97	3.83	1.06	4.10	0.84	0.183
C6—There is equal emphasis on the achievements of both male and female students in my university teaching.	4.33	0.81	4.15	0.97	4.53	0.50	0.035
C7—I actively encourage both male and female students to participate equally in class.	4.34	0.80	4.14	0.94	4.58	0.50	0.005
Training and Resources							
T1—Educators receive adequate training on gender equality.	3.55	0.92	3.50	0.90	3.60	0.94	0.393
T2—My institution provides resources to promote gender equality.	3.71	0.87	3.64	0.88	3.80	0.86	0.298
T3—Gender equality training should be mandatory for all educators.	3.66	0.91	3.56	0.82	3.78	1.01	0.105
T4—There are sufficient professional development opportunities related to gender equality.	3.54	0.89	3.51	0.84	3.57	0.96	0.589
T5—The teaching course I attended has provided me with sufficient training about the Gender Equality in Higher education	3.39	0.93	3.40	0.90	3.37	0.97	0.946
T6—The teaching course I attended has helped in developing more gender inclusive curriculum and assignments.	3.39	0.85	3.39	0.80	3.40	0.92	0.656
T7—The teaching course I attended needs to be updated and include more content about gender equality in Vietnamese higher education.	3.64	0.85	3.50	0.93	3.80	0.71	0.037
Institutional Policies and Culture							
E1—There is a clear policy on gender equality at my institution.	3.78	0.89	3.75	0.87	3.82	0.93	0.514
E2—Gender bias is not an issue in my institution.	3.99	0.97	3.89	1.09	4.12	0.78	0.367
E3—Female students and female staff are treated equally to their male counterparts.	4.28	0.85	4.24	0.94	4.33	0.73	0.843
E4—There are adequate measures to prevent gender discrimination in my institution.	3.74	0.97	3.67	0.99	3.83	0.94	0.288
E5—Gender equality policies are effectively implemented in my institution.	3.86	0.88	3.79	0.93	3.93	0.82	0.360
E6—My institution encourages female leadership in academia.	4.14	0.83	4.01	0.90	4.28	0.72	0.089
E7—Gender equality is an integral part of institutional culture.	4.04	0.87	3.97	0.90	4.12	0.83	0.332
E8—Students are aware of gender equality issues and policies.	3.77	0.87	3.72	0.91	3.82	0.83	0.559
E9—I believe gender equality training is essential for educators.	4.04	0.84	3.88	0.95	4.23	0.65	0.034
E10—Gender stereotypes are still prevalent in the classroom environment.	2.80	1.21	2.88	1.20	2.72	1.22	0.451
E11—Both male and female students feel equally valued in our institution.	4.11	0.83	3.99	0.97	4.27	0.61	0.140
E12—The institution takes effective measures to address gender-based discrimination.	3.72	0.88	3.63	0.91	3.83	0.83	0.185
E13—I feel confident addressing gender equality issues in my classroom.	3.95	0.81	3.81	0.88	4.13	0.68	0.027
Professional Development and Support							
P1—There are equal opportunities for professional development regardless of gender.	4.13	0.82	3.97	0.93	4.32	0.62	0.040
P2—I feel supported by my institution to implement gender inclusive practices.	3.89	0.87	3.83	0.90	3.97	0.82	0.406
P3—I have witnessed gender discrimination in my institution.	2.21	1.18	2.35	1.22	2.05	1.11	0.173
P4—My teaching practices have changed as a result of gender equality initiatives.	3.29	0.96	3.32	0.95	3.25	0.99	0.704
P5—Male and female students have equal opportunities to excel in all subjects.	4.17	0.87	3.99	1.03	4.40	0.56	0.035
P6—Efforts to promote gender equality have led to noticeable improvements in student outcomes.	3.69	0.92	3.69	0.97	3.68	0.85	0.783
P7—Gender equality is a priority in our school's strategic goals.	3.67	0.88	3.58	0.98	3.77	0.74	0.268

In summary, while there is broad agreement on the importance of gender equality across various aspects of higher education, female respondents consistently rated several aspects more favourably, indicating that they may perceive greater progress or support for gender inclusiveness in their institutions than males. The results underscore the need to update teaching materials, enhance training programs, and address remaining gender disparities in classroom practices and professional opportunities.

4.6. Opinions of Respondents on Gender Equality Based on Years of Teaching Experience

Table 6 presents the respondents' views on gender equality in higher education across five teaching experience groups (0–5 years, 6–10 years, 11–15 years, 16–20 years, and 20 years or more). The table shows the mean scores, standard deviations, and significant values of the Kruskal–Wallis H test. The data reveal that respondents with more teaching experience (16 years or more) generally had more positive views on gender equality, especially regarding the adequacy of training and resources. Significant differences were found in training, institutional policies, and professional development items. The curriculum and pedagogy section reflects perceptions of gender inclusiveness in curriculum design and teaching practices. Most items had no significant differences across the experience levels, suggesting that perceptions about gender inclusivity in the curriculum and pedagogy are consistent regardless of teaching experience.

Table 6. Opinions of respondents on gender equality based on years of teaching experience.

Code	0–5 Years		6–10 Years		11–15 Years		16–20 Years		20 Years and More		K-W (Sig.)
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Curriculum and Pedagogy											
C1	3.43	0.98	3.45	0.93	3.38	1.30	3.57	1.09	3.61	1.00	0.926
C2	3.29	0.95	3.64	0.81	3.31	0.97	3.54	0.87	3.67	0.82	0.383
C3	3.14	1.35	3.55	0.93	3.12	1.18	3.08	1.19	3.33	1.14	0.718
C4	3.14	1.07	3.45	0.93	3.12	1.03	3.38	0.76	3.04	0.96	0.339
C5	3.86	0.90	4.09	0.54	3.69	1.16	3.97	0.87	4.06	1.03	0.638
C6	4.57	0.79	4.09	0.54	3.96	1.11	4.38	0.83	4.49	0.61	0.072
C7	4.57	0.79	4.27	0.65	4.08	1.09	4.30	0.85	4.49	0.58	0.473
Training and Resources											
T1	2.57	0.53	3.18	0.60	3.38	0.90	3.70	0.94	3.73	0.92	0.006
T2	3.29	0.49	3.64	0.67	3.62	1.02	3.78	0.92	3.78	0.83	0.399
T3	2.86	0.69	3.55	0.52	3.62	1.02	3.73	0.90	3.76	0.93	0.095
T4	3.14	1.07	3.45	0.82	3.42	1.10	3.54	0.90	3.67	0.77	0.486
T5	2.29	0.76	3.45	1.04	3.38	1.10	3.49	0.84	3.45	0.83	0.034
T6	2.43	0.79	3.36	0.81	3.42	1.03	3.43	0.83	3.49	0.73	0.053
T7	3.29	1.11	3.64	0.81	3.58	1.10	3.57	0.73	3.76	0.76	0.660
Institutional Policies and Culture											
E1	2.71	0.95	3.45	0.69	3.62	1.13	3.89	0.66	4.00	0.82	0.004
E2	4.14	0.69	3.91	0.70	3.58	1.24	3.81	1.00	4.33	0.77	0.020
E3	4.71	0.49	4.18	0.75	3.96	1.04	4.16	0.87	4.49	0.73	0.034
E4	3.29	1.25	3.45	0.52	3.54	1.21	3.92	0.72	3.84	1.01	0.191
E5	4.00	0.82	3.82	0.60	3.73	1.04	3.76	0.80	3.98	0.93	0.637
E6	4.14	1.07	3.91	0.83	3.96	1.00	4.00	0.75	4.37	0.72	0.109
E7	4.00	1.00	3.82	0.87	3.85	1.12	4.00	0.67	4.22	0.83	0.373
E8	3.57	0.79	3.55	0.82	3.69	0.93	3.81	0.88	3.84	0.88	0.636
E9	3.86	0.69	4.00	0.63	3.77	1.03	4.00	0.82	4.24	0.79	0.174
E10	2.71	1.50	3.64	0.67	3.12	1.14	2.86	1.21	2.43	1.19	0.017
E11	4.29	0.76	3.64	0.81	3.88	0.95	3.95	0.88	4.43	0.64	0.004
E12	3.29	0.76	3.55	0.82	3.54	1.03	3.76	0.80	3.88	0.86	0.297
E13	3.57	0.53	3.55	0.69	3.81	0.94	3.92	0.80	4.20	0.75	0.011
Professional Development and Support											
P1	4.43	0.53	4.00	0.89	3.85	1.12	4.00	0.78	4.35	0.63	0.128
P2	3.57	0.98	3.64	0.67	3.65	1.06	3.92	0.76	4.10	0.83	0.120
P3	1.71	0.95	2.91	1.14	2.35	1.20	2.54	1.12	1.82	1.13	0.003
P4	2.29	1.11	3.55	0.82	3.15	1.05	3.43	0.90	3.33	0.91	0.080
P5	4.57	0.53	3.91	0.94	3.81	1.02	4.08	0.86	4.43	0.73	0.014
P6	3.00	1.15	3.82	0.60	3.50	1.14	3.81	0.88	3.76	0.81	0.230
P7	3.14	1.21	3.73	0.65	3.54	0.95	3.65	0.89	3.80	0.83	0.534

The training and resources items in this section addressed the adequacy of training and resources available for the promotion of gender equality. Significant differences emerged in ‘educators receive adequate training (T1)’, with a p -value of 0.006, showing that educators with more experience (16–20 years and above) feel that they receive adequate training compared to those with less experience (0–5 years). Similarly, ‘sufficiency of training provided in teaching courses (T5)’ was significant ($p = 0.034$), with those in the 0–5 years group assigning this item lower scores ($M = 2.29$) compared to other groups. This suggests that less experienced educators feel undertrained in gender equality matters. The institutional policies and culture section referred to the institutional culture regarding gender equality. Several items showed significant differences across teaching experience levels—notably, ‘clear gender equality policy (E1)’ was significant at $p = 0.004$, with more experienced respondents (16–20 years and 20+ years) rating this policy more highly. ‘Gender bias is not an issue (E2)’ was significant at $p = 0.020$, where respondents with 20+ years of experience assigned it the highest scores ($M = 4.33$); ‘female students and staff treated equally (E3)’ was significant at $p = 0.034$, with a similar trend of more positive ratings among more experienced educators; and ‘gender stereotypes in the classroom (E10)’ was significant at $p = 0.017$, showing more variability, with lower ratings by respondents with over 20 years of experience, indicating that they may perceive more gender stereotypes in the classroom. These results suggest that more experienced educators perceive greater institutional support for gender equality, although some concerns about gender stereotypes persist.

The professional development and support items in this section assessed the support for professional development related to gender equality. ‘Witnessed gender discrimination (P3)’ was significant ($p = 0.003$), with less experienced respondents (0–5 years) reporting fewer instances of witnessing gender discrimination compared to those with 6–10 years of experience ($M = 2.91$). Additionally, P5 (male and female students have equal opportunities to excel) showed significant differences ($p = 0.014$), with respondents with more experience (16–20 years and 20+ years) reporting higher agreement. This suggests that more experienced educators are more confident about the opportunities available to students of both genders.

4.7. Post Hoc Analysis of Variables with Significant Differences Based on Years of Experience

Table 7 presents a post hoc analysis comparing educators’ perspectives on gender equality based on their teaching experience. The analysis highlights significant differences across several variables, particularly in areas related to training, institutional policies, gender bias, and student equality. The comparison between educators with 0–5 years of experience and those with 16–20 years or more than 20 years on ‘educators receive adequate training on gender equality (T1)’ shows a significant difference. Educators with less experience (0–5 years) perceive that they receive significantly less adequate training on gender equality compared to their more experienced colleagues. The test statistic for the difference between 0–5 years and 16–20 years is -45.585 (Adj. Sig = 0.023), while, for 0–5 years and more than 20 years, the test statistic is -47.081 (Adj. Sig = 0.013). This suggests that newer educators may feel underprepared to address gender equality issues, indicating the need for enhanced training for early-career educators. Similarly, there were significant differences in the responses regarding gender equality training provided in courses (T5). Educators with more than 20 years of experience are significantly more likely to report sufficient training compared to those with 0–5 years (test statistic = -43.947 , Adj. Sig = 0.024) and 16–20 years of experience (test statistic = -46.994 , Adj. Sig = 0.015), which further highlights the training gap perceived by less experienced educators.

Table 7. Post hoc analysis of variables with significant differences based on years of teaching experience.

Sample 1–Sample 2	Test Statistic	Std. Error	Std. Test Statistic	Sig.	Adj. Sig.
T1—Educators receive adequate training on gender equality.					
0–5 years–16–20 years	−45.585	14.963	−3.047	0.002	0.023
0–5 years–More than 20 years	−47.081	14.633	−3.218	0.001	0.013
T5—The teaching course I attended has provided me with sufficient training about the gender equality in higher education.					
0–5 years–More than 20 years	−43.947	14.498	−3.031	0.002	0.024
0–5 years–16–20 years	−46.994	14.826	−3.170	0.002	0.015
E1—There is a clear policy on gender equality at my institution.					
0–5 years–16–20 years	−42.811	14.461	−2.960	0.003	0.031
0–5 years–More than 20 years	−49.029	14.142	−3.467	0.001	0.005
E2—Gender bias is not an issue in my institution.					
11–15 years–More than 20 years	−25.189	8.610	−2.926	0.003	0.034
E10—Gender stereotypes are still prevalent in the classroom environment.					
More than 20 years–6–10 years	37.082	12.342	3.005	0.003	0.027
E11—Both male and female students feel equally valued in our institution.					
6–10 years–More than 20 years	−35.478	11.681	−3.037	0.002	0.024
E13—I feel confident addressing gender equality issues in my classroom.					
6–10 years–More than 20 years	−33.349	11.547	−2.888	0.004	0.039
P3—I have witnessed gender discrimination in my institution.					
More than 20 years–16–20 years	24.708	7.925	3.118	0.002	0.018
More than 20 years–6–10 years	36.207	12.200	2.968	0.003	0.030
P5—Male and female students have equal opportunities to excel in all subjects.					
11–15 years–More than 20 years	−25.067	8.468	−2.960	0.003	0.031

There is a significant difference between educators with 0–5 years of experience and those with 16–20 years (test statistic = −42.811, Adj. Sig = 0.031) and more than 20 years (test statistic = −49.029, Adj. Sig = 0.005) on clear policies on gender equality at their institutions (E5). Educators with less experience are less likely to perceive a clear gender equality policy in their institutions than more experienced educators, indicating a potential disconnect in policy awareness or communication. The results for ‘gender bias is not an issue in my institution (E2)’ indicate that educators with 11–15 years of experience and those with more than 20 years show a significant difference (Test Statistic = −25.189, Adj. Sig = 0.034). This suggests that educators with moderate experience perceive more gender bias than those with longer careers, possibly indicating shifts in the institutional culture over time or differences in their awareness of gender bias issues.

Regarding ‘gender stereotypes that are still prevalent in the classroom environment (E10)’, educators with more than 20 years of experience reported significantly more gender stereotypes in the classroom compared to those with 6–10 years of experience (test statistic = 37.082, Adj. Sig = 0.027), which might reflect seasoned educators’ heightened awareness of subtle gender dynamics that newer educators may not yet recognise. Both (E11) and (E13) exhibited significant differences between respondents aged 6–10 years and those with more than 20 years of experience. This implies that experienced educators are more likely to believe that both male and female students are equally valued, and they feel more equipped to tackle sensitive gender issues.

The results of the post hoc analysis of ‘I have witnessed gender discrimination in my institution (P3)’ showed significant differences between educators with more than 20 years of experience and those with 16–20 years (test statistic = 24.708, Adj. Sig = 0.018) and 6–10 years (test statistic = 36.207, Adj. Sig = 0.030). More experienced educators are more likely to have witnessed gender discrimination, which could be attributed to their longer tenures and exposure to diverse institutional dynamics. Regarding ‘male and female students have equal opportunities to excel in all subjects (P5)’, educators with 11–15 years of experience perceived fewer equal opportunities for male and female students compared

to those with more than 20 years of experience (Adj. Sig = 0.031). This perception difference could reflect changes in institutional policies over time or differences in how educators interpret student opportunities based on their experience.

4.8. Opinions of Respondents on Gender Equality Based on Academic Positions

Table 8 presents an analysis of the respondents' opinions on gender equality based on their academic positions. In contrast, Table 9 shows the post hoc results for variables with significant differences in the Kruskal–Wallis H test. The analysis shows a statistically significant difference (Sig. = 0.028) in 'gender equality is important in my institution (C2)'. Lecturers reported the lowest mean score (3.34), indicating a relatively lower emphasis on gender equality, while the 'others' category reported the highest mean score (4.17). This suggests that those in higher or alternative academic positions perceive a stronger institutional commitment to gender equality. With a significant result (Sig. = 0.019), the data show that lecturers (M = 4.16) perceive fewer active initiatives compared to senior lecturers (M = 4.51) and associate professors (M = 4.69) on 'gender equality initiatives are actively promoted (C6)'. This could indicate a communication gap or initiative participation among less senior faculty members.

Table 8. Opinions of respondents on gender equality based on academic positions.

Code	Lecturer		Senior Lecturer		Associate Professor		Others		K-W (Sig.)
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Curriculum and Pedagogy									
C1	3.34	1.14	3.67	1.00	3.77	1.01	4.17	0.41	0.122
C2	3.34	0.99	3.67	0.67	3.85	0.69	4.17	0.41	0.028
C3	3.09	1.14	3.27	1.18	3.38	1.19	4.17	0.41	0.119
C4	3.07	1.00	3.20	0.81	3.38	0.96	4.00	0.00	0.050
C5	3.84	0.97	4.02	1.03	4.23	0.93	4.17	0.41	0.350
C6	4.16	0.96	4.51	0.63	4.69	0.48	4.00	0.00	0.019
C7	4.21	0.94	4.47	0.63	4.69	0.48	4.17	0.41	0.131
Training and Resources									
T1	3.29	0.90	3.78	0.85	3.69	1.03	4.33	0.52	0.004
T2	3.46	0.87	3.96	0.71	3.85	1.07	4.50	0.55	0.001
T3	3.59	0.92	3.73	0.94	3.54	0.88	4.17	0.75	0.353
T4	3.31	0.97	3.64	0.71	3.85	0.69	4.67	0.52	0.001
T5	3.12	0.95	3.58	0.78	3.54	0.78	4.67	0.52	0.000
T6	3.22	0.91	3.51	0.79	3.54	0.66	4.17	0.41	0.019
T7	3.49	0.91	3.84	0.64	3.31	0.95	4.50	0.55	0.004
Institutional Policies and Culture									
E1	3.57	0.92	3.98	0.84	3.92	0.86	4.33	0.52	0.024
E2	3.76	1.11	4.16	0.77	4.38	0.65	4.50	0.55	0.068
E3	4.13	0.94	4.42	0.75	4.46	0.66	4.50	0.55	0.288
E4	3.59	0.98	3.80	1.01	4.00	0.71	4.50	0.55	0.049
E5	3.71	0.93	3.96	0.82	3.92	0.76	4.67	0.52	0.035
E6	3.96	0.92	4.31	0.70	4.31	0.63	4.50	0.55	0.130
E7	3.85	0.93	4.20	0.76	4.15	0.80	4.67	0.52	0.045
E8	3.63	0.93	3.87	0.79	3.77	0.83	4.50	0.55	0.071
E9	3.87	0.93	4.11	0.75	4.38	0.51	4.67	0.52	0.031
E10	2.88	1.20	2.56	1.12	2.46	1.13	4.50	0.55	0.002
E11	3.91	0.96	4.22	0.64	4.54	0.52	4.67	0.52	0.019
E12	3.50	0.92	3.84	0.74	4.00	0.82	4.67	0.52	0.003
E13	3.76	0.88	4.07	0.72	4.31	0.48	4.50	0.55	0.020
Professional Development and Support									
P1	4.00	0.99	4.29	0.63	4.23	0.44	4.17	0.41	0.663
P2	3.72	0.94	4.13	0.76	4.00	0.82	3.83	0.41	0.116
P3	2.29	1.13	2.02	1.18	1.85	0.99	3.50	1.38	0.038
P4	3.15	1.04	3.40	0.81	3.46	0.78	3.67	1.37	0.256
P5	3.94	1.02	4.40	0.62	4.62	0.51	4.17	0.41	0.023
P6	3.47	1.03	3.89	0.65	4.00	1.00	4.00	0.63	0.049
P7	3.41	0.88	3.89	0.78	4.00	0.91	4.17	0.75	0.014

Table 9. Post hoc analysis of variables with significant differences based on academic positions of respondents.

Sample 1–Sample 2	Test Statistic	Std. Error	Std. Test Statistic	Sig.	Adj. Sig.
C4—The teaching course in Vietnam sufficiently covers gender equality.					
Lecturer–Others	−41.169	15.388	−2.675	0.007	0.045
T1—Educators receive adequate training on gender equality.					
Lecturer–Senior Lecturer	−19.137	6.976	−2.743	0.006	0.037
Lecturer–Others	−42.725	15.461	−2.763	0.006	0.034
T2—My institution provides resources to promote gender equality.					
Lecturer–Senior Lecturer	−20.442	6.809	−3.002	0.003	0.016
Lecturer–Others	−45.015	15.089	−2.983	0.003	0.017
T4—There are sufficient professional development opportunities related to gender equality.					
Lecturer–Others	−54.983	15.077	−3.647	0.000	0.002
Senior Lecturer–Others	−43.478	15.386	−2.826	0.005	0.028
T5—The teaching course I attended has provided me with sufficient training about gender equality in higher education.					
Lecturer–Others	−60.049	15.319	−3.920	0.000	0.001
Senior Lecturer–Others	−42.822	15.633	−2.739	0.006	0.037
T6—The teaching course I attended has helped in developing a more gender inclusive curriculum and assignments.					
Lecturer–Others	−42.064	15.043	−2.796	0.005	0.031
T7—The teaching course I attended needs to be updated and include more content about gender equality in Vietnamese higher education.					
Associate Professor–Others	−51.596	17.139	−3.010	0.003	0.016
Lecturer–Others	−43.581	14.789	−2.947	0.003	0.019
E5—Gender equality policies are effectively implemented in my institution.					
Lecturer–Others	−41.667	15.051	−2.768	0.006	0.034
E10—Gender stereotypes are still prevalent in the classroom environment.					
Associate Professor–Others	−61.750	18.323	−3.370	0.001	0.005
Senior Lecturer–Others	−58.739	16.135	−3.640	0.000	0.002
Lecturer–Others	−48.809	15.811	−3.087	0.002	0.012
E12—The institution takes effective measures to address gender-based discrimination.					
Lecturer–Others	−49.206	15.211	−3.235	0.001	0.007

There was a significant difference (Sig. = 0.004) in perceptions regarding the adequacy of gender equality training (T1). Lecturers reported lower satisfaction ($M = 3.29$), while the ‘others’ category had the highest mean (4.33). This suggests that those in lower academic positions feel that they have received less adequate training than those in higher positions, indicating a need for more training targeted at early-career academics. The variable ‘my institution provides sufficient resources for gender equality education (T2)’ showed a significant difference (Sig. = 0.001), with lecturers ($M = 3.46$) perceiving fewer resources compared to senior lecturers ($M = 3.96$) and others ($M = 4.50$). This discrepancy highlights the importance of ensuring that all academic ranks have equal access to resources supporting gender equality education. There was a significant difference (Sig. = 0.001) in the perception of the frequency of gender equality workshops (T4), with lecturers reporting fewer workshops ($M = 3.31$) compared to associate professors ($M = 3.85$) and others ($M = 4.67$), which suggests that workshops may not be as accessible or emphasised for those in lower academic positions. Regarding (T5), significant differences (Sig. = 0.000) were indicated, with lecturers reporting a lower mean score (3.12) compared to the ‘others’ category ($M = 4.67$). This reinforces the perception that early-career academics feel inadequately trained on gender equality, while those in other categories or higher academic roles report more comprehensive training experiences. There was a significant difference (Sig. = 0.004) in the perception of how often gender equality was discussed in meetings (T7). Lecturers reported lower scores ($M = 3.49$) compared to senior lecturers ($M = 3.84$) and others ($M = 4.50$). This suggests that the topic may be more frequently addressed in higher-level or administrative meetings that junior faculty may not attend.

Significant differences were recorded in various items related to institutional policies and culture, namely E1 (Sig. = 0.024), E4 (Sig. = 0.049), E5 (Sig. = 0.035), E7 (Sig. = 0.045), E9 (Sig. = 0.031), E10 (Sig. = 0.002), E11 (0.019), E12 (0.003), and E13 (Sig. = 0.020), which largely indicate that more experienced or senior academic staff feel more empowered or prepared to address gender issues in the classroom and understand the institutional standpoint on gender equality, among others.

There was a significant difference (Sig. = 0.038), with lecturers (M = 2.29) reporting more observations of gender discrimination than others (M = 3.50), regarding 'I have witnessed gender discrimination in my institution (P3)'. This finding suggests that those in lower academic positions are more likely to encounter or perceive gender discrimination within their institutions. Meanwhile, there was a significant difference (Sig. = 0.014) in the perceptions of equal opportunities for students. Lecturers (M = 3.41) perceived fewer opportunities compared to senior lecturers (M = 3.89) and others (M = 4.17) regarding the item 'male and female students have equal opportunities to excel in all subjects (P5)', indicating that junior faculty may be less aware of or less involved in initiatives promoting equal student opportunities.

5. Further Discussion and Implications of Findings

The analysis of the gender distribution across differing lengths of teaching experience shows that male educators tend to have more teaching experience compared to female educators, which may reflect gender disparities in career longevity within Vietnamese higher education. The studies by [T. Nguyen and Phan \(2021\)](#) and [H. Tran and Le \(2023\)](#) found similar patterns, suggesting that female educators often encounter barriers that limit their career advancement over time, such as balancing familial responsibilities with professional commitments. The implication is that retention strategies targeting female faculty could help to bridge this experience gap, supporting gender diversity in experienced academic roles ([Kohtamäki et al., 2024](#)). A noted limitation of this study is the absence of responses from individuals holding the title of professor.

Furthermore, the cross-tabulation of the gender and academic positions of the respondents indicates that, while female respondents hold a fairly equal share of senior lecturer positions, male respondents are slightly more prevalent in higher academic roles such as associate professors, reflecting potential gender disparities in advancement to senior ranks. Male faculty members are more likely to occupy senior positions—a trend seen in other studies, such as by [M. Pham et al. \(2022\)](#), who reported a higher prevalence of men in leadership roles. This imbalance suggests structural barriers hindering women's progression to senior roles. The implication is that interventions, such as leadership training and mentorship programs for female faculty, may help to address these disparities and promote more balanced representation in senior academic positions ([Bayhantopcu & Aymerich Ojea, 2024](#)). The cross-tabulation of the gender and ages of the respondents suggested that male respondents were generally older, with higher representation in the older age groups.

In contrast, female respondents were more prevalent in the younger group. The findings also indicated that younger age groups had a more balanced gender distribution, whereas older age groups were male-dominated. This trend aligns with research by [A. Nguyen \(2021\)](#) and [T. Nguyen \(2021\)](#), who noted that gender parity tends to improve in younger cohorts but is less prevalent among older faculty. These findings imply that gender equality initiatives are making an impact but still require reinforcement to ensure their sustainability in academia ([Göker & Polatdemir, 2024](#)).

The opinions of the respondents on gender equality based on gender indicate that female educators feel more strongly about equal opportunities for students, possibly reflecting their own experiences within the academic system. Thus, while there is broad

agreement on the importance of gender equality across various aspects of higher education, female respondents consistently rate several aspects more favourably, indicating that they may perceive greater progress or support for gender inclusiveness in their institutions than males. The results highlight the need for the continued updating of teaching materials, enhancements in training programs, and measures to address the remaining gender disparities in classroom practices and professional opportunities, with female respondents expressing greater dissatisfaction with equality measures. Similar trends have been observed by [T. Nguyen and Phan \(2021\)](#) and [Nordgaard and Correll \(2018\)](#) who reported that women often experience inequities in promotion and recognition. These findings imply the need for gender-sensitive policy frameworks to address specific concerns raised by female faculty, such as fair promotional pathways and unbiased evaluation criteria, to foster a more inclusive environment ([Tang & Horta, 2024](#)). The opinions on gender equality based on years of teaching experience also reflected gender equality. Respondents with fewer years of experience showed higher concern regarding gender equality, while those with longer tenures were generally more satisfied. This aligns with [H. Tran and Le \(2023\)](#) and [D. Nguyen and Le \(2022\)](#), who noted that junior staff often face more immediate equality-related challenges. The implication is that early-career support programs addressing gender-specific challenges could improve the perceptions of gender equality among newer educators, fostering a supportive academic culture ([Casad et al., 2021](#)).

The post hoc analysis of variables with significant differences based on years of teaching experience highlights significant differences in perceptions based on teaching experience. Faculty members with more experience, such as lecturers, are less likely to perceive gender disparities than newer educators—a trend supported by studies such as [M. Pham et al. \(2022\)](#) and [H. Le and Do \(2020b\)](#). This may indicate that senior faculty benefit more from existing structures, while junior faculty face greater obstacles. The implication is that institutions should assess and adopt policies to support equitable career progression, especially for early-career educators ([Okunade et al., 2023](#)). The opinions on gender equality based on academic positions show that perceptions of gender equality vary across academic ranks, with senior faculty reporting higher satisfaction than junior faculty. The studies by [T. Nguyen and Phan \(2021\)](#) and [Haas and Hadjar \(2020\)](#) found that women in lower academic positions often feel marginalised in promotion and recognition processes. These findings suggest the need for policies that promote equity across all academic levels, ensuring that junior faculty have equal opportunities and recognition, regardless of gender ([Li et al., 2023](#)). Conclusively, the post hoc analysis of variables with significant differences based on academic positions reveals that individuals' academic positions influence their perceptions of gender equality, with those in senior positions perceiving fewer gender disparities. Similar findings presented by [H. Tran and Le \(2023\)](#) and [N. Hoang \(2022\)](#) indicate that senior staff may have a vested interest in maintaining the status quo, while junior staff experience more challenges. This implies a need for institutions to assess policies to ensure equitable treatment across all academic levels, with a particular focus on addressing the challenges faced by junior and mid-career faculty ([Kleven et al., 2024](#)).

6. Conclusions and Recommendations

This study aimed to explore educators' perspectives on gender equality in Vietnamese higher education, specifically focusing on how academic positions influence these views. This research sought to uncover disparities in attitudes toward gender issues and provide actionable recommendations to address them within the Vietnamese context. The methodology adopted a quantitative approach, utilising a structured survey to gather data from educators across various academic positions, including lecturers, senior lecturers, associate professors, and professors. The data were analysed using statistical methods,

including post hoc analyses, to identify significant differences in perceptions based on respondents' academic ranks. Key findings from the analysis indicated that educators in higher academic positions (senior lecturers, associate professors, and professors) were more aware of gender inequalities than those in lower ranks. Specifically, higher-ranking respondents recognised gender imbalances in leadership roles, promotion processes, and access to professional development opportunities. Conversely, those in junior roles were less likely to perceive these disparities, suggesting a gap in awareness and experience related to gender challenges in higher education.

Based on these findings, this study recommends that Vietnamese higher education institutions implement policies that promote gender awareness and equality at all academic levels. This includes mandatory gender equality training programs for all faculty members and establishing mentorship schemes to support female academics in their careers. Additionally, institutions should regularly review their promotion and leadership selection processes to ensure that they are transparent and free of gender bias. Future studies should investigate how the institutional culture and societal norms influence gender perceptions in Vietnamese higher education. Expanding the scope to include other regions within Vietnam or comparing the findings with other Southeast Asian countries could offer further insights regarding how to foster gender equality in academia.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, M.Q.R., A.L., T.V.T. and D.P.L.; methodology, M.Q.R., A.L., T.V.T. and D.P.L.; software, M.Q.R. and A.L.; validation, M.Q.R. and A.L.; formal analysis, M.Q.R. and A.L.; investigation, M.Q.R., A.L., T.V.T. and D.P.L.; resources, M.Q.R. and A.L.; data curation, M.Q.R., A.L., T.V.T. and D.P.L.; writing—original draft preparation, M.Q.R. and A.L.; writing—review and editing, M.Q.R. and A.L.; visualization, M.Q.R. and A.L.; supervision, M.Q.R. and A.L.; project administration, M.Q.R., A.L. and T.V.T.; funding acquisition, M.Q.R., A.L. and T.V.T. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This research was funded by the British Council under the Going Global Partnership Programme for Gender Equality, project number GEP 2023-07.

Institutional Review Board Statement: The study was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki, and approved by the Ethics Panel at the University College of Estate Management (protocol code 2419, 21 May 2024).

Informed Consent Statement: Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the study.

Data Availability Statement: The raw data supporting the conclusions of this article will be made available by the authors on request.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

References

- Acar-Erdol, T., & Gözütok, F. D. (2018). Development of gender equality curriculum and its reflective assessment. *Turkish Journal of Education*, 7(3), 117–135. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Alshdiefat, A. S., Lee, A., Sharif, A. A., Rana, M. Q., & Abu Ghunmi, N. A. (2024a). Women in leadership of higher education: Critical barriers in Jordanian universities. *Cogent Education*, 11(1), 2357900. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Alshdiefat, A. S., Sharif, A. A., Ghunmi, N.-A. M. A., Lee, A., & Rana, M. Q. (2024b). Factors impacting women gaining leadership roles in the Jordanian construction sector: Architects and civil engineers. *Buildings*, 14(4), 944. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Balducci, M. (2023). Linking gender differences with gender equality: A systematic-narrative literature review of basic skills and personality. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, 1105234. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Barone, C., & Assirelli, G. (2020). Gender segregation in higher education: An empirical test of seven explanations. *Higher Education*, 79(1), 55–78. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Bayhantopcu, E., & Aymerich Ojea, I. (2024). Integrated sustainability management and equality practices in universities: A case study of Jaume I University. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, 25(3), 631–648. [\[CrossRef\]](#)

- Casad, B. J., Franks, J. E., Garasky, C. E., Kittleman, M. M., Roesler, A. C., Hall, D. Y., & Petzel, Z. W. (2021). Gender inequality in academia: Problems and solutions for women faculty in STEM. *Journal of Neuroscience Research*, 99(1), 13–23. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
- Doan, P., & Nguyen, T. (2023). Collaboration and resource-sharing for gender-sensitive education reform in Vietnam. *Educational Leadership Quarterly*, 35(2), 78–95.
- Doan, T., & Nguyen, L. (2023). Gender sensitivity in teacher training programs: A case study of Vietnamese higher education. *Journal of Educational Development*, 45(2), 178–195.
- Feltham, T. (2020). *Foundations for feminist legal theory* (Working Paper No. 46). Portland State University.
- Fernández, D. P., Ryan, M. K., & Begeny, C. T. (2023). Gender expectations, socioeconomic inequalities and definitions of career success: A qualitative study with university students. *PLoS ONE*, 18(2), e0281967. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Gegout, C. (2024). Making universal education a priority for sustainable development: The E.U., Vietnam and education. *Global Policy*, 15(1), 91–102. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Ghosh, S., & Sankar, C. S. (2024). Competency-based teacher education in gender and inclusive practices. *Social Science Journal for Advanced Research*, 4(5), 18–25.
- Göker, Z. G., & Polatdemir, A. (2024). The quest for gender equality in universities at the crossroads of neoliberal and anti-gender pressures: The case of Turkey. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 22(5), 954–966. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Haas, C., & Hadjar, A. (2020). Students' trajectories through higher education: A review of quantitative research. *Higher Education*, 79(6), 1099–1118. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Hayden, M., & Thi Ly, P. (2015). Higher education access and inclusion: Lessons from Vietnam. In R. T. Teranishi, L. B. Pazich, M. Knobel, & W. R. Allen (Eds.), *Mitigating inequality: Higher education research, policy, and practice in an era of massification and stratification* (pp. 19–33). Emerald.
- Hoang, N. (2022). Gender-sensitive teaching materials: A review of availability and challenges in Vietnamese higher education. *Vietnam Journal of Education Policy*, 15(1), 59–73.
- Hoang, P. (2022). The role of support systems in fostering gender equality in higher education. *Vietnamese Journal of Education*, 39(4), 310–325.
- Kleven, H., Landais, C., Posch, J., Steinhauer, A., & Zweimüller, J. (2024). Do family policies reduce gender inequality? Evidence from 60 years of policy experimentation. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy*, 16(2), 110–149. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Kohtamäki, V., Zheng, G., & Jinia, N. (2024). Gender inequality in academic leadership: Bangladesh, China and Finland. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 78(1), 78–92. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Kollmayer, M., Schultes, M. T., Lüftenegger, M., Finsterwald, M., Spiel, C., & Schober, B. (2020). REFLECT—A teacher training program to promote gender equality in schools. In *Frontiers in education* (Vol. 5, p. 136). Frontiers Media S.A.
- Kuteesa, K. N., Akpuokwe, C. U., & Udeh, C. A. (2024). Gender equity in education: Addressing challenges and promoting opportunities for social empowerment. *International Journal of Applied Research in Social Sciences*, 6(4), 631–641. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Küçükakın, S. (2024). Advancing gender-sensitive pedagogies through continuous professional development. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 49(3), 102–117.
- Le, H., & Do, M. (2020a). The cultural barriers to gender equality in Vietnamese higher education institutions. *International Journal of Gender Studies*, 17(3), 90–105.
- Le, H., & Do, T. (2020b). Gender equality in Vietnamese higher education: Challenges and strategies. *Vietnam Journal of Higher Education Studies*, 17(4), 88–101.
- Le, T., Nguyen, D., & Pham, H. (2022). Teaching methods and their impact on gender equality: A Vietnamese perspective. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 74(2), 217–232.
- Li, J. Y., Lee, Y., & Xu, D. (2023). The role of strategic internal communication in empowering female employees to cope with workplace gender discrimination. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, 28(1), 135–154. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Love, I., Nikolaev, B., & Dhakal, C. (2024). The well-being of women entrepreneurs: The role of gender inequality and gender roles. *Small Business Economics*, 62(1), 325–352. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Luu, T. H., Vu, T. T., & Tran, T. N. (2020). Developing the ability to apply knowledge and skills for students under stem education. *American Journal of Educational Research*, 8(5), 340–346. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Maheshwari, G. (2023). A review of literature on women's leadership in higher education in developed countries and Vietnam: Barriers and enablers. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 51(5), 1067–1086.
- McQuillan, M. T., & Leininger, J. (2023). Supporting gender-inclusive schools: Educators' beliefs about gender diversity training and implementation plans. In *Leading socially just schools* (pp. 162–182). Routledge.
- Merayo, N., & Ayuso, A. (2023). Analysis of barriers, supports and gender gap in the choice of STEM studies in secondary education. *International Journal of Technology and Design Education*, 33(4), 1471–1498. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Meri Crespo, E., Navas Saurin, A. A., & Abiétar López, M. (2024). Providing access to training—Enough to achieve gender equality? An analysis of public gender policies in Vocational Education and Training. *Journal of Vocational Education & Training*, 76(1), 106–122.

- Merma-Molina, G., Urrea-Solano, M., & Hernández-Amorós, M. J. (2024). The integration of gender equality (SDG 5) into university teaching: The view from the frontline. *Innovative Higher Education*, 49, 419–452. [CrossRef]
- Nguyen, A. (2021). Gender bias in Vietnamese higher education curricula: A critical review. *Journal of Educational Research and Practice*, 12(1), 52–67.
- Nguyen, D., & Le, T. (2022). Professional development for gender-sensitive teaching in Vietnamese higher education. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 43(1), 67–85.
- Nguyen, H. C., Evers, C., & Marshall, S. (2017). Accreditation of Vietnam's higher education: Achievements and challenges after a dozen years of development. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 25(4), 475–488. [CrossRef]
- Nguyen, T. (2021). Addressing gender inequality in higher education: A comprehensive approach to curricula and pedagogy. *Higher Education Policy Review*, 29(1), 110–129.
- Nguyen, T., & Phan, Q. (2021). The role of institutional policies in promoting gender equality in Vietnamese universities. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Education*, 42(1), 101–119.
- Nordgaard, A., & Correll, R. (2018). Sampling strategies. In *Integrated analytical approaches for pesticide management* (pp. 31–46). Academic Press.
- Okunade, B. A., Adediran, F. E., Balogun, O. D., Maduka, C. P., Adegoke, A. A., & Daraojimba, R. E. (2023). Gender policies and women's empowerment in nigeria: An analytical review of progress and barriers. *International Journal of Applied Research in Social Sciences*, 5(10), 543–565. [CrossRef]
- Paap, K. R., Anders-Jefferson, R. T., Balakrishnan, N., & Majoubi, J. B. (2024). The many foibles of likert scales challenge claims that self-report measures of self-control are better than performance-based measures. *Behaviour Research Methods*, 56(2), 908–933. [CrossRef]
- Pasque, P. A., & Nicholson, S. E. (Eds.). (2023). *Empowering women in higher education and student affairs: Theory, research, narratives, and practice from feminist perspectives*. Taylor & Francis.
- Patel, J. (2024). Gender equality—A promise to attain sustainable development. *International Journal of Sustainable Building Technology*, 7(1), 48–53.
- Pham, L., Vu, T., & Nguyen, D. (2022). The state of gender equality training programs in Vietnamese universities. *Journal of Educational Reform in Vietnam*, 18(3), 122–137.
- Pham, M., Vu, L., & Tran, T. (2022). Resource challenges in implementing gender-sensitive teaching practices in higher education. *Educational Policy Review*, 38(3), 223–240.
- Phuong, J., Rowe, P., & Lawless, A. (2023). Navigating the river: Experiences of women academic leaders in Vietnam. *Australian Journal of Management*, 48(4), 754–768. [CrossRef]
- Rana, M. Q., Fahim, S., Saad, M., Lee, A., Oladinrin, O. T., & Ojo, L. D. (2024a). Exploring the underlying barriers for the successful transition for women from higher education to employment in Egypt: A focus group study. *Social Sciences*, 13(4), 195. [CrossRef]
- Rana, M. Q., Lee, A., Saher, N., & Shabbir, Z. (2024b). Barriers to empowerment: Examining the transition of Pakistani women from higher education (HE) to professional life. *Social Sciences*, 13(10), 514. [CrossRef]
- Sanfo, J. B. M. B., Ogawa, K., & Truong, T. H. (2024). Education expansion and its returns to education in Vietnam: A two-step Heckman model analysis. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 1–16. [CrossRef]
- Sharif, A. A., Lee, A., Alshdiefat, A. S., Rana, M. Q., & Abu Ghunmi, N. A. (2024). Sustainable gender equality: A comparative perspective on STEM education and employment in Jordan. *Sustainability*, 16(6), 2273. [CrossRef]
- Sigurdardottir, M. S., Rafnsdottir, G. L., Jónsdóttir, A. H., & Kristofersson, D. M. (2023). Student evaluation of teaching: Gender bias in a country at the forefront of gender equality. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 42(4), 954–967.
- Tang, L., & Horta, H. (2024). Supporting academic women's careers: Male and female academics' perspectives at a Chinese research university. *Minerva*, 62(1), 113–139. [CrossRef]
- Tardos, K., & Paksi, V. (2024). The role of the support of top management in gender equality outcomes in higher education and research. *Feminismo/s*, 43(January), 273–309. [CrossRef]
- Tran, H., & Le, Q. (2023). Professional development for gender equality in higher education: Current trends in Vietnam. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 54(1), 145–162.
- Tran, T. H. (2022). Integrating the feminist theory into teaching at higher education, solution to address gender equality in Vietnam. *Dong Thap University Journal of Science*, 11(4), 98–104. [CrossRef]
- United Nations General Assembly. (2015). *Transforming our world: The 2030 agenda for sustainable development*. United Nations.
- United Nations Women. (2018). *Turning promises into action: Gender equality in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*. U.N. Women. Available online: <https://www.unwomen.org/en/digital-library/publications/2018/2/gender-equality-in-the-2030-agenda-for-sustainable-development-2018> (accessed on 2 January 2025).
- Van de Werfhorst, H. G. (2017). Gender segregation across fields of study in post-secondary education: Trends and social differentials. *European Sociological Review*, 33(3), 449–464. [CrossRef]
- Vu, D. (2021). Teachers' awareness of gender dynamics in Vietnamese classrooms. *Vietnam Educational Research Journal*, 40(4), 44–60.

- Vu, M. T., & Pham, T. T. T. (2023). Still in the shadow of Confucianism? Gender bias in contemporary English textbooks in Vietnam. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*, 31(3), 477–497.
- Vu, N. (2021). Gender equality initiatives in Vietnamese universities: Progress and challenges. *Asian Journal of Higher Education*, 9(2), 95–112.
- Vu, T. M., & Yamada, H. (2024). The impacts of Confucianism on gender inequality in Vietnam. *The Journal of Economic Inequality*, 22(1), 165–184. [[CrossRef](#)]
- World Economic Forum. (2022). *Global gender gap report*. World Economic Forum.
- Yolcu, E., & Sarı, M. (2024). An action on gender equality: Educational practices for primary school students in Turkey. *Anadolu Journal of Educational Sciences International*, 14(1), 1–28. [[CrossRef](#)]

Disclaimer/Publisher’s Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.