

Law and gender in higher education – research protocol

V1. 29 April 2020

1	<i>The aim of the research</i>	2
2	<i>Methodology</i>	2
2.1	<i>Theoretical background</i>	2
2.2	<i>Research approach and questions</i>	3
2.3	<i>Methods and sampling</i>	3
3	<i>Team</i>	5
4	<i>Risks and mitigation strategies</i>	6
5	<i>The questionnaire</i>	7
6	<i>References</i>	15

1 The aim of the research

The overall objective of the research is to investigate conditions and attitudes towards gender equality in academic institutions involved in the project.

Beside this, the research and the project itself have two specific goals:

1. To improve existing competences for gender mainstreaming equality in academic institutions
2. Improving cooperation and networking between partners on the project – to enhance intercultural dialogue, exchange of knowledge and experiences and creating fertile communication that will allow common actions aimed at promoting gender equality

Objectives: measure perceptions about gender equality in higher education

Specific objectives: (1) experiences with specific gender related policies at institutional level, (2) perceptions about gender equality in educational material (syllabi, textbooks etc.), (3) general gender patterns and attitudes.

2 Methodology

2.1 Theoretical background

In our analysis, we start from the following assumptions:

There are structural inequalities (in terms of power and other resources) between women and men. The structural differences are visible at the level of organization (Pajvančić M. & Petrušić N. M, 2014: 27), but also at the level of wider communities, grasped by the notion of gender regimes (Hughson, 2015: 255-256).

There are also implicit beliefs and attitudes, not reflected, internalized, that can influence the evaluation of competences and achievements (Roos & Gatta, 2009). These cultural patterns can be observed at individual and at organizational level. Throughout the analysis we will need to distinguish between explicit organizational policies and organizational culture which is more informal and implicit.

Surveys often demonstrate that university professionals are aware of gender equality and support it as an organizational principle. However, official statistics (e.g. on leadership positions in faculties, universities, and projects; support mechanisms for reintegration of parents after parental leave etc.) and in-depth qualitative researches show structural inequalities in access to various resources (in Serbian context, cf. Babović, 2010: 26, 46-47c). This is the consequence of interaction of structural and cultural (implicit) patterns.

Having this in mind, we assume that gender (in)equality is reproduced in social and university environment and at three levels: at the level of institutions, at the level of education process and content and at wider societal level.

2.2 Research approach and questions

Professional and wider socio-economic position and opinions of the university staff will be analysed according to the three dimensions of gender (in)equality:

- a) **institutional framework** – quality of rules and regulations regarding career promotion, gender pay gap, maternity leave and parental leave, family friendly institutional support, new jobs` announcements, protection from sexual harassment and mobbing, as well as from family violence,
- b) **educational framework** – quality of gender (in)sensitivity of the study programmes, syllabi and textbooks (Vujadinović & Petrušić, 2017), as well as of the pedagogical approach and “the hidden curriculum” (value statements, prejudices, and stereotypes implied in the communication and relation between academic staff in itself and between professors and students); and
- c) **cultural setting** – value systems, stereotypes, prejudices of the professors regarding gender issues in academia (personal estimate of the necessity of gender equality, how it should or could be reached, do women have equal capacities and/or equal opportunities, what “fair share of private and professional duties” should mean, what should be a family friendly institutional design, is positive discrimination necessary...).

The following research question will be the basis of the survey tool:

- Do organizational cultures promote gender equality or maintain patterns of gender segregation, inequality, and do they reproduce gender stereotypes and sexism?
- Are integrative rituals (e.g. leadership change, member promotion) equally accessible to women and men, or are segregation patterns occurring in this aspect as well?
- Are curricula and textbooks gender sensitive?
- What are attitudes and beliefs of staff with regards to the gender equality (as well as what are underlying values)?
- Are organizations aware of the need to monitor gender equality and that specific policies work to promote gender equality?
- Who is or should be the policy holder, or who are the agents of change?

2.3 Methods and sampling

We will use the following research techniques:

1. Desk analysis of existing administrative data on staff selection and promotion, membership in boards and other managing bodies, etc.
2. Online survey on attitudes of academic staff on gender (in)equality in higher education.

1. **Desk analysis.** Desk analysis is the first step in the gender assessment of an academic programmes and organization, because it gives basic, factual and quantitative information (ILO, 2012: 33). In this case, desk analysis is investigating gender issues embedded in our organization. We will be following the ILO Gender Audit approach, that is, the ILO Participatory Gender Audit Methodology proposed by International Labour Office (ILO, 2012: 14-22) This step will include analysis of official data on leadership position, promotions, organizational/formal policies (formal acts, strategies, or other documents that specifically regulate the field of gender equality or are relevant for gender equality). Key data: gender ratio among students, different academic and management positions, existence or nonexistence of certain policies and procedures related to e.g. balancing work and childcare etc.

1. **On-line survey.** A short on-line questionnaire will be focused on three dimensions of the analysis (institutional, educational and cultural). We will use random sample of junior and senior academic staff at our universities. An email invitation with link will be send sent directly to selected respondents. It is expected that a total of 30 to 40 academic staff per institution will make up the sample.

3 Team

The team is made up of researchers from four universities who are partners on the project:

1. University of Cádiz - professor Raquel Pastor and professor Eva Bermúdez
2. University of Örebro - professor Rigmor Argren
3. LUMSA University - professor Antonio Martuscelli
4. University of Belgrade – associate professor Danilo Vuković and teaching assistant Valerija Dabetić

4 Risks and mitigation strategies

Risks	Mitigation strategies
Academic staff would not be willing to respond to questionnaire.	Send reminders and kind invitation to selected respondents. If not effective, invite other to participate in the questionnaire.
Respondents do not answer on all required survey questions - incomplete survey	We will expand the sample or invite others to take part in the research
Administrative data not available	Reduce the analyses to existing and comparable data

5 The questionnaire

A QUESTIONNAIRE FOR GATHERING INFORMATION ON THE ATTITUDES OF EMPLOYEES OF THE CONSORTIUM MEMBERS` ACADEMICS ABOUT GENDER EQUALITY ISSUES

This questionnaire has been created within the Erasmus Plus project titled “New Quality in Education for Gender Equality – Strategic Partnership for the Development of a Master's Study Program LAW AND GENDER – LAWGEM”. The University of Belgrade Faculty of Law is the coordinator of the LAWGEM project, and the members of the Consortium are the Orebro University from Sweden, the LUMSA University from Italy, the University of Cadiz from Spain, and the Saarland University from Germany.

This questionnaire represents one of the proposed intellectual outputs of the LAWGEM project, the so-called Empirical Survey Tool, and all Consortium members will be using it as the instrument for exploring the attitudes of teachers at their own university. After collecting data and analysis from each particular survey, the experts from all Consortium members will undertake a comparative analysis. The results of the conducted empirical surveys at each university as well as the comparative analysis results will be published within the LAWGEM project.

The results of this research will be available at the webpage of the LAWGEM project - lawgem.ius.bg.ac.rs

Filling out this questionnaire, anonymously, takes about 20 minutes.

All of the questions are of the closed-ended variety.

We kindly ask you to fill out this questionnaire. We would like to thank you upfront for your time, good will and cooperation.

Q1) Gender

1	Male
2	Female
3	Other

Q2) Age: _____

Q3) What is marital status:

1	Single
2	Married or partnership
3	Divorced
4	Widow or widower
5	Something else

Q4) Are you a parent?

1	Yes
2	No

Q5) Academic title

1	BA
2	Master
3	Magister of science
4	Phd

Q6) Type of contract:

1	Part time
2	Full time

Q7) Are you on a substitute position?

1	Yes
2	No
9	DK/NA

Q8) Duration of contract

1	Limited/temporary position
2	Unlimited (undefined in terms of time)/permanent position
3	Civil servant (for Spain...)??

Q9) Level in academic hierarchy

1	Graduate teaching assistant
2	Teaching assistant
3	Assistant professor=PhD Lecturer
4	Associate professor
5	Full professor

Q10) Ideological self-location scale

Extreme Left-wing										Extreme right-wing
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	

Cultural/general level

Q11) Please tell me whether you agree or disagree with each of the following statements

	Totally agree	Tend to agree	Tend to disagree	Totally disagree	Don't know
Q11_1: It is acceptable for man to cry	4	3	2	1	9
Q11_2: Women are more likely than man to make decisions based on their emotions	4	3	2	1	9
Q11_3: The most important role of a women is to take care of her home and family	4	3	2	1	9
Q11_4: The most important role of a man is to earn money	4	3	2	1	9

Q12) Do you think that gender equality has been achieved in Serbia in

	Yes, definitely	Yes, to some extent	No, not really	No, not at all	Don't know
Q12_1: Politics	4	3	2	1	9
Q12_2: At work	4	3	2	1	9
Q12_3: In leadership positions in companies and other organisations	4	3	2	1	9

Q13) Please tell me whether you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.

	Totally agree	Tend to agree	Tend to disagree	Totally disagree	Don't know
Q13_1: Promoting gender equality is important to ensure a fair and democratic society	4	3	2	1	9
Q13_2: Promoting gender equality is important for companies and for the economy	4	3	2	1	9
Q13_3: Promoting gender equality is important for your faculty	4	3	2	1	9
Q13_4: Promoting gender equality is important for you personally	4	3	2	1	9

Q14) If you had to choose between the following options which would you prefer? Please show how close your opinion is to the statements by choosing a number between 1 and 5

	1	2	3	4	5	
Q14_1: A woman should be prepared to cut down on her paid work for the sake of her family	1	2	3	4	5	A woman should not have to cut down on her paid work for the sake of her family
Q14_2: Men should take as much responsibility as women for the home and children	1	2	3	4	5	Women should take more responsibility for the home and children
Q14_3: When jobs are scarce, men should have more right to a job than women	1	2	3	4	5	When jobs are scarce, women should have the same right to a job as men

Q15) How often are you or have been involved in any of the following activities outside of paid work?

	Every day	Several times a week	Once or twice a week	Less often than once a week	Never	Don't know
Q15_1: Hygiene, bathing	5	4	3	2	1	9
Q15_2: Feeding	5	4	3	2	1	9
Q15_3: Taking them to school	5	4	3	2	1	9
Q15_4: After-school activities	5	4	3	2	1	9
Q15_5: School tasks	5	4	3	2	1	9
Q15_6: Going to the park	5	4	3	2	1	9
Q15_7: Other leisure activities	5	4	3	2	1	9
Q15_8: Cooking and housework	5	4	3	2	1	9
Q15_9: Caring for elderly/ disabled relatives	5	4	3	2	1	9

Institutional level

Q16) Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements:

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Somewhat at disagree	Neutral / no opinion	Somewhat at agree	Agree	Strongly agree
Q16_1: In general, men and women are equally well represented (in terms of numbers) in my faculty	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Q16_2: In general, men and women are treated equally in my department	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Q16_3: My department is committed to promoting gender equality	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Q16_4: If I had any concerns about gender equality in my department, I would know who to approach	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Q16_5: My department is responsive to concerns about gender equality	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Q17) In your department, have you perceived a difference in any of the following with regards to gender?

	Yes, always to the advantage of women	Yes, often to the advantage of women	Yes, occasionally to the advantage of women	I have not noticed a difference	Yes, occasionally to the advantage of men	Yes, often to the advantage of men	Yes, always to the advantage of men
Q17_1: Allocation of desirable and sought-after tasks or roles	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Q17_2: Distribution of office space	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Q17_3: The receipt of mentoring and/or other guidance in making career decisions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Q17_4: Representation in senior positions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Q17_5: Allocation of administrative tasks	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Q18) In your department, have you perceived a difference in any of the following with regards to gender?

	Yes, always to the advantage of women	Yes, often to the advantage of women	Yes, occasionally to the advantage of women	I have not noticed a difference	Yes, occasionally to the advantage of men	Yes, often to the advantage of men	Yes, always to the advantage of men
Q18_1: Attention from senior management	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Q18_2: Access to informal circles of influence	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Q18_3: Receiving positive feedback from management	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Q18_4: Recruitment and selections for academic posts	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Q18_5: Promotion decisions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Q19) In your department, have you perceived a difference in any of the following with regards to gender?

	Yes, always to the advantage of women	Yes, often to the advantage of women	Yes, occasionally to the advantage of women	I have not noticed a difference	Yes, occasionally to the advantage of men	Yes, often to the advantage of men	Yes, always to the advantage of men
Q19_1: Allocation of formal training and career development opportunities	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Q19_2: Allocation of teaching	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Q19_3: Participation in projects	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Q19_4: Invitations to lectures, conferences, etc.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Q19_5: Appointments to editorships of journals	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Q19_6: Recognition of intellectual contributions during meetings, conferences, workshops etc.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Q20) How would you assess the following statements

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neutral / no opinion	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree
Q20_1: My supervisor has understanding for my caring responsibilities (at home, for children and elderly...)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Q20_2: My Faculty has policies put in place (effective) for life-work balancing	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Q20_3: My work schedule allows me to spend time with my family and friends	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Q20_4: I am able to set boundaries between work and life	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Q20_5: I am satisfied with my work-life balance	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Q20_6: My schedule has never being changed for my motherhood/parenthood/elderly care responsibilities	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Q21) (FILTER) In my institution, during or after my parental leave, the following policies were in place:

	Exist and are implemented	Exist, but are not implemented	They are implemented , but do not exist formally	Don't know
Q21_1: Keeping in touch with the department while away	3	2	1	9
Q21_2: Flexible working hours	3	2	1	9
Q21_3: Initial part-time working building up to full time	3	2	1	9
Q21_4: Lower initial teaching load	3	2	1	9
Q21_5: Lower initial administrative load	3	2	1	9
Q21_6: Lower initial research supervision	3	2	1	9
Q21_7: Parent's network, support group at work	3	2	1	9
Q21_8: Additional block of shared parental leave	3	2	1	9
Q21_9: Facilities for continued baby care	3	2	1	9
D21_10: Childcare services at workplace	3	2	1	9

Q22) (FILTER) Please indicate whether your institution provided you with information on the following when preparing you for your most recent or current period of maternity, paternity, adoption, parental, or other type of parental leave

	My institution did not provide information and I did not ask	I asked for information, but received none	I asked for and received information	Information was provided without me asking
Q22_1: Childcare related policies, including payments and benefits	1	2	3	4
Q22_2: Facilities for continued baby feeding on return to work	1	2	3	4
Q22_3: Contacts for supporting services (e.g. HR, occupational health)	1	2	3	4
Q22_4: Time off for antenatal appointments	1	2	3	4
Q22_5: Health and safety assessment	1	2	3	4
Q22_6: How and when to notify your institution of your intentions regarding return to work	1	2	3	4
Q22_7: Workplace childcare facilities	1	2	3	4
Q22_8: Leave cover and handover	1	2	3	4
Q22_9: Options for phased return, or other forms of workload adjustment on return	1	2	3	4
Q22_10: Rest facilities during pregnancy	1	2	3	4

Q23. Please answer the following questions:

	Yes	No	I don't know	I prefer not to answer
I have knowledge of sexual harassment of students by the teaching staff in my professional life in academia	1	2	8	9
I have suffered sexual harassment in the context of academia by senior position colleagues.	1	2	8	9
I have knowledge of sexual harassment by senior position academics to lower positioned academic personnel.	1	2	8	9
The cases of sexual harassment in academia I have knowledge are treated as something to cover and hide, turning a blind eye and not really protecting the victim.	1	2	8	9
The cases of sexual harassment in academia I have knowledge of, have been legally treated and the victim was protected.	1	2	8	9

Educational level

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neutral / no opinion	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree
Q24_1: Curricula at my faculty are gender sensitive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Q24_2: It is necessary to perform a critical reconsideration from the gender sensitive point of view of all the textbooks used at my faculty.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Q24_3: Gender sensitive legal studies are important to the professional competences of the future lawyers, judges and members of other legal professions.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Q24_4: As a rule, classes do not provide a gender perspective when learning about legal institutes.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Q24_5: Gender perspective in legal studies is utterly irrelevant to the quality of content and the meaning of acquired legal knowledge.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Q24_6: Additional education of teaching staff on matters of gender equality is necessary at my faculty.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Q24_7: Introducing gender perspective in higher education curricula should be regulated by law.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Q24_8: Standards for accreditation of study programmes should have as a compulsory requirement the ability to understand and apply the principles of gender equality.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

6 References

1. Babović, M. (2010). *Rodne ekonomske nejednakosti u komparativnoj perspektivi: Evropska Unija i Srbija*. Sociološko udruženje Srbije i Crne Gore, Institut za sociološka istraživanja Filozofskog fakulteta u Beogradu, SeConS – Grupa za razvojnu inicijativu. Beograd.
2. Hughson, M. (2015). „Rodni režimi na poluperiferiji“. *Zeničke sveske - Časopis za društvenu fenomenologiju i kulturnu dijalogiku* 21:255-265, <https://www.ceeol.com/search/article-detail?id=749917>
3. Hughson, M. (2015). *Poluperiferija i rod: pobuna konteksta*. Institut za kriminološka i sociološka istraživanja, Beograd.
4. Hughson, M. (2017). *Muškarci u Srbiji druga strana rodne ne/ravnopravnosti*. Institut za kriminološka i sociološka istraživanja. Beograd.
5. Hughson, M. (2017). "Unpacking Silence and Distortion: Mapping Misogyny in Serbia". *Књиженство* 7:137-147.
6. Vujadinović, D., Petrušić, N. (2017). „Gender Mainstreaming in Legal Education in Serbia: A Pilot Analysis Of Curricula And Textbooks“. *Annals FLB – Belgrade Law Review* LXV/ 4
7. Gender mainstreaming – Conceptual framework, methodology and presentation of good practices, 1998, <http://www.unhcr.org/3c160b06a.pdf> (assessed 28. 04. 2020)
8. Pajvančić, M., Petrušić, N. M. (2014). „Značaj institucionalnih mehanizama za ostvarivanje rodne ravnopravnosti“. *Zbornik radova Pravnog fakulteta u Nišu*, br. 67
9. European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE), Report on Effectiveness of Institutional Mechanisms for the Advancement of Gender Equality Review of the implementation of the Beijing Platform for Action in the EU Member States, file:///C:/Users/Valerija/Downloads/mh0213481enc_0.pdf (assessed 28.04.2020.)
10. International Labour Office (2012). *A Manual for Gender Audit Facilitators - the ILO Participatory Gender Audit Methodology - 2nd Edition*. Geneva.
11. Roos, P. A, Gatta, M. L. (2009). „Gender (in)equity in the academy: Subtle mechanisms and the production of inequality“. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility* 27: 177–200.