

# Report of intellectual output 2 of the LAWGEM project

—

## Mapping gender equality at LUMSA University

LUMSA university

January 30, 2020

## Content

<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>3</b>
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK .....	3
X UNIVERSITY .....	<b>ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.</b>
<b>METHOD.....</b>	<b>4</b>
DESIGN .....	4
DESK ANALYSIS. ....	5
THE EMPIRICAL SURVEY TOOL - EST .....	5
<i>The EST index</i> .....	6
SAMPLE.....	6
PROCEDURE .....	6
ANALYSIS.....	7
<b>RESULTS .....</b>	<b>8</b>
DESK ANALYSIS .....	8
BACKGROUND INFORMATION OF THE SAMPLE AS PRESENTED IN THE SURVEY .....	9
EMPIRICAL SURVEY .....	10
<i>Cultural/general level</i> .....	10
<i>Institutional level</i> .....	11
<i>Educational level</i> .....	14
<b>ANALYSIS.....</b>	<b>15</b>
CULTURAL/GENERAL LEVEL.....	15
INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL .....	16
EDUCATIONAL LEVEL .....	17
LIMITATIONS .....	17
CONCLUSION.....	17
<b>REFERENCES .....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>APPENDIX 1. EMPIRICAL SURVEY TOOL – EST .....</b>	<b>19</b>

## Introduction

A Consortium led by the University of Belgrade, Faculty of Law and consisting of Örebro University from Sweden, LUMSA University from Italy, 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 the project of developing the master 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. 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 at the webpage of the LAWGEM project.

## 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 at the level of wider communities, grasped by the notion of gender regimes (Hughson, 2015). 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 as well as organizational level. The analysis distinguish 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 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). 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.

The overall aim of the second output in the LAWGEM project was to investigate and map conditions and attitudes towards gender equality in academic institutions involved in the project.

## LUMSA University

LUMSA (Libera Università degli Studi Maria Ss. Assunta di Roma) is a public non-state Italian university formed on Catholic principles. It is the second oldest university in Rome after Sapienza, and was founded by Luigia Tincani in 1939. LUMSA is accountable to the state university system and awards qualifications equivalent to those issued by state universities.

University teaching is distributed across three departments: Law, Economics, Politics and Modern languages campus; Law - Palermo campus; Social Sciences - Communication, Education and Psychology.

The Department of Law, Economics, Politics and Modern languages in Rome was born in October 2017 following the union between the Department of Law and that of Economics, Politics and Modern Languages. The Department inherits strong experiences, knowledge and traditions, collected in a teaching offer that, despite the variety of the disciplines proposed, finds a decisive element of homogeneity in the analysis of the increasingly complex contemporary reality.

The Department of Law in Palermo is founded on the traditions of the Faculty of Law, and also offers new opportunities for educational and professional training. The department engages in both aspects of university activity - teaching and scientific research.

The Department of Human Studies- Communication, Education and Psychology is a pioneering centre for study and scientific research, a lively intellectual environment where experienced, nationally renowned teaching staff prepare students for the world of work.

With around 300 internationally recognised members of teaching staff, the University provides both qualified education for young people and supports lifelong learning programs.

LUMSA University achieved outstanding results in the last Assessment of Research Quality (VQR). The areas of Business, Economics, Law and Social Sciences ranked Q1 (upper quartile of the distribution). Psychology and Political Science ranked Q2 (second quartile). The proportion of publications with excellent/very good rank is higher than the national average in the areas of Economics, Law, Languages and Literature, Pedagogy, Psychology and Social Sciences. In Law, LUMSA ranks fourth in Italy among the small sized universities, and fifth overall. The Department of Economics, Politics and Modern Languages, Department Law (Rome) and Department of Law (Palermo) rank Q1 in Italy. In the Social Sciences, LUMSA University ranks third in Italy among the small sized universities for the Department of Human Sciences - Communication, Education and Psychology, and fourth overall.

Professionalism, growth and development are the University's fundamental principles, along with teaching, employment, research and the student experience.

Students are the lifeblood of the university. The teaching staff maintain a direct and ongoing relationship with their students, and programs are designed to deliver specific high-level technical and cultural skills. With around 7.200 students, LUMSA is not just a high profile internationally recognised academic institution, it is also a place for personal development.

University life provides many opportunities for debate and participation, so the close links between humanistic tradition, technological innovation and our Catholic roots are at the very heart of the university. Particular care is taken in the Erasmus project, to the point that LUMSA is awarded by the European Union for being among the best Italian universities in the implementation of the European program.

## Method

### Design

The design of this study is twofold; first a desk analysis was performed, second an on-line survey was conducted.

**Desk analysis.** Desk analysis is the first step in the gender assessment of an academic programme and organization, since it gives basic, factual and quantitative information (ILO, 2012). In this case, desk analysis is investigating gender issues embedded in our organization. The work follows the ILO Gender Audit approach, that is, the ILO Participatory Gender Audit Methodology proposed by International Labour Office (ILO, 2012: 14-22)

**On-line survey.** An on-line questionnaire that focuses on three dimensions of the analysis (cultural, institutional and educational) will be performed. The survey was conducted within each university faculty where law education was held.

### Desk analysis.

The main aim with the desk analysis is 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, that are relevant for working towards gender equality.

### The Empirical Survey Tool – EST

The 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 is aimed to map the professional and wider socio-economic positions and opinions of the university staff according to three dimensions of gender (in)equality. 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 from strongly or totally disagree (1) to /Strongly or totally agree (4-6). Two questions had a scale ranging from (1) informally/ not providing information to (3-4) exist and implemented/ provided information. No answer or missing value was set to (9) and excluded from analysis.

1. Cultural/ general level– This theme consisted of 4 questions (Q11-Q14) with a total of 14 subquestions, 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 general gender issues (Q\_11), regarding the position of women in politics and academia (Q\_12), regarding an importance of gender equality in different aspects (Q\_13), and regarding a fair share of private and professional duties and gender-based employment preferences(Q\_14).
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 concerned quality of rules and regulations regarding general approach towards gender equality (Q\_15), career promotion (Q\_16, Q\_17, Q\_18), family friendly institutional support/work-life balance (Q\_19), maternity leave and parental leave (Q\_20, Q\_21), sexist attitudes and sexual harassment (Q\_22).
3. Educational framework – This theme consisted of 1 question Q23 with a total of 8 subquestions, where values ranged from 1 to 6. The questions concerned quality of gender (in)sensitivity of the study programmes, syllabi and textbooks (Vujadinović & Petrušić, 2017),

importance of gender perspective in legal studies, necessity of additional education of teaching staff as well as necessity legally to introduce issue of gender equality into the Law on Higher education and into accreditation requirements.

The following research question was 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 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?

#### The EST index

An index of gender equality was made for each subscale as well as the total EST. The index value was created by adding the answers to a subtotal for each thematic part as well as for the total scale. Missing values were treated as 0.

The reliability analysis showed that Q22 had too many missing values and thereby had to be excluded from further analysis of the index. Further analysis when Q22 was removed showed Cronbachs alpha for the subscales: Cultural/general level Cronbachs alpha 0.417, Institutional level Cronbachs alpha 0.916, and Educational level Cronbachs alpha 0.715. The total Cronbachs alpha was 0.885.

The final sums of sub-index with good internal consistency for each theme were as follows; Cultural/general level sub- index ranged from 14 – 59, Institutional level ranged from 42 – 208, and educational level ranged from 8 – 48. The total index ranged from 64 – 315. The higher the level the higher gender equality.

#### Sample

The survey questionnaire was sent by email to all permanent faculty and teaching staff of the LUMSA university in both the Palermo and Roma campuses. Of the 300 persons of staff that received the EST 84 (28%) answered.

#### Procedure

The EST technical part was constructed by the Belgrade team who translated the EST from English into the five languages used for each university. The EST was then created into a web survey tool, one for each university and language. The links to the survey were sent out to the EST teams who coordinated the data collection but did not store data. Thereby, the survey was totally anonymous for the universities. Data was collected from June 22nd – July 15.

When data collection was finished the Belgrade team transferred the data into SPSS files. Data were then analysed by Belgrade team and results were presented for each university as results word files with analysis from SPSS.

## Analysis

The descriptive statistics were done by using frequency, percentage, arithmetic mean and standard deviation.

Based on data structure for gender comparisons were independent samples t-test analysis were done. For comparisons between universities, based on data structure, first one-way anova's were completed and then post hoc test for multiple comparisons for observed means. All statistical analyses were done by using SPSS version 25.

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

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

## Results

The results part is divided into three parts; the desk analysis, background information from the survey and the results from the survey regarding the three teams.

### Desk analysis

The desk analysis was based on data from the The Department of Law in Palermo from the LUMSA university. Data was collected from official records at the university. Data represents the study year 2019/2020 and was collected in July 2020. In total 1200 students were enrolled in courses/programs of any level of education during the study year, and 79 staff were employed at the Department for the same period.

The results shown in table 1 reveal that there were gender differences concerning enrollment at undergraduate studies, master and doctoral studies, where female students were more likely to enter studying process.

There are large gender differences concerning the management and leadership positions, the head of department has been always a man during the 20 years of the history of the Department of Law.

There are also important gender differences within the academic staff, meaning that for all academic titles there is a striking majority of men. Only 19% of the overall teaching staff is composed of women. Moreover, the presence of women is almost completely concentrated in the lowest level of the teaching staff, the teaching assistant position.

Among Assistant professors, Associate professors and Full professors there is only one woman.

Gender ratios concerning enrolled students showed few gender differences: there are more enrolled female students at all levels of studies (undergraduate, master, doctoral students) and there are proportionally more graduated female students.

**Table 1. Descriptive data from the faculty of Department of Law of the LUMSA university for the academic year 2019-2020.**

Question	Women (Fq, %)	Men (Fq, %)
<b>Students enrolled to all educational programs/courses</b>	500, 41,7%	700, 58,3%
<b>Students graduated</b>	93, 53%	82, 47%
<b>Students enrolled to master studies</b>	43, 58.9%	30, 41.1%
<b>Students enrolled to doctoral studies</b>	13, 52%	12, 48%
<b>Students with achieved MA</b>	0, 0%	0, 0%
<b>Students with achieved PhD diplomas</b>	0, 0%	0, 0%
<b>Faculty management and leadership positions</b>	0, 0%	5, 100%
<b>Faculty teaching staff</b>	15, 19%	64, 81%
- <b>Teaching assistant</b>	14, 25,9%	40 74,1%
- <b>Assitant professor/ PhD Lecturer</b>	0, 0%	8, 100%
- <b>Associate Professor</b>	1, 16,7%	5, 83,3%
- <b>Full Professor</b>	0, 0%	11, 100%
<b>Permanent positions</b>	1, 5,5%	17, 94.5%
<b>Temporary positions</b>	14, 22,9%	47, 77,1%



### Background information of the sample as presented in the survey

In total 84 (28%) of the staff at the department of Law in the LUMSA university performed the EST. They are hereafter named respondents, of which 40 (47.6%) were female, 44 (52.4%) were male, and 0 (0%) other gender. Their mean age was 46.4 years (sd= 12.2 years). Their marital status was single (13, 15.5%), married or partnership (64, 76.2 %), divorced (3.5 %), widow or widower (1, 1.2 %), or something else (1, 1.2%). 55 (65.5 %) of the respondents stated that they were parents. There were only one or two missing answers for these questions.

The academic degree presented for the respondents in the EST was having a BA (19, 22, 6 %), Master (1, 1.2%), Magister of Science (5, 6%), or a PhD (59, 70.2%) degree. Respondents stated that they held a part time contract (32, 38.1%) or a full time contract (44, 52.4%), where the duration of the contract was temporary positions (47, 56 %), permanent position (36, 42.9 %), or civil servant (1, 1.2 %). Their professional category were teaching assistant (41, 48.8 %), Assistant professor/PhD Lecturer (10, 11.9 %), Associate Professor (14, 16.7 %), and Professor (14, 16.7 %).

Overall about two thirds of respondents (79, 94%) 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 intensity of involvement in the following activities were : Hygiene/bathing (44 (52 %) of 84, Every day), Feeding, (29 (34.5 %), Once or twice a week), Taking them to school (25 (29.8 %) , Never), After-school activities (27 (32 %), Several times a week), School tasks (27 (32.1 %), Never), Going to the park (22 (26.2 %), less than once a week), Other leisure activities (20 (23.8 %), Several times a week), Cooking and housework (33 (39.3%), Every day), and Caring for elderly/ disabled relatives (34 (40.4 %), Never).

Gender differences were found for cooking and housework, where women were more likely to perform daily these activities than men.

## Empirical Survey

The index for the overall EST was 184.58 and ranged from 64 to 315. There were not statistically significant gender differences on the index level. Overall the results show that mean values above the mid points indicating that a certain degree of gender equality is present, but not sufficiently and the process of improving gender equality is of an utmost importance.

Results for each theme is presented separately.

### Cultural/general level

The index for this level was 44.77 in a possible range going from 14 to 59. There were not statistically significant gender differences on the index level. Overall the results show that mean values are rather high, indicating that a gender equality is present to a certain extent, but that the process of improving gender equality is of an utmost importance.

The results from the cultural/general level show that a certain level of gender equality has been achieved in cultural/general mindset, which can be seen in table 2. Namely, the scaling for these questions (except Q 14) go from 1 to 4, and mean values for both gender go close to 4 for the statements that it is legitimate that men cry, that women are more likely than men to make decisions based on emotions, that the most important role of a man is to earn money, that promoting gender equality is important for the society, the economy the faculty and personally.

In the case of Q 14 mean values are close to 5 (the highest level in the scale) regarding the statements that men should have equal responsibility as women for home and children.

No gender differences were found.

**Table 2. Gender comparative result for the cultural/general level by 84 respondents at LUMSA university for questions 11 to 14.**

Question <sup>1</sup>	Missing values	Women (m. sd)	Men (m. sd)	Gender differences <sup>2</sup>
Q11_1	2	3.6 (0.8)	3.8 (0.5)	NO
Q11_2	1	2.9 (1.0)	3.0 (1.0)	NO
Q11_3	2	3.6 (0.7)	3.5 (0.8)	NO
Q11_4	1	3.7 (0.7)	3.6 (0.6)	NO
Q12_1	3	1.7 (0.8)	1.8 (0.9)	NO
Q12_2	0	1.5 (0.7)	1.8 (1.0)	NO
Q12_3	2	1.4 (0.6)	1.5 (0.7)	NO
Q13_1	2	4.0 (0.2)	3.9 (0.6)	NO
Q13_2	0	3.8 (0.6)	3.8 (0.7)	NO
Q13_3	2	3.6 (0.7)	3.7 (0.7)	NO
Q13_4	2	3.8 (0.4)	3.7 (0.8)	NO
Q14_1	2	3.4 (1.4)	3.3 (1.4)	NO
Q14_2	2	4.7 (0.6)	4.6 (0.8)	NO
Q14_3	2	3.9 (1.6)	3.7 (1.7)	NO

<sup>1</sup>For full text on questions please see EST appendix 1.

<sup>2</sup>Differences are calculated with the XX analysis. Significant differences are set at  $p < .05$  and labelled YES, if no significance is found it is labelled NO

## Institutional level

The index for this level was 119.14 in a range of scores from 42 to 208. It could be concluded that institutional framework at the department of Law in the LUMSA University has reached a certain level of gender equality, which however has been still far from satisfactory. Overall the results show that mean values are relatively high, indicating a gender equality is present to a certain extent.

Q 15 is devoted to the statements about the already achieved gender equality in the institutional framework and responses prevail between 4 (partly agree) and 5 (agree) in the 6 level scale.

The question on whether men and women are equally well represented in the faculty obtains a higher score among women than among men and this difference is statistically significant. Female responses have generally a lower score than men's for women being treated equally in the faculty and for the faculty being committed to promoting gender equality indicating that their perception about gender equality is less firm than that of men. However, these differences are statistically significant only in the first case.

Q16 is devoted to the issues of allocation of career opportunities and responses are situated between over 4 to over 5 with maximum score 6, which is very high. However, again lower mean values are present in all responses of women, meaning that they have less enthusiastic opinion based on their experience. Similar situation is with Q17 and Q18, which are also related to different dimensions and aspects of career opportunities.

Q22 are about sexist behavior and attitudes. The low values indicate that answers are all between disagree and strongly disagree. No big differences are found between men and women.

Gender difference is also founded for 17\_4 question, indicating that gender equality is present for women to a lower degree than men, i.e. that women are less enthusiastic about the way recruitment and selections for academic posts are done.

**Table 3. Gender comparative result for the cultural/general level by 84 respondents at LUMSA university for questions 15 to 19 and 22 ranging from 1 to 6.**

Question <sup>1</sup>	Missing values	Women (m. sd)	Men (m. sd)	Gender differences <sup>2</sup>
Q15_1	9	4.4 (1.4)	3.6 (1.7)	YES
Q15_2	7	4.6 (1.5)	5.4 (1.1)	YES
Q15_3	14	4.5 (1.5)	5.1 (1.3)	NO
Q15_4	18	3.8 (1.8)	4.4 (1.7)	NO
Q15_5	15	4.5 (1.5)	4.6 (1.6)	NO
Q16_1	7	4.8 (1.5)	5.2 (1.4)	NO
Q16_2	8	5.2 (1.0)	5.5 (1.0)	NO
Q16_3	10	5.0 (0.9)	5.3 (1.3)	NO
Q16_4	9	4.5 (1.3)	5.0 (1.3)	NO
Q16_5	9	4.9 (1.1)	5.3 (1.0)	NO
Q17_1	12	4.8 (1.4)	5.2 (1.3)	NO
Q17_2	16	4.7 (1.2)	5.1 (1.2)	NO
Q17_3	10	4.9 (1.2)	5.4 (1.1)	NO

Q17_4	6	4.8 (1.3)	5.3 (1.1)	YES
Q17_5	8	4.7 (1.4)	5.2 (1.1)	NO
Q18_1	6	4.8 (1.3)	5.1 (1.2)	NO
Q18_2	5	5.3 (0.9)	5.4 (1.0)	NO
Q18_3	9	5.3 (0.8)	5.5 (0.9)	NO
Q18_4	8	5.2 (0.8)	5.6 (0.9)	YES
Q18_5	18	5.0 (0.9)	5.2 (1.1)	NO
Q19_1	27	5.0 (1.0)	5.0 (1.4)	NO
Q19_2	23	4.3 (1.3)	4.0 (1.6)	NO
Q19_3	10	4.6 (1.2)	4.7 (1.6)	NO
Q19_4	8	4.7 (1.3)	4.5 (1.5)	NO
Q19_5	8	4.3 (1.3)	4.2 (1.6)	NO
Q22_1	13	1.7 (1.0)	1.4 (0.9)	NO
Q22_2	15	1.5 (0.8)	1.4 (1.1)	NO
Q22_3	13	1.2 (0.4)	1.2 (0.9)	NO
Q22_4	15	1.1 (0.3)	1.2 (0.9)	NO
Q22_5	15	1.1 (0.3)	1.2 (0.9)	NO
Q22_6	18	1.2 (0.5)	1.4 (0.8)	NO

<sup>1</sup>For full text on questions please see EST appendix 1.

<sup>2</sup>Significant differences are set at  $p < .05$  and labelled YES, if no significance is found it is labelled NO

The results from the second part of the institutional level (Q20 and Q21), which were filtered questions and only apply to those who are parents, show that there are very high numbers of missing values for Q20, which can be seen in table 4. Overall the results show that mean values are low, indicating that women who have exercised the right to maternity leave are not of opinion that there is much at all gender equality in this regard. Responses on questions covered by Q21 show very low mean 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.

No gender differences were found.

**Table 4. Gender comparative result for the cultural/general level by 13 respondents at LUMSA university for questions 15 to 22 ranging from 1 to 6.**

Question <sup>1</sup>	Missing values	Women (m. sd)	Men (m. sd)	Gender differences <sup>2</sup>
Q20_1	81	2.3 (1.5)	0.0 (0.0)	NO
Q20_2	81	2.5 (2.1)	4.0 (0.0)	NO
Q20_3	81	1.0 (0.0)	4.0 (0.0)	NO
Q20_4	80	1.0 (0.0)	4.0 (0.0)	NO
Q20_5	82	1.0 (0.0)	4.0 (0.0)	NO
Q20_6	82	1.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	NO
Q20_7	83	1.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	NO
Q20_8	82	1.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	NO
Q20_9	80	1.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	NO
Q20_10	79	1.0 (0.0)	1.0 (0.0)	NO
Q21_1	0	1.1 (0.3)	1.0 (0.0)	NO
Q21_2	0	1.0 (0.0)	1.0 (0.0)	NO
Q21_3	0	1.1 (0.3)	1.0 (0.0)	NO
Q21_4	0	1.0 (0.0)	1.0 (0.0)	NO
Q21_5	0	1.1 (0.3)	1.0 (0.0)	NO
Q21_6	0	1.0 (0.0)	1.0 (0.0)	NO
Q21_7	0	1.0 (0.0)	1.0 (0.0)	NO

<sup>1</sup>For full text on questions please see EST appendix 1.

<sup>2</sup>Significant differences are set at  $p < .05$  and labelled YES, if no significance is found it is labelled NO

### Educational level

The index for this level was 23.78, what should be placed in the frame of scores from 8 to 48. There were not statistically significant gender differences on the index level.

The results from the educational level show that mean values are below or around 4, between “partly disagree” and “partly agree” which can be seen in table 5. Overall, the results show that mean values are a little bit more positive than negative from gender equality perspective. The results show that mean values are rather lower for men than women, meaning that women have been more oriented in favor of gender equality in educational dimension than men.

Gender differences were found only for Q23\_7 (Introducing gender perspective in higher education curricula should be regulated by law), in a sense that women are much more in favor of this approach than men.

**Table 5. Gender comparative result for the cultural/general level by 84 respondents at LUMSA university for question 23 ranging from 1 to 6.**

Question <sup>1</sup>	Missing values	Women (m. sd)	Men (m. sd)	Gender differences <sup>2</sup>
Q23_1	18	3.7 (1.6)	3.6 (1.7)	NO
Q23_2	20	2.5 (1.3)	2.6 (1.6)	NO
Q23_3	21	4.6 (1.6)	4.4 (1.7)	NO
Q23_4	45	3.1 (1.3)	3.8 (1.6)	NO
Q23_5	33	4.7 (1.2)	3.8 (1.9)	NO
Q23_6	21	3.3 (1.4)	3.4 (1.6)	NO
Q23_7	24	4.2 (1.4)	3.1 (1.7)	YES
Q23_8	20	4.6 (1.2)	3.8 (1.8)	NO

<sup>1</sup>For full text on questions please see EST appendix 1.

<sup>2</sup>Significant differences are set at  $p < .05$  and labelled YES, if no significance is found it is labelled NO

## Analysis

### Total index and overall results

With an overall index of 184.6 on a possible range between 64 to 315, the Department of Law at the LUMSA University seems to have a medium to high performance in term of gender equality. It indicates that systemic work on gender equality issue through cultural, institutional and educational level is necessary, especially regarding additional education of academic staff for improving gender perspective in their professional life, through trainings, 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.

### Cultural/general level

When having in mind that total index for cultural/general level ranges from 14 to 59, the index 44.77 is rather positive from the gender equality perspective. It corresponds to the scaled as 4 responds (partly agree) and 5 (agree) in the six-range-scale, meaning that a certain majority refuses patriarchal stereotypes and considers that men can also cry without shame, women do not make decisions in an irrational way, that women should equally care for their job and career as well as for home and family, that it is not true that men have the most important role in earning money, that women should be equal in politics, work and leading positions, that promoting gender equality is important for the society, all institutions and each person.

The results from the cultural/general level show that patriarchal stereotypes and prejudices, which are given in Q 11 and Q 14 are refused by majority of respondents independently of their gender, which can be seen in table 2. Concerning the stereotype that men should not cry, 77.4% refuse it. Similar situation is with the response to Q11\_3, which expresses stereotyped statement that the most important role of a woman is to take care of her home and family.

However, concerning Q 11\_2, that women are more likely than men to make decisions based on their emotions, both gender are close to the response scaled in the overall results with 3 - "tend to agree", which indicates a high level of stereotyped way of thinking.

Concerning Q 12, which refers to the statements of respondents about whether gender equality is achieved in politics, at work and in leadership positions the majority "tends to disagree" and proportionally more men than women.

In addition, table 2 shows that in the case of Q 13, which is related to value statements of respondents about an importance of gender equality for fair and democratic society, for companies and for the economy, for the Faculty and for the person her/himself, the majority of respondents agrees and generally proportionally more women than men. Overall the results show that mean values are rather high, indicating that gender equality is present to a certain extent. Concerning Q 14, which is related to the questions and stereotyped attitudes about whether women should be prepared or not to cut their paid work for the sake of taking care of her family (14\_1), whether men should not equally take care for home and children (14\_2), and whether men have more right to job when jobs are scarce (14\_3), responses are different from the gender perspective. In the case of 14\_1, respondents are between the stated attitudes, what indicates existence and persistence of patriarchal matrix, while in the case 14\_2 and 14\_3 respondents are closer to the attitudes that men should take as much responsibility as women for the home and children, and that men should not have more right to job than women in the situation of scarce jobs.

## Institutional level

When having in mind that total index for institutional level ranges from 42 to 208, the index 119,14, it could be said that institutional framework at the LUMSA university has reached a certain level of gender equality but still far from enough.

The results from the first part of questions for the institutional level (Q15-Q19 and Q22) show that gender equality is present to a significant extent. In the case of Q15, which is related to a general attitudes about how the Faculty government treat gender equality (men and women are equally well represented, men and women are treated equally, Faculty is committed to promoting gender equality, if I had any concerns about gender equality in my Faculty, I would know who to approach, my Faculty is responsive to concerns about gender equality), results range around 4 and 5. Gender equality is also rather much present in Q16, which is related to academic and administrative support for career advancement, with results around 4 and 5 (allocation of desirable and sought-after tasks or roles are distributed independently from gender, distribution of office space are done independently from gender, mentoring and/or other guidance in making career decisions are done independently from gender, representation in senior positions are done independently from gender, allocation of administrative tasks are done independently from gender). Q17, which is related also to career promotion, with results around 4 and 5 shows a rather high level of gender equality through responses to the questions related to the statements that attention from senior management, access to informal circles of influence, receiving positive feedback from management, recruitment and selections for academic posts, and promotion decisions are done independently from gender. However, women have slightly lower scores in this sections although only in case of Q17\_4 the difference is statistically significant.

Results for Q18 around 5 show that gender equality is present in statements related also to career promotion, which say that allocation of formal training and career development opportunities, allocation of teaching, participation in projects, invitations to lectures, conferences, and appointments to editorships of journals are done independently from gender.

Q22 is related to the issues of sexist behavior and sexual harassment (sexist behavior is tolerated at my faculty, during lectures and extracurricular communication with students the teachers at our Faculty sometimes express sexist attitudes, sexual harassment occurs at my faculty, sexual harassment of students by the teaching staff occurs at my faculty, sexual harassment by senior position academics to lower positioned academic personnel occurs at my faculty, cases of sexual harassment in my faculty are treated as something to cover and hide). No gender differences are found in all questions covered by Q22, indicate that women and men have similar perspectives concerning sexist behavior and sexual harassment, i.e. higher mean values in this case refer to less present gender equality, or better articulated – it expresses implications about an existence of sexist behavior and sexual harassment.

Results for Q20 and Q21 show an extraordinary high number of missing values because of the small number of those who have been using maternity leave. However, the responses indicate that women are more critical than men towards the lack of support for mothers in different aspects on their coming back to work and towards the lack of policy measures for supporting in financial and organizational ways the child care for academic staff.



## Educational level

When having in mind that total index for educational level ranges from 8 to 48, the index 23.78 indicates a poor achievement in terms of gender equality in the educational aspect.

There are high numbers of missing values for all questions, especially for Q23\_4 (45) – As a rule, classes do not provide a gender perspective when learning about legal institutes and Q23\_5 (33) – Gender perspective in legal studies is utterly irrelevant to the quality of content and the meaning of acquired legal knowledge. These missing values are indicative for a demonstrative ignoring of the mentioned essential issues, what implies the potential obstruction and refusal of introducing educational policies oriented towards reconsidering textbooks and Curricula from gender perspective.

As already said, the results show that mean values are rather lower for men than women, meaning that women have been more aware of an importance of introducing gender mainstreaming in legal education, i.e. women have been more open for educational policy changing in this regard.

## Limitations

The limitations, common to these types of surveys, are related to the ad-hoc sampling design that can influence in unknown ways the distributional properties of the sample and the inference that derives. A bigger sample would allow for a more detailed analysis and further breakdowns by demographic characteristics and employment status. Lack of administrative data on the LUMSA faculty and teaching staff has reduced the scope of the desk analysis to the Palermo department of Law only.

## Conclusion

Total index for department of Law at the LUMSA university – is 184.58 (placed in the frame from 64 to 315) points towards the positive side viewed from gender perspective. The index is however low compared to the other universities that took part to the empirical survey tool. This shows gender inequality is indeed an issue that deserves further analysis and attention.

Index for Cultural/general level is 44.77 (placed in the frame from 14 to 59), which is rather high – 76%, the most on positive side viewed from gender perspective and gives the best scores when compared with all other fields of investigation.

Index for Institutional level is 119,14 (placed in the frame from 42 to 208), which is rather high - 57%, much more on positive than negative side viewed from gender perspective.

Index for Educational level is 23.78 (placed in the frame from 8 to 48), which is around 49.5%. This index is by far the lowest when compared with all other fields of investigation. In particular, participants do not fully agree on the need to reconsider textbooks used from a gender sensitive point of view, on the fact that classes do not provide a gender perspective and that additional education of teaching staff on gender issues is needed.

Overall, the sample at the LUMSA university shows a good degree of awareness and consideration for gender equality issues. However, some aspects of gender relationships in the institutional, cultural and educational contexts show that further improvements are possible and indeed desirable. This, implies the necessity to introduce more systemic gender equality policies in order to reach a better gender equality balance at the Faculty in cultural, institutional and educational dimension.

## References

- 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.
- 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>
- Hughson, M. (2015). *Poluperiferija i rod: pobuna konteksta*. Institut za kriminološka i sociološka istraživanja, Beograd.
- Hughson, M. (2017). *Muškarci u Srbiji druga strana rodne ne/ravnopravnosti*. Institut za kriminološka i sociološka istraživanja. Beograd.
- Hughson, M. (2017). "Unpacking Silence and Distortion: Mapping Misogyny in Serbia". *Књижевство* 7:137-147.
- 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
- Gender mainstreaming – Conceptual framework, methodology and presentation of good practices, 1998, <http://www.unhcr.org/3c160b06a.pdf> (assessed 28. 04. 2020)
- Pajvančić, M., Petrušić, N. M. (2014). „Značaj institucionalnih mehanizama za ostvarivanje rodne ravnopravnosti“. *Zbornik radova Pravnog fakulteta u Nišu*, br. 67
- 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](file:///C:/Users/Valerija/Downloads/mh0213481enc_0.pdf) (assessed 28.04.2020.)
- International Labour Office (2012). *A Manual for Gender Audit Facilitators - the ILO Participatory Gender Audit Methodology - 2nd Edition*. Geneva.
- 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.

## 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](http://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 22<sup>th</sup>. 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](mailto: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
<b>Q2) What is your gender</b>			
Q2_1. Male	1	0	9
Q2_2 Female	1	0	9
Q2_3 Other gender	1	0	9
<b>Q3) What is your marital status</b>			
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
<b>Q4) Are you a parent?</b>			
	1	0	9
<b>Q5) Academic degree</b>			
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
<b>Q6) Type of contract:</b>			
Q6_1 Part time	1	0	9
Q6_2 Full time	1	0	9
<b>Q7) Are you on a substitute position?</b>			
	1	0	9
<b>Q8) Duration of contract</b>			
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
<b>Q11_1:</b> It is acceptable for man to cry	4	3	2	1	9
<b>Q11_2:</b> Women are more likely than men to make decisions based on their emotions	1	2	3	4	9
<b>Q11_3:</b> The most important role of a women is to take care of her home and family	1	2	3	4	9
<b>Q11_4:</b> The most important role of a man is to earn money	1	2	3	4	9
<b>Q12_1:</b> Gender equality has been achieved in _____ ( <i>inscribe a particular Consortium university and delete this</i> ) in politics	4	3	2	1	9
<b>Q12_2:</b> Gender equality has been achieved in _____ at work	4	3	2	1	9
<b>Q12_3:</b> Gender equality has been achieved in _____ in leadership positions in companies and other organizations	4	3	2	1	9
<b>Q13_1:</b> Promoting gender equality is important to ensure a fair and democratic society	4	3	2	1	9
<b>Q13_2:</b> Promoting gender equality is important for companies and for the economy	4	3	2	1	9
<b>Q13_3:</b> Promoting gender equality is important for your faculty	4	3	2	1	9
<b>Q13_4:</b> 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

<b>Q14_1:</b> 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
<b>Q14_2:</b> 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
<b>Q14_3:</b> 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
<b>Q15_1:</b> In general, men and women are equally well represented (in terms of numbers) in my faculty	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
<b>Q15_2:</b> In general, men and women are treated equally in my faculty	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
<b>Q15_3:</b> My faculty is committed to promoting gender equality	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
<b>Q15_4:</b> If I had any concerns about gender equality in my faculty, I would know who to approach	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
<b>Q15_5:</b> My faculty is responsive to concerns about gender equality	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
<b>Q16_1:</b> Allocation of desirable and sought-after tasks or roles are distributed independently from gender	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
<b>Q16_2:</b> Distribution of office space are done independently from gender	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
<b>Q16_3:</b> Mentoring and/or other guidance in making career decisions are done independently from gender	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
<b>Q16_4:</b> Representation in senior positions are done independently from gender	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
<b>Q16_5:</b> Allocation of administrative tasks are done independently from gender	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
<b>Q17_1:</b> Attention from senior management are done independently from gender	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
<b>Q17_2:</b> Access to informal circles of influence are done independently from gender	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
<b>Q17_3:</b> Receiving positive feedback from management are done independently from gender	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
<b>Q17_4:</b> Recruitment and selections for academic posts are done independently from gender	1	2	3	4	5	6	9

<b>Q17_5:</b> 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
<b>Q18_1:</b> Allocation of formal training and career development opportunities are done independently from gender	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
<b>Q18_2:</b> Allocation of teaching are done independently from gender	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
<b>Q18_3:</b> Participation in projects are done independently from gender	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
<b>Q18_4:</b> Invitations to lectures, conferences, etc. are done independently from gender	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
<b>Q18_5:</b> Appointments to editorships of journals are done independently from gender	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
<b>Q19_1:</b> My supervisor has understanding for my caring responsibilities (at home, for children and elderly...)	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
<b>Q19_2:</b> My faculty has policies put in place (effective) for life-work balancing	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
<b>Q19_3:</b> My work schedule allows me to spend time with my family and friends	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
<b>Q19_4:</b> I am able to set boundaries between work and life	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
<b>Q19_5:</b> 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
<b>Q20_1:</b> Keeping in touch with the department while away	3	2	1	9
<b>Q20_2:</b> Flexible working hours	3	2	1	9
<b>Q20_3:</b> Initial part-time working building up to full time	3	2	1	9
<b>Q20_4:</b> Lower initial teaching load	3	2	1	9
<b>Q20_5:</b> Lower initial administrative load	3	2	1	9
<b>Q20_6:</b> Lower initial research supervision	3	2	1	9
<b>Q20_7:</b> Parent's network, support group at work	3	2	1	9
<b>Q20_8:</b> Additional block of shared parental leave	3	2	1	9
<b>Q20_9:</b> Facilities for continued baby care	3	2	1	9
<b>D20_10:</b> 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
<b>Q21_1:</b> Childcare related policies, including payments and benefits	1	2	3	4
<b>Q21_2:</b> Facilities for continued baby feeding on return to work	1	2	3	4
<b>Q21_3:</b> Contacts for supporting services (e.g. HR, occupational health)	1	2	3	4
<b>Q21_4:</b> Time off for antenatal appointments	1	2	3	4
<b>Q21_5:</b> How and when to notify your institution of your intentions regarding return to work	1	2	3	4
<b>Q21_6:</b> Options for phased return, or other forms of workload adjustment on return	1	2	3	4
<b>Q21_7:</b> 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
<b>Q22_1</b> Sexist behavior is tolerated at my faculty	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
<b>Q22_2</b> During lectures and extracurricular communication with students the teachers at our Faculty sometimes express sexist attitudes	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
<b>Q22_3</b> Sexual harassment occurs at my faculty	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
<b>Q22_4</b> Sexual harassment of students by the teaching staff occurs at my faculty	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
<b>Q22_5</b> Sexual harassment by senior position academics to lower positioned academic personnel occurs at my faculty.	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
<b>Q22_6</b> 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
<b>Q23_1:</b> Curricula at my faculty are gender sensitive	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
<b>Q23_2:</b> 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
<b>Q23_3:</b> 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
<b>Q23_4:</b> As a rule, classes do not provide a gender perspective when learning about legal institutes.	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
<b>Q23_5:</b> 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
<b>Q23_6:</b> Additional education of teaching staff on matters of gender equality is necessary at my faculty.	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
<b>Q23_7:</b> Introducing gender perspective in higher education curricula should be regulated by law.	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
<b>Q23_8:</b> 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