

ERASMUS + STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP IN HIGHER EDUCATION - New Quality in Education for Gender Equality
- Strategic Partnership for the Development of Master`s Study program LAW AND GENDER, LAWGEM -
Project No: 2019-1-RS01-KA203-00088



LAWGEM

Master`s Study Program
Law and Gender

LAWGEM



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

Report of Intellectual Output 2 of the LAWGEM Project

—

Mapping Gender Equality at Belgrade University

Belgrade University

January 28 2021

Content

1. Introduction	4
1.1 <i>Theoretical framework</i>	4
1.2 <i>Belgrade University</i>	4
2. Method	6
2.1 <i>Design</i>	6
2.2 <i>Desk analysis</i>	6
2.3 <i>The Empirical Survey Tool - EST</i>	6
2.3.1 <i>The EST index</i>	8
2.4 <i>Sample</i>	8
2.5 <i>Procedure</i>	9
2.6 <i>Analysis</i>	9
3. Results	10
3.1 <i>Desk analysis</i>	10
3.2 <i>Background information of the sample as presented in the survey</i>	10
3.3 <i>Empirical Survey</i>	11
3.3.1 <i>Cultural/general level</i>	11
3.3.2 <i>Institutional level</i>	13
3.3.3 <i>Educational level</i>	15
4. Analysis	16
4.1 <i>Total index and overall results</i>	16
4.1.1 <i>Institutional level</i>	17
4.1.2 <i>Educational level</i>	18
4.2 <i>Limitations</i>	18
4.3 <i>Conclusion</i>	19
5. References	20
6. Appendix 1. Empirical Survey Tool – EST	21

1. Introduction

A consortium led by the University of Belgrade, Faculty of Law and consisting of Örebro University from Sweden, LUMSA University from Italy, the University of Cadiz from Spain, and Saarland University from Germany is working on the Erasmus Plus project *New Quality in Education for Gender Equality – Strategic Partnership for the Development of a Master's Study Program LAW AND GENDER – LAWGEM*. As an integral part of developing the master's program in Law and Gender, the mentioned universities have carried out an empirical study of attitudes towards selected gender issues held by their respective faculty staff, within the proposed LAWGEM intellectual output 2 (IO2) This report presents the results and analysis of this mapping. The results of the conducted empirical surveys at each University, as well as the comparative analysis, will be published within the LAWGEM project and will be available as the completed IO2 at the webpage of the LAWGEM project.

1.1 Theoretical framework

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 & Petrušić, 2014), but also the level of wider communities, grasped by the notion of gender regimes (Hughson, 2015a, b). There are also implicit beliefs and attitudes, not reflected, internalized, that can influence the evaluation of competencies and achievements (Roos & Gatta, 2009). These cultural patterns can be observed at an individual as well as organizational level. The analysis distinguishes between explicit organizational policies and organizational culture, which is more informal and implicit.

Furthermore, surveys often demonstrate that university professionals are aware of gender equality and support it as an organizational principle. However, official statistics related to leadership positions in faculties, universities, and projects, also related to support mechanisms for the reintegration of parents after parental leave, etc., as well as to in-depth qualitative research show structural inequalities in access to various resources (in Serbian context, cf. Babović, 2010). This is the consequence of the interaction of structural and cultural (implicit) patterns. Having this in mind, we assume that gender (in)equality is reproduced in social and University environments at three levels: at the level of institutions, at the level of the education process and content, and a broader societal level.

The overall aim of the second output in the LAWGEM project - called Empirical Survey Tool (EST) - was to investigate and map conditions and attitudes towards gender equality in academic institutions involved in the project.

1.2 Belgrade University

The University of Belgrade is one of the oldest university centers in the region. It was established in the first half of the XIX century and thereby has a long tradition as a leading educational institution. The University played the role of Alma mater of all universities in Serbia, Montenegro, and Macedonia, and a large part of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Presently, the University of Belgrade

comprises 31 faculties, eight research institutes, and a University library. It conjugates approximately 2,500 professors and about 78,000 students, a significant number from neighbouring countries.

The Faculty of Law, established in 1808 as part of the University of Belgrade, is one of the largest law faculties in the region, with a long tradition of being at the forefront of the country's legal education. Since its founding, it has educated almost 50,000 law graduates, around 1,200 *magistri iuris* and 830 *doctores iuris*, as well as hundreds of specialists in various areas. Many Faculty of Law alumni have become recognized experts and scholars in all branches of law, law professors, and high-ranking government officials. At present, there are about 8.000 students enrolled in undergraduate studies and hundreds more at various levels of post-graduate studies (23 master programs and 16 doctoral programs). Faculty of Law attracts students from different countries through the Erasmus+ program and other international exchange programs. International students often enrol at Master's program in European Integration, Master's program in Public Procurement, and Master's program in Tax Law, which are entirely taught in English. The number of academic staff varies. The number is currently 103, among whom 37 full professors, 20 associate professors, 21 assistant professors/Ph.D. lecturers plus three lecturers of foreign languages (24), 14 assistants and 7 young assistants, together 21 teaching assistants.

2. Method

2.1 Design

This study's design was twofold; first, a desk analysis was performed; second, an online survey was conducted.

Desk analysis. Desk analysis was the first step in the gender assessment of an academic program and organization since it gives basic, factual, and quantitative information (ILO, 2012). In this case, desk analysis was investigating gender issues embedded in the organization. The work followed the ILO Participatory Gender Audit approach, that is, the ILO's proposed methodology to promote organizational learning (ILO, 2012: 14-22)

Online survey. An online questionnaire was constructed that focused on three dimensions; cultural, institutional, and educational. The survey was conducted within each university faculty, where law education was held.

2.2 Desk analysis

The desk analysis aims to create a contextualization of the data for the faculty where the survey was conducted. The desk analysis included official data on gender ratio concerning academic staff and students relevant for working towards gender equality.

2.3 The Empirical Survey Tool - EST

The Empirical Survey Tool (EST) was developed by the EST team, consisting of members from all five universities. The work was carried out through e-mails, web meetings and physical meetings with each university team. The EST aimed to map the professional positions as well as wider socio-economic positions and opinions of the university staff according to three dimensions of gender (in)equality. It has been developed based on ASSET's (Athena Survey of Science, Engineering, and Technology) questionnaire¹, European Social Survey, European Quality of Survey, Eurobarometer, as well as a pre-test questionnaire carried out at the University of Belgrade. Each part will be further explained. For the full EST see Appendix 1.

For the background questions dichotomous answers were chosen, i.e., yes/no. For the three thematic areas Likert scales ranging from strongly or totally disagree (1) to /strongly or totally agree (4-6) were used. Two questions had a scale ranging from informally/ not providing information (1-2) to exist and implemented/ provided information (3-4). No answer or missing value was set to (9) for all questions and were excluded from analysis.

A series of socio-demographic variables were established at the beginning, which will be taken as independent variables, to measure attitudes and perceptions regarding the gender perspective in

¹ The ASSET Survey aims to explore the association between gender and experiences, expectations and perceptions of the workplace among STEM academics, and to contribute to work improving conditions for STEM academics across the sector. The validity of ASSET survey is tested in 2016, conducted among STEM academics in 52 universities that make up the sample. Previous ASSET surveys cumulatively received over 14,500 respondents from more than 70 universities. (Scottish Funding Council, the Higher Education Funding Council for Wales and Universities UK).

academia. In this section, structural differences by each university of origin have to be taken into account, so that various categorizations of both contract typology and professional categories are considered. Last question in the background group (Q10) is aimed to detect the involvement of the respondents in the care tasks of dependent children or relatives², and could be interpreted in connection with Q18, Q19 and Q20 regarding institutional support to work and family life balance.

1. **Cultural/ general level**– This theme consisted of 4 questions (Q11-Q14) with a total of 14 sub-questions, where Q11 (4), Q12 (3) and Q13 (4) had values from 1 – 4, and Q14 (3) had values from 1 to 5. The questions concerned 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.
2. **Institutional framework** – This theme consisted of 8 questions (Q15-Q22) with a total of 48 sub-questions, where Q15 (5), Q16 (5), Q17 (5), Q18 (5), Q19 (5) and Q22 (6) had values from 1 – 6, while Q20 (10) had values from 1 to 3 and Q 21 (7) had values from 1 to 4. The questions aimed to identify the perception and/or the level of awareness of the gender gap in the institution, particularly – but not only - related to work and life balance measures. They aim at measuring overall work life balance satisfaction and attitudes about the role of direct supervisors, the institutions and the amount of workload on reaching and maintaining that balance. Hence, we assume that the position of academic staff with regards to the work life balance depends at least on these three levels: direct supervisor, faculty and the amount of workload, that is, the actual level of tasks to be completed by academic staff members. It concerned the quality of rules and regulations regarding recruitment, career promotion, maternity leave and parental leave, family friendly institutional support, and gender allocation gap in the workplace, sexist behaviour and sexual harassment.
3. **Educational framework** – This theme consisted of 1 question Q23 with a total of 8 sub-questions, where values ranged from 1 to 6. The questions aimed to detect the perception of the professors of the need to insert gender perspective in law programs and studies, and concerned the perception of 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.

² The justification on the validity of these activities is founded on the Questionnaire on Time Use from National Statistics Institute in Spain (2010-2011) (https://www.ine.es/daco/daco42/empleo/cues_hogar.pdf), related to activities in the households, divided in different ambits as: Meal preparation, House maintenance, Preparation and care of clothing and household items, Construction and repairs, Shopping, Home management and services, child care and care of adults. According to this, the list of activities included related to children and elderly care, are:

8. Child care Physical care, monitoring of children. Reading, playing, talking, helping with homework or studies. School/kindergarten meeting. Accompanying the children to school, to the doctor, ...Transporting the children.

9. Care of adults (except domestic work) Personal services to adults in general, care of disabled, sick or elderly adults. Cleaning, haircutting, massage. Psychological aid, information and advice. Accompanying an adult to the doctor. Hospital visits. Reading, playing, talking.

The following research questions were the basis of the EST:

- 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 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?

2.3.1 *The EST index*

An index of gender equality was made for each subscale as well as for the total EST. The index value was created by adding the answers for all questions within all three teams to a separate subtotal value for each thematic part. Then, to create an index value for the entire scale subtotal values were added into a total value. Missing values were treated as 0.

The reliability analysis showed that Q20 had too many missing values and thereby had to be excluded from further analysis of the index. Although, Q20 was analyzed as a separate question in table 4, the overall internal consistency of the EST was found to be acceptable.

For Belgrade university the following analysis where done:

- The sub-index for Cultural/general level consists of 14 questions. The value ranges from 14 to 59. The Cronbachs alpha value was 0.66.
- The sub-index for institutional level consists of 38 questions. The value ranges from 38 to 214. The Cronbachs alpha value was 0.91.
- The sub-index for Educational level consists of 8 questions. The value ranges from 8 to 48. The Cronbachs alpha value was 0.85.
- The total index consists of all three levels. The value ranges from 60 to 321. The Cronbachs alpha value was 0.90.

2.4 *Sample*

The sample from the University of Belgrade was constructed out from the Faculty of Law's whole academic staff. The number was currently 103 staff; 37 full professors, 20 associate professors, 21 assistant professors/ Ph.D. lecturers plus three lecturers of foreign languages (24), 14 assistants, and 7 young assistants. Of the 103 staff 34 (33%) are involved in the LAWGEM project. All colleagues received the questionnaire online and also responded online and anonymously.

Of the 103 staff members who received the EST, the response rate was 60.2 %, ($n= 62$).

2.5 Procedure

Each partner university translated the EST from English into its language. The Belgrade team constructed the EST technical part. The EST was then created into a web survey tool, one for each University and language. The survey link was sent out to the EST teams who coordinated the data collection but did not store data. Thereby, the survey was anonymous for the universities. Data were collected from June 22nd to July 15th.

When data collection was finished, the Belgrade team transferred the data into SPSS files. The Belgrade team then analysed data, and results were presented for each University as results in word files with analysis from SPSS.

2.6 Analysis

The descriptive statistics were done by using frequency, percentage, arithmetic mean, and standard deviation. Based on data structure for gender comparisons, chi-square analyses were used to analyse data on the categorical level, and independent sample t-test analyses were used for interval/ratio level. For comparisons between universities, based on data structure, chi-square analyses were used to analyse data on a categorical level. First, one-way ANOVA's were completed, and post hoc tests for multiple comparisons for observed means were done. All statistical analyses were done using SPSS version 25.

Missing values and no answers were excluded from all comparative analyses.

The SPSS analysis will be presented with the overall results. For specific results of statistical analysis, data can be provided upon request.

3. Results

The results part is divided into three sections: the desk analysis, background information from the survey, and the survey results regarding the three themes.

3.1 Desk analysis

The desk analysis was based on data from the Faculty of Law at Belgrade University. Data were collected from official records at the University, and represents the academic year 2019/2020. In total, 1232 students were enrolled in courses/programs of any level of education during the study year, and 102 members of the staff were employed at the Faculty for the same period.

The results shown in table 1 reveal that overall female students to a higher degree enrolled than male students as well as completed their studies at undergraduate, master and doctoral studies in higher percentage than male students.

There were gender differences concerning the academic staff, where the higher level of academic title, the larger disproportion in favor of men in relation to women was shown. There were also more men than women in Faculty management and leadership positions. Not fully in line with these results more women have slightly less temporary positions than men do.

Table 1. Descriptive data from the Faculty of Law at Belgrade university per academic year for 2019/2020.

Question	Total	Women (Fq, %)	Men (Fq, %)
Students enrolled to all educational programs/courses	1232	728 (59.9%)	504 (41.1%)
Students graduated	919	577 (62.8%)	342 (37.2%)
Students enrolled to master studies	543	320 (58.9%)	223 (41.07%)
Students enrolled to doctoral studies	37	20 (54.0%)	17 (46.0%)
Students with achieved MA – in 2019/2020	283	171 (63.9%)	112 (36.1%)
Students with achieved PhD diplomas – in 2019/2020	8	5 (62.5%)	3 (37.5%)
Faculty management and leadership positions	5	2 (40.0%)	3 (60.0%)
Faculty teaching staff	103	42 (40.8%)	61 (59.2%)
- Teaching assistant	21	14 (66.6%)	7 (33.8%)
- Assistant professor/ PhD Lecturer	24	12 (50.0%)	12 (50.0%)
- Associate Professor	20	8 (40.0%)	12 (60.0%)
- Full Professor	37	12 (32.4%)	25 (67.6%)
Permanent positions – only full professors	37	10 (27.9%)	26 (72.1%)
Temporary positions	66	32 (48.4%)	34 (51.6%)

3.2 Background information of the sample as presented in the survey

In total, 62 (60.2 %) of the staff at the Faculty of Law at Belgrade university performed the EST. They are hereafter named respondents, of which 33 (54.1 %) were female, 28 (45.9 %) were male, and one missing. Their mean age was 37.8 years (sd= 17.7 years). Their marital status was single (15, 25.4 %), married or partnership (35, 59.3 %), divorced (2, 3.4 %), widow or widower (1, 1.7

%), or something else (6, 10.2%). 35 (59.3 %) of the respondents stated that they were parents. There were no missing answers to these questions.

The academic degree presented for the respondents in the EST was having a BA (2, 3.3 %), Master (14, 23.3 %), or a PhD (44, 73.3 %) degree. Respondents stated that they held a part time contract (1, 1.8 %) or a full-time contract (56, 98.2 %), where the duration of the contract was temporary positions (41, 68.3 %), or permanent position (19, 31.7 %). Their professional category where graduate/teaching assistant (13, 22.8 %), Assistant professor/PhD Lecturer (16, 28.1 %), Associate Professor (11, 19.3 %), and Full Professor (17, 29.8 %). Five (8.1%) did not answer.

Regarding the background question 10, overall, about three-fourths (75 %) of respondents answered the question of *How often are you or have you been involved in any of the following activities, outside of paid work, related to your dependent children or relatives?* Of those who considered the question as relevant, the most frequent answer on the intensity of involvement in the following activities: Hygiene/bathing (23 (47.9 %) of 48, Every day), Feeding, (19 (38.8 %) of 49, Every day), Taking them to school (18 (40.0 %) of 45, Every day), After-school activities (22 (46.8 %) of 47, Several times a week), School tasks (13 (29.5 %) of 44, never), Going to the park (14 (29.2 %) of 48, Several times a week), Other leisure activities (17 (37.0 %) of 46, Several times a week), Cooking and housework (15 (32.6 %) of 46, Several times a week), and Caring for elderly/ disabled relatives (16 (35.6 %) of 45, Never).

Gender differences were found for after-school activities and going to the park, where women were less likely to perform these activities than men.³

3.3 Empirical Survey

The mean index for the overall EST was 213 (SD = 31.97). There were no gender differences on the index level where women (211, SD= 35.15) had equal index values to men (214, SD= 28.99), $t(59)=0.33$, n.s.

Results for each theme is presented separately.

3.3.1 Cultural/general level

The results from the cultural/general level show that a significant level of gender equality has been achieved in the cultural/general mindset, which can be seen in table 2, where the mean values for both genders is close to the highest value of each question. Statements like - it is legitimate that men cry, that gender equality is important for ensuring a fair and democratic society, gender equality is important for companies and economy as well as men should have equal responsibility as women for home and children and that men should not have priority for getting a job when there is a lack of jobs, are all said to be important for the respondents. These responses speak positively about important changes in value statements towards overcoming deeply rooted patriarchal stereotypes and prejudices.

³ See similar results: M. Blagojević Hjuson, *Rodni barometer u Srbiji: Razvoj i svakodnevni život*, Beograd 2013; M. Hughson, *Muškarci u Srbiji druga strana rodne ne/ravnopravnosti*, Institut za kriminološka i sociološka istraživanja, Beograd 2017.

Gender differences were found for 12_1 (Gender equality has been achieved in Serbia in politics), 12_2 (Gender equality has been achieved in Serbia at work), and 12_3 questions (Gender equality has been achieved in Serbia in leadership positions in companies and other organizations), indicating that gender equality is present to a higher degree for men than for women. Namely, men are more of the opinion that gender equality has been achieved in Serbia in politics, at work, and in leadership positions in companies and other organizations. However, these results can also be interpreted and most probably should be interpreted in a way that women have been more critical than men towards the given state of affairs concerning gender equality achievements in politics, at work, and in leadership positions in Serbia.

Gender differences were also found for 13_1 (Promoting gender equality is important to ensure a fair and democratic society), 13_2 (Promoting gender equality is important for companies and for the economy) and 13_3 (Promoting gender equality is important for your faculty) questions, indicating that gender equality is present to a higher degree for women than men, in a sense that women have been more aware of the mentioned importance.

Table 2. Gender comparative result for the cultural/general level by 62 respondents at Belgrade university for questions 11 to 14.

Question ¹	Missing values	Women (m, sd)	Men (m, sd)	Gender differences ²
Q11_1	0	3.9 (0.3)	3.7 (0.7)	NO
Q11_2	0	2.9 (1.0)	2.7 (1.0)	NO
Q11_3	1	3.1 (1.0)	2.8 (1.0)	NO
Q11_4	0	3.4 (0.8)	3.1 (0.9)	NO
Q12_1	3	2.1 (0.9)	2.9 (0.9)	YES
Q12_2	3	2.3 (0.8)	3.0 (0.8)	YES
Q12_3	1	1.9 (0.8)	2.9 (0.8)	YES
Q13_1	0	3.8 (0.4)	3.4 (0.9)	YES
Q13_2	1	3.7 (0.6)	3.1 (0,8)	YES
Q13_3	0	3.8 (0.4)	3.4 (0.9)	YES
Q13_4	1	3.6 (0.6)	3.4 (0.9)	NO
Q14_1	0	3.7 (1.2)	3.1 (1.3)	NO
Q14_2	0	4.8 (0.7)	4.4 (1.0)	NO
Q14_3	0	4.5 (1,3)	4.3 (1.3)	NO

¹For full text on questions, please see EST appendix 1.

²Differences are calculated with the t-test analysis. Significant differences are set at $p < .05$ and labeled YES. If no significance is found, it is labeled NO

The index for the cultural/general level was 46 (SD= 5.64). There were no gender differences on the index level where women (47, SD= 5.26) had equal index values to men (45, SD= 6.10), $t(59) = -1.14$, n.s.

3.3.2 Institutional level

The index for the institutional level was 137 (SD= 27.88). It could be concluded that the institutional framework at the Faculty of Law has reached a certain level of gender equality, since the mean value are relatively high. The results shown in table 3 support this statement, since mean values in general are between 4-6.

Table 3. Gender comparative result for the institutional level by respondents at Belgrade university for questions 15 to 19 and 22, ranging from 1 to 6

Question ¹	Missing values	Women (m, sd)	Men (m, sd)	Gender differences ²
Q15_1	1	4.2 (1.8)	4.8 (1.4)	NO
Q15_2	0	4.1 (1.4)	5.0 (1.3)	YES
Q15_3	2	3.9 (1.3)	5.1 (1.1)	YES
Q15_4	4	3.8 (1.7)	4.6 (1.6)	NO
Q15_5	4	4.7 (1.0)	4.8 (1.2)	NO
Q16_1	3	4.5 (1.3)	4.9 (1.2)	NO
Q16_2	2	4.9 (1.2)	5.1 (1.2)	NO
Q16_3	4	5.0 (1.3)	5.3 (1.0)	NO
Q16_4	6	4.3 (1.4)	4.8 (1.2)	NO
Q16_5	5	4.1 (1.4)	4.7 (1.3)	NO
Q17_1	4	4.2 (1.6)	4.9 (1.1)	NO
Q17_2	7	3.9 (1.8)	4.6 (1.1)	NO
Q17_3	6	5.0 (0.9)	5.1 (1.2)	NO
Q17_4	2	4.5 (1.3)	5.1 (1.1)	NO
Q17_5	4	5.2 (0.8)	5.2 (1.1)	NO
Q18_1	6	5.0 (1.1)	5.3 (1.1)	NO
Q18_2	4	5.0 (1.0)	5.0 (1.2)	NO
Q18_3	4	5.1 (1.1)	5.4 (1.0)	NO
Q18_4	2	5.3 (0.9)	5.4 (1.0)	NO
Q18_5	4	5.0 (1.3)	5.4 (1.0)	NO
Q19_1	11	4.8 (1.5)	5.2 (1.1)	NO
Q19_2	6	4.1 (1.5)	4.8 (1.3)	NO
Q19_3	2	5.0 (0.9)	5.1 (1.1)	NO
Q19_4	2	4.4 (1.3)	5.1 (1.1)	YES
Q19_5	1	4.4 (1.3)	5.0 (1.2)	NO
Q22_1	3	3.9 (1.5)	2.7 (1.3)	YES
Q22_2	6	3.9 (1.2)	3.0 (1.5)	YES
Q22_3	15	4.1 (1.3)	2.8 (1.3)	YES
Q22_4	19	3.9 (1.5)	3.0 (1.4)	YES
Q22_5	13	3.5 (1.6)	2.3 (1.1)	YES
Q22_6	13	3.7 (1.6)	2.9 (1.5)	NO

¹For full text on questions, please see EST appendix 1.

²Differences are calculated with the t-test analysis. Significant differences are set at $p < .05$ and labeled YES. If no significance is found, it is labeled NO

From 62 respondents, there are no missing values only for Q15_2, everywhere else there are missing values and they are rather high for Q19_1, Q22_3, Q22_4, Q22_5, Q22_6.

In table 3 can be seen that Q15 is devoted to the statements about the already achieved gender equality in the institutional framework, and it could be interpreted that the lower responses for women show that women do not think these achievements have been done yet, although men do. Q16 is devoted to the issues of allocation of career opportunities, and responses are very high. However, again lower mean values are present in all responses for women, meaning that they have less enthusiastic opinions based on their experience. A similar situation is with Q17 and Q18, which also are related to different dimensions and aspects of career opportunities. Gender differences are also found for Q19_4, where women are less enthusiastic concerning their ability to set boundaries between life and work.

Table 3 shows that gender equality is less present in Q22, which is related to sexist behavior and sexual harassment. Gender difference relates to the opinion about the scope of sexist behavior and sexual harassment at the Faculty, where women have a more critical approach than men.

In table 4, the results can be seen from the second part of the institutional level (Q20 and Q21), which were filtered questions and only applied to those who were parents (35). Apparent is a high level of missing values for the question 20, related to the parental leave, meaning that all men among 35 parents, besides those who have not been parents did not give response.

Table 4. Gender comparative result for the institutional level by 35 respondents at Belgrade university for questions 20 to 21.

Question ¹	Missing values	Women (m, sd)	Men (m, sd)	Gender differences ²
Q20_1	46	1.9 (0.8)	3.3 (1.2)	YES
Q20_2	47	2.4 (1.2)	3.3 (1.2)	NO
Q20_3	53	1.9 (1.4)	2.0 (0.0)	NO
Q20_4	48	1.8 (1.1)	3.0 (1.4)	NO
Q20_5	49	2.2 (0.9)	2.0 (0.0)	NO
Q20_6	46	1.2 (0.4)	2.7 (1.2)	NO
Q20_7	46	1.3 (0.6)	1.0 (0.0)	NO
Q20_8	54	2.8 (1.5)	1.5 (0.7)	NO
Q20_9	45	1.0 (0.0)	1.0 (0.0)	NO
Q20_10	45	1.0 (0.0)	1.0 (0.0)	NO
Q21_1	0	1.3 (0.7)	1.8 (1.2)	NO
Q21_2	0	1.0 (0.0)	1.3 (0.8)	NO
Q21_3	0	1.2 (0.6)	1.5 (1.1)	NO
Q21_4	0	1.1 (0.3)	1.4 (0.9)	NO
Q21_5	0	1.7 (1.0)	1.4 (1.0)	NO
Q21_6	0	1.2 (0.7)	1.4 (0.9)	NO
Q21_7	0	1.0 (0.0)	1.3 (0.8)	NO

¹For full text on questions, please see EST appendix 1.

²Differences are calculated with the t-test analysis. Significant differences are set at $p < .05$ and labeled YES. If no significance is found, it is labeled NO.

Overall, the results show that mean values are low, indicating that respondents who have exercised the right to parental leave are not of the opinion that there is much at all gender equality in this regard. Responses show low values regarding childcare services and support for mothers to have easier and smoother coming back to work, meaning that there has been a very low level of implemented gender equality in this regard. Gender differences were found for Q20_1 question, where women were much more aware than men about their not keeping in touch with the department during the maternal leave.

The index for the institutional level was 137 (SD= 27.88). There were no gender differences on the index level where women (133, SD= 29.01) had equal index values to men (143, SD= 26.44), $t(59)= 1.43$, n.s.

3.3.3 Educational level

Overall the results show that respondents are a little bit more positive than negative from a gender-equality perspective. Gender differences were found for Q23_4 (As a rule, classes do not provide a gender perspective when learning about legal institutes), where women express much more critical gender-equality oriented opinions than men. Also, for Q23_6 (Additional education of teaching staff on matters of gender equality is necessary at my faculty) and Q23_7 (Introducing a gender perspective in higher education curricula should be regulated by law) women are much more in favor of this approach than men.

Furthermore, gender differences were found for Q23_8 (Standards for accreditation of study programs should have as a compulsory requirement the ability to understand and apply the principles of gender equality), indicating that women are much more for introducing gender equality into standards of accreditation than men.

Table 5. Gender comparative result for the educational level by the respondents at Belgrade university for question 23 ranging from 1 to 6.

Question ¹	Missing values	Women (m, sd)	Men (m, sd)	Gender differences ²
Q23_1	13	3.2 (1.2)	3.5 (1.7)	NO
Q23_2	9	3.8 (1.4)	3.4 (1.7)	NO
Q23_3	3	4.7 (1.2)	4.2 (1.5)	NO
Q23_4	5	4.6 (1.0)	3.7 (1.4)	YES
Q23_5	4	4.4 (1.3)	3.9 (1.7)	NO
Q23_6	3	4.5 (0.8)	3.5 (1.7)	YES
Q23_7	7	4.2 (1.3)	3.1 (1.8)	YES
Q23_8	4	4.5 (1.0)	3.5 (2.0)	YES

¹For full text on questions, please see EST appendix 1.

²Differences are calculated with the t-test analysis. Significant differences are set at $p < .05$ and labeled YES. If no significance is found, it is labeled NO

The index for the educational level was 29 (SD= 9.98). There were no gender differences on the index level where women (31, SD= 9.06) had equal index values to men (26, SD= 10.73), $t(58)= - 1.91$, n.s.

4. Analysis

4.1 Total index and overall results

The mean index for the overall EST was 213 (SD = 31.97), which is 66.3% of the maximum (321). Relevant for interpreting these results is the comparison with the result of a similar empirical survey, which had been done at the Faculty in December 2018 (first empirical survey – FES 18), i.e. a year and half before starting the LAWGEM project. FES 18 was also anonymous and voluntary, offered online to the whole academic staff and in that case 52 from then 98 members of academic staff took part. In addition, there have been many activities oriented towards gender equality awareness raising at the Faculty since three years ago – conferences, seminars, publishing books. Most important and rather well promoted event within the Faculty was the initiative for establishing gender equality action plan (GAP), which had a few times been also the matter of the public discussion. In the context and process of GAP creation, the mentioned first empirical survey had been constructed and implemented. Results of FES 18 can be compared especially in the case of similar or same questions, which do exist because that questionnaire had served as the germ and the guidelines for creating the EST, and also contained general, cultural, institutional and educational framework.

In short, results of the first empirical survey were to a certain extent worse from the point of academic staff's statements on gender equality.⁴ Better results in the EST case could be understood as the result of the systemic work invested in the mentioned activities and their contribution to rising awareness and improving value statements of the academic staff in regards of gender equality. In addition, the work on preparing LAWGEM project already from the beginning of 2019 and the further ever bigger involvement of 34 members of academic staff in the LAWGEM project development did have an impact on certain changes in their value statements. Besides above mentioned, it is highly probable that most or all of LAWGEM members might have taken part in EST, and if we suppose that they had represented almost half of the sample their opinion certainly contributed significantly to the achieved rather high mean values.

4.1.1. Cultural/general level

Results show that a majority of the respondents refuses patriarchal stereotypes and promotes gender equality as important for the society, all institutions, and each person. It also shows that patriarchal stereotypes and prejudices are refused by the majority of respondents independently of their gender. Explanation should be searched for in the above mentioned argumentation. Interestingly enough, comparatively speaking, the results for EST have been the best in the case of cultural/general level, because the index for this level was 46, what is a very high mean value - 77.9 % of the maximum value (59).

On the other hand, in FES 18, the results in favor of gender equality were the least present in the context of cultural value statements, i.e. stereotypes and prejudices. And more concretely, the results related to cultural value statements in FES 18 were worse than in EST, in a sense that cultural stereotypes and prejudices had been much more present and visible in that survey. Besides above offered explanation linked to awareness raising, additional reason could probably be found in the

⁴ D. Vujadinović, Lj. Kovačević, T. Marinković, I. Krstić, M. Davinić, *Achieving Gender Equality at the University of Belgrade Faculty of Law: Research and Policy Study* (bilingual publication), Belgrade 2020 (57-119).

fact that the questions related to cultural views and value statements in FES 18 were much more direct and diversified and probably provoked more direct and open expressing of biased opinions than in the EST. If there were around 23.7% of unclear and negative notions about whether gender discrimination is any more the problem in Serbia, this percentage was too high for such a notorious question. The extremely stereotypical value statement that women have more rights than they deserve was rejected by more than 85% of respondents, but 9.1% were of unclear opinion, and 5.4% of an agreement with the stereotype. Stereotypical thinking was existent among significant 16.5%, and potentially among those 14.5% with an undefined opinion in regards of the statement that women cannot be successful in 'male' professions (academic work traditionally belonged to males). A great proportion of respondents (76.5%) rejected the stereotype that gender equality is detrimental for Serbian society, however there were 7.4% of those who agreed and 16.4% of those with an unclear opinion. A high proportion of respondents rejected the stereotype that gender equality is an ideological and not civilizational matter (71%), while a significant proportion had no clear opinion (16.4%), and a rather high proportion accepted this stereotype – 12.8%. A rather high proportion of respondents agreed with the stereotype that introducing legal measures and public policies in favor of gender equality represent imposed, artificial and unnecessary interventions (20%), a rather high proportion does not have a clear opinion (14.5%), which has been too high negative indicator from the point of gender equality (65% rejected this stereotype). Stereotypical view that rules against domestic violence are detrimental for men was rejected by only 56.5% of the respondents, and almost 44% had unclear opinion or the statement against. Only 47.3% of the respondents did not agree with the stereotype that female members of academic staff use their 'feminine charms' for purposes of getting university employment or advancing their career.⁵

4.1.1 Institutional level

The mean index value for this level was 137, which is 65.8 % of the maximum (208). Men are much more satisfied with institutional framework as fair and just towards women, male respondents consider it as sufficiently oriented towards gender equality, while women have been more suspicious and critically oriented. Young female single women have been over-represented in the sample, and they are more open towards both educational reforms and gender equality and they are more aware of an importance which gender equality has had for higher and legal education. They have also been more aware than their colleagues about the lack of systemic support of the institutional settings for their female career promotion. They are more skeptical and critical towards institutional level since they have experienced institutional and cultural settings' based obstacles, and they believe in an importance of educational level, while being fully aware that their own efforts in educational terms are crucial for overcoming the mentioned obstacles. According to their awareness about the education as the emancipatory engine, they also can more easily envisage the importance of a gender competent quality of educational process.

The majority of the professors are men and they are by default older than the teaching assistants, and as being older they might be more traditional and insofar less sensitive for gender discrimination. Besides, while being on the highest positions they consider the given state of affairs as better than it is. Namely, what they understand as institutionally well designed framework in terms of gender

⁵ Ibid, 115-117.

equality, and what insofar gives more gender equal results, could or should be interpreted as an indicator of their more conformist and insufficiently critical approach.

4.1.2 Educational level

The mean index value for this level was 29, which is 60.4 % of the maximum (48). Mean values are rather lower for men than women, meaning that women have been more aware of the importance of introducing gender mainstreaming in legal education. However, the mean values are rather high, and when compared with the mentioned previous survey, the EST results are better.

Namely, according to the FES 18, there were 60% of respondents who agreed that gender perspective is very important for legal education. However, there were almost 40% of those who considered gender perspective in legal studies irrelevant or have an undefined opinion. For 58% of respondents it was acceptable (useful and necessary) to get additional education about gender equality, but at the same time 22% respondents did not have a clear opinion, and 20% disagreed. There were 64% of respondents with a positive attitude towards the introduction of gender sensitive pedagogy in the legal education.

However, when questions in FES 18 pointed more specifically to the issue of textbooks and learning materials, as well as legal regulation in favor of gender competent higher education and legal education, the resistance increased. Only 41% of the respondents thought that the textbooks should have gender competent content. Introducing legal rules in favor of gender sensitive university education into the Law on Higher Education was acceptable for 49% of respondents, unacceptable for 16.4%, and 34% of respondents had undefined opinion on the issue. Only half of the sample was positive and half was unclear or against it. There were 49% of respondents who agreed that rules for accreditation of faculties and study programs should include requirements of gender sensitization of higher education, while more than 27% disagreed and 23.6% did not have a clear opinion.⁶

4.2 Limitations

As already mentioned, a great number of the Law Faculty academic staff have been participating in the LAWGEM project ($n=34$), and probably most of them also answered the EST. This might have influenced the Belgrade results, since they had developed or enriched their pro gender-equality mindset already since two years ago when the profiling of the LAWGEM project had started and most directly at least six months before answering the EST. Besides that, positive influence of other activities conducted in favor of gender equality at the Faculty since a few previous years might have played a certain role even in a wider scope of the academic staff. In other words, these facts might be the cause of the results being better than could have been expected due to FES 18 surveys' results, which had expressed more traditional/patriarchal affiliations and statements.

Another limitation is the response rate which preferably should have been higher in order to catch the whole Faculty's opinions on gender-equality. There is a risk that those more in favor of gender-equality issues were among the respondents. This has been seen in other studies as well.⁷

⁶ Ibid, 111-119.

⁷ Ibid. See also: P.A. Roos, M.L. Gatta, „Gender (in)equity in the academy: Subtle mechanisms and the production of inequality“, *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility*, 2009, 177–200.

4.3 Conclusion

Better are results of EST than in the case of previous empirical survey. That proves importance of intentions oriented towards gender equality, which do give results even if they have not been systemic top-down policies but have been more based on individual attempts. Results of EST have been still far from optimal standards of gender equality either in institutional, or, educational, or cultural dimension. Both conclusions imply the necessity of introducing systemic gender equality policies in order to boost better and deeper moves forwards towards better gender equality achievements at the Faculty in cultural, institutional, and educational dimensions.

It all indicates that systemic work on gender equality is necessary as a constant, systemic endeavor especially regarding additional education of academic staff for improving gender perspective in their professional life, through training, through developing new study programs which are gender-sensitive, through stimulating by means of new regulation and cultural settings the gender-sensitive approach in writing textbooks, gender-sensitive pedagogical approach, accreditation procedures, scientific research projects application procedures.

5. References

- Gender mainstreaming – Conceptual framework, methodology and presentation of good practices, 1998, <http://www.unhcr.org/3c160b06a.pdf> (assessed 28. 04. 2020)
- G. Wallon, S. Bendiscioli & M. Garfinkel, *Exploring quotas in academia*, Robert Bosch Stiftung, Heidelberg 2015.
- D. Vujadinović, Rod i pravna regulativa. In: S. Lilić (Ed.), *Perspektive implementacije evropskih standarda u pravni sistem Srbije*, Belgrade 2013 (60-81).
- D. Vujadinović, Gender Mainstreaming in Law and Legal Education, *Annals of the Faculty of Law in Belgrade - Belgrade Law Review*, 2015, 53 (4), 56-74.
- D. Vujadinović, N. Petrušić, „Gender Mainstreaming in Legal Education in Serbia: A Pilot Analysis Of Curricula And Textbooks“, *Annals FLB – Belgrade Law Review* 2017, LXV/4
- D. Vujadinović, „Teorijsko-metodološki okvir za razumevanje rodni odnosa - slučaj Srbije“. In: D. Vujadinović & V. Stanimirović, *Studije roda*, Belgrade 2017, (13-32).
- D. Vujadinović, Lj. Kovačević, T. Marinković, I. Krstić, M. Davinić, *Achieving Gender Equality at the University of Belgrade Faculty of Law: Research and Policy Study* (bilingual publication), Belgrade 2020.
- International Labour Office, *A Manual for Gender Audit Facilitators - the ILO Participatory Gender Audit Methodology*, Geneva 2012, 2nd Edition.
- L. Husu, Gender Equality in Nordic Academia - Advantages and Challenges. In: D. Vujadinović & Z. Antonijević (Eds), *Rodna ravnopravnost u visokom obrazovanju - koncepti, prakse i izazovi*, Akademska knjiga, Novi sad 2019, (63-73).
- Lj. Kovačević, „Ravnopravnost muškaraca i žena kao bitan element dostojanstvenog zapošljavanja“, *Radno i socijalno pravo*, 2018, 22 (1), 97-143.
- M. Babović, *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 2010.
- M. Blagojević Hjuson, *Rodni barometer u Srbiji: Razvoj i svakodnevni život*, Beograd 2013.
- M. Hughson, „Rodni režimi na poluperiferiji“, *Zeničke sveske - Časopis za društvenu fenomenologiju i kulturnu dijalogiku*, 2015, 255-265, <https://www.ceeol.com/search/article-detail?id=749917>
- M. Hughson, *Poluperiferija i rod: pobuna konteksta*, Institut za kriminološka i sociološka istraživanja, Beograd 2015.
- M. Hughson, *Muškarci u Srbiji druga strana rodne ne/ravnopravnosti*, Institut za kriminološka i sociološka istraživanja, Beograd 2017.
- P.A. Roos, M.L. Gatta, „Gender (in)equity in the academy: Subtle mechanisms and the production of inequality“, *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility*, 2009, 177–200.
- S. Baer, „ Equality adds Quality: on Upgrading Higher Education and Research in the Field of Law“, *Annals of the Faculty of Law in Belgrade - Belgrade Law Review*, 2017, 65 (4), 5-27.

6. Appendix 1. Empirical Survey Tool – EST

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 Örebro 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 analysis will be conducted for each university. The experts from all Consortium members will then undertake a comparative analysis. The results of the conducted empirical surveys at each university as well as the comparative analysis 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

You receive this questionnaire as a co-worker at the faculty of which the *LAWGEM* project is being conducted at your university. We kindly ask you to fill out this questionnaire. Filling out this questionnaire is voluntary, and you will be anonymous. By answering the questionnaire, you consent to be part of the study. All of the questions are of the closed-ended variety and it will take about 20 minutes to do.

Please return the questionnaire before June 22th. Reminders will be sent out to everyone, if you have answered the questionnaire please disregard for the reminder.

-

If you have any questions regarding the questionnaire please contact IT Petar Pavlovic ppetar@ius.bg.ac.rs, from the Faculty of Law University of Belgrade, which is in charge of the distribution of the questionnaire.

-

We would like to thank you upfront for your time, good will and cooperation!

Background questions

Q1) Age:

	YES	NO	No answer
Q2) What is your gender			
Q2 1. Male	1	0	9
Q2 2 Female	1	0	9
Q2 3 Other gender	1	0	9
Q3) What is your marital status			
Q3 1 Single	1	0	9
Q3 2 Married or partnership	1	0	9
Q3 3 Divorced	1	0	9
Q3 4 Widow or widower	1	0	9
Q3 5 Something else	1	0	9
Q4) Are you a parent?			
	1	0	9
Q5) Academic degree			
Q5 1 BA	1	0	9
Q5 2 Master	1	0	9
Q5 3 Magister of science	1	0	9
Q5 4 PhD	1	0	9
Q6) Type of contract:			
Q6 1 Part time	1	0	9
Q6 2 Full time	1	0	9
Q7) Are you on a substitute position?			
	1	0	9
Q8) Duration of contract			
Q8 1 Temporary position	1	0	9
Q8 2 Permanent position	1	0	9
Q8 3 Civil servant	1	0	9

Q9) Professional category: _____

Q10) How often are you or have you been involved in any of the following activities, outside of paid work, related to your dependent children or relatives?

	Every day	Several times a week	Once or twice a week	Less often than once a week	Never	Not relevant
Q10 1: Hygiene, bathing	5	4	3	2	1	9
Q10 2: Feeding	5	4	3	2	1	9
Q10 3: Taking them to school	5	4	3	2	1	9
Q10 4: After-school activities	5	4	3	2	1	9
Q10 5: School tasks	5	4	3	2	1	9
Q10 6: Going to the park	5	4	3	2	1	9
Q10 7: Other leisure activities	5	4	3	2	1	9
Q10 8: Cooking and housework	5	4	3	2	1	9
Q15_0: Caring for elderly/disabled relatives	5	4	3	2	1	9

Cultural/general level

Please mark whether you agree or disagree with each of the following statements

	Totally agree	Tend to agree	Tend to disagree	Totally disagree	No answer
Q11_1: It is acceptable for man to cry	4	3	2	1	9
Q11_2: Women are more likely than men to make decisions based on their emotions	1	2	3	4	9
Q11_3: The most important role of a women is to take care of her home and family	1	2	3	4	9
Q11_4: The most important role of a man is to earn money	1	2	3	4	9
Q12_1: Gender equality has been achieved in _____ (<i>inscribe a particular Consortium university and delete this</i>) in politics	4	3	2	1	9
Q12_2: Gender equality has been achieved in _____ at work	4	3	2	1	9
Q12_3: Gender equality has been achieved in _____ in leadership positions in companies and other organizations	4	3	2	1	9
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

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

Institutional level

Please mark the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements at your faculty:

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Partly disagree	Partly agree	Agree	Strongly agree	No answer
Q15_1: In general, men and women are equally well represented (in terms of numbers) in my faculty	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
Q15_2: In general, men and women are treated equally in my faculty	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
Q15_3: My faculty is committed to promoting gender equality	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
Q15_4: If I had any concerns about gender equality in my faculty, I would know who to approach	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
Q15_5: My faculty is responsive to concerns about gender equality	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
<hr/>							
Q16_1: Allocation of desirable and sought-after tasks or roles are distributed independently from gender	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
Q16_2: Distribution of office space are done independently from gender	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
Q16_3: Mentoring and/or other guidance in making career decisions are done independently from gender	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
Q16_4: Representation in senior positions are done independently from gender	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
Q16_5: Allocation of administrative tasks are done independently from gender	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
<hr/>							
Q17_1: Attention from senior management are done independently from gender	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
Q17_2: Access to informal circles of influence are done independently from gender	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
Q17_3: Receiving positive feedback from management are done independently from gender	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
Q17_4: Recruitment and selections for academic posts are done independently from gender	1	2	3	4	5	6	9

Q17_5: Promotion decisions are done independently from gender	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Please mark the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements at your faculty:

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Partly disagree	Partly agree	Agree	Strongly agree	No answer
Q18_1: Allocation of formal training and career development opportunities are done independently from gender	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
Q18_2: Allocation of teaching are done independently from gender	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
Q18_3: Participation in projects are done independently from gender	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
Q18_4: Invitations to lectures, conferences, etc. are done independently from gender	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
Q18_5: Appointments to editorships of journals are done independently from gender	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
Q19_1: My supervisor has understanding for my caring responsibilities (at home, for children and elderly...)	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
Q19_2: My faculty has policies put in place (effective) for life-work balancing	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
Q19_3: My work schedule allows me to spend time with my family and friends	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
Q19_4: I am able to set boundaries between work and life	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
Q19_5: I am satisfied with my work-life balance	1	2	3	4	5	6	9

- **Q20) (FILTER)** In my institution, during or after my parental leave, the following policies were in place:

	Exist and are implemented	Exist, but not implemented	Informally	Don't know
Q20_1: Keeping in touch with the department while away	3	2	1	9
Q20_2: Flexible working hours	3	2	1	9
Q20_3: Initial part-time working building up to full time	3	2	1	9
Q20_4: Lower initial teaching load	3	2	1	9
Q20_5: Lower initial administrative load	3	2	1	9
Q20_6: Lower initial research supervision	3	2	1	9
Q20_7: Parent's network, support group at work	3	2	1	9
Q20_8: Additional block of shared parental leave	3	2	1	9
Q20_9: Facilities for continued baby care	3	2	1	9
D20_10: Childcare services at workplace	3	2	1	9

Q21) (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, or other type of parental leave

	They 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 asking
Q21_1: Childcare related policies, including payments and benefits	1	2	3	4
Q21_2: Facilities for continued baby feeding on return to work	1	2	3	4
Q21_3: Contacts for supporting services (e.g. HR, occupational health)	1	2	3	4
Q21_4: Time off for antenatal appointments	1	2	3	4
Q21_5: How and when to notify your institution of your intentions regarding return to work	1	2	3	4
Q21_6: Options for phased return, or other forms of workload adjustment on return	1	2	3	4
Q21_7: Rest facilities are available during pregnancy	1	2	3	4

According to your personal impressions or knowledge, please mark the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements at your faculty:

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Partly disagree	Partly agree	Agree	Strongly agree	No answer
Q22_1 Sexist behavior is tolerated at my faculty	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
Q22_2 During lectures and extracurricular communication with students the teachers at our Faculty sometimes express sexist attitudes	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
Q22_3 Sexual harassment occurs at my faculty	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
Q22_4 Sexual harassment of students by the teaching staff occurs at my faculty	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
Q22_5 Sexual harassment by senior position academics to lower positioned academic personnel occurs at my faculty.	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
Q22_6 Cases of sexual harassment in my faculty are treated as something to cover and hide.	1	2	3	4	5	6	9

Educational level

Please mark the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements on higher education:

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Partly disagree	Partly agree	Agree	Strongly agree	No answer
Q23_1: Curricula at my faculty are gender sensitive	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
Q23_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	9
Q23_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	9
Q23_4: As a rule, classes do not provide a gender perspective when learning about legal institutes.	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
Q23_5: Gender perspective in legal studies is utterly irrelevant to the quality of content and the meaning of acquired legal knowledge.	6	5	4	3	2	1	9
Q23_6: Additional education of teaching staff on matters of gender equality is necessary at my faculty.	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
Q23_7: Introducing gender perspective in higher education curricula should be regulated by law.	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
Q23_8: Standards for accreditation of study programs should have as a compulsory requirement the ability to understand and apply the principles of gender equality.	1	2	3	4	5	6	9