

Report of intellectual output 2 of the LAWGEM project

—

Mapping gender equality at Örebro University

Örebro University

January 28 2021

Content

INTRODUCTION	3
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	3
ÖREBRO UNIVERSITY.....	3
METHOD.....	5
DESIGN	5
DESK ANALYSIS	5
THE EMPIRICAL SURVEY TOOL - EST	5
<i>The EST index</i>	7
SAMPLE.....	7
PROCEDURE	8
ANALYSIS.....	8
RESULTS	9
DESK ANALYSIS	9
BACKGROUND INFORMATION OF THE SAMPLE AS PRESENTED IN THE SURVEY	10
EMPIRICAL SURVEY	11
<i>Cultural/general level</i>	11
<i>Institutional level</i>	12
<i>Educational level</i>	14
ANALYSIS.....	15
CULTURAL/GENERAL LEVEL.....	15
INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL	15
EDUCATIONAL LEVEL	16
LIMITATIONS	16
CONCLUSION.....	16
REFERENCES	17
APPENDIX 1. EMPIRICAL SURVEY TOOL – EST	18

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 and the comparative analysis will be published within the LAWGEM project. They will be available as the completed IO2 on 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 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, e.g., on leadership positions in faculties, universities, and projects; support mechanisms for the reintegration of parents after parental leave, etc., and in-depth qualitative research show structural inequalities in access 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 and 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 was to investigate and map conditions and attitudes towards gender equality in academic institutions involved in the project.

Örebro University

Örebro University (ORU) is in Örebro, Sweden. Previously a University College, the university was founded in 1999. The university has 15,000 students, 470 doctoral students, and 1,600 staff. ORU offers 80 undergraduate and masters level programs, including professional degree programs, such as medicine, psychology, law, and engineering. In terms of organization, ORU hosts three faculties and eight schools on three campuses.

The EST was performed for staff members at two Schools of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences: the School of Humanities, Education and Social Sciences, and the School of Law, Psychology and Social Work. Approximately 4,700 students attend programs in this Faculty. Given the broad range of subjects encompassed in the Faculty, the field of study for students varies but includes public planning and administration programs, social analysis, law, criminology, psychology, social work, and various teacher education programs. Research is conducted in 17 subjects in the Faculty, and prominent research environments include, among others, the Centre for Violence Studies (CVS). ORU has a diverse portfolio of H2020 projects that cut across multiple areas connected to ICT, medicine, health, social sciences, and gender studies. To date, there are 22 approved projects, of which ORU coordinates six.

Method

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.

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.

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 and 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, and 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 the 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 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

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).

considered. The 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 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 concerning value systems, stereotypes, prejudices of the professors regarding gender issues in academia: a 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 subquestions, 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 behavior, and sexual harassment.
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 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 the quality of gender (in)sensitivity of the study programs, 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.

The following research question was the basis of the EST:

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.

- 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 the 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 policyholder, or who are the agents of change?

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 Örebro university, the following analysis where done:

- The sub-index for the Cultural/general level consists of 14 questions. The value ranges from 14 to 59. The Cronbach's alpha value was 0.58.
- The sub-index for the institutional level consists of 38 questions. The value ranges from 38 to 214. The Cronbach's alpha value was 0.87
- The sub-index for Educational level consists of 8 questions. The value ranges from 8 to 48. The Cronbach's alpha value was 0.80.
- The total index consists of all three levels, with 60 questions. The value ranges from 64 to 321. The Cronbach's alpha value was 0.71.

Missing values were found for Cultural/general level ($r=0\% - 7.5\%$), Institutional level ($r=0\% - 55.0\%$), and Educational level ($r=0\% - 70.0\%$).

Sample

Based on the purpose of this mapping exercise (to investigate and map conditions and attitudes towards gender equality in the respective academic institutions involved in the project), the EST-team, after thorough deliberations, decided that the sample should consist of the teaching staff at the respective universities since they have the durable influence on design and implementation of the curricula vis-à-vis the students. Given the variations of employment types across the participating universities, it was further decided that the respondents should be asked to self-identify as to academic degrees and type of contracts. At Örebro University, the teaching staff at the School of

Law, Psychology and Social Work and the School of Humanities, Education and Social Sciences of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences at Örebro University³ were asked to participate.

Of the 277 staff members who received the EST, the response rate was 14 % ($n= 40$).

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 22 to July 15.

When data collection was finished, the Belgrade team transferred the data into SPSS files. The Belgrade team then analyzed data, and results were presented for each university as results in 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, chi-square analyses were used to analyze 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 analyze 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 The faculty further consists of the School of Music, which however was not deemed relevant for the purposes of this mapping exercise, and hence was excluded from the survey.

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.

Desk analysis

The desk analysis was based on data from the School of Law, Psychology and Social Work and the School of Humanities, Education and Social Sciences part of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences at Örebro University⁴. Data were collected from official records at the university. Data represented the academic year 2019/2020 and was collected in June 2020. In total, 6,235 students were enrolled in courses/programs of any level of education during the study year. 174 staff were employed at the School of Law, Psychology, and Social Work and 257 were employed at the School of Humanities, Education, and Social Sciences. Together a total of 431 staff were employed at the time of the data collection in June 2020. The EST was sent to all teaching staff, which was 277.

The results shown in table 1 reveal that there were gender differences concerning staff as well as students. The subjects were more likely to be dominated by female students (69 %) and teachers (58 %) and have lesser numbers of male students (31 %) and teachers (42 %).

Gender ratios concerning faculty staff showed gender differences, with junior lecturers consisting of more women (70 %) than men (30 %). As the increase of the academic degree, the gender ratio starts to shift. For Assistant Professor/Ph.D. Lecturer the ratio of women (60 %) over men (40 %) declines. At the level of Professor, it has changed so that there are more men (63 %) than women (37 %).

Table 1. Descriptive data from the School of law, Psychology and Social work and the School of Humanities, Education and Social Sciences at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences at Örebro University per academic year for 2019/2020.

Question	Total	Women (Fq, %)	Men (Fq, %)
Students enrolled in all educational programs/courses	6235	4289 (69 %)	1946 (31 %)
Students graduated	368	282 (77 %)	86 (23 %)
Students enrolled to master studies	734	533 (73 %)	201 (27 %)
Students enrolled in doctoral studies	81	50 (62 %)	31 (38 %)
Students with achieved MA	222	132 (59 %)	90 (41 %)
Students with achieved Ph.D. diplomas	11	7 (64 %)	4 (36 %)
Faculty management and leadership positions		not available	not available
Faculty teaching staff	277	162 (58 %)	115 (42 %)
- Junior Lecturer (adjunct)	67	47 (70 %)	20 (30 %)
- Assistant Professor/Ph.D. Lecturer	166	99 (60 %)	67 (40 %)
- Associate Professor		not available	not available
- Full Professor	44	16 (37 %)	28 (63 %)
Permanent positions		not available	not available
Temporary positions		not available	not available

⁴ The faculty further consists of the School of Music, which however was not deemed relevant for the purposes of this mapping exercise, and hence was excluded from the survey.

Background information of the sample as presented in the survey

In total, 40 (14%) of the staff at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences at Örebro University performed the EST. They are hereafter named respondents, of which 24 (60%) were female, 16 (40%) were male, and 0 (0%) another gender. Their mean age was 46.85 (range 27 to 72 years). Their marital status was single (6, 15.0%), married or partnership (31, 77.5 %), divorced (2, 5 %), widow or widower (1, 2.5 %), or something else (0, 0%). 32 (80 %) 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, 5 %), Master (3, 7.5%), Magister of Science (5, 12.5%), or a Ph.D. (30, 75 %) degree. Respondents stated that they held a part-time contract (6, 15 %) or a full-time contract (34, 85 %), where the duration of the contract was temporary positions (10, 25.6 %), permanent position (28, 71.8 %), or civil servant (1, 2.6 %). Their professional category was teaching assistant (12, 31.6 %), Assistant professor/Ph.D. Lecturer (12, 31.6 %), Associate Professor (8, 21.1 %), and Professor (6, 15.8 %). Two (5%) did not answer.

Overall, about two-thirds of respondents (67.5%) answered the question *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 was: Hygiene/bathing (10 (37 %) of 27, Every day), Feeding, (13 (59 %) of 22, Every day), Taking them to school (11 (44 %) of 25, Every day), After-school activities (10 (35 %) of 28, for both Once or twice a week or Several times a week), School tasks (13 (48 %) of 27, Several times a week), Going to the park (8 (35 %) of 23, Once or twice a week), Other leisure activities (15 (54 %) of 28, Several times a week), Cooking and housework (23 (70 %) of 33, Every day), and Caring for elderly/ disabled relatives (11 (41 %) of 27, Never).

Gender differences were found, where women were more likely to do cooking and housework activities and less likely to engage in other leisure activities than men on a more frequent basis.

Empirical Survey

The index for the overall EST was 187 (SD = 36.93). There were no gender differences on the index level where women (190, SD= 42.01) had equal index values to men (182, SD= 28.35), $t(38) = -0.64$, n.s.

Results for each theme is presented separately.

Cultural/general level

The cultural/general level results showed that mean values for questions Q11- Q13 ranged from tend to disagree (2.0) to totally agree (4.0), which can be seen in table 2. Overall, the results show that mean values are moderate to high, indicating that gender equality is present among respondents.

Gender differences were found for two of fourteen questions, indicating that overall gender equality is present for both men and women. Results on question *Q13_2 Promoting gender equality is important for companies and for the economy*, and *Q13_3 Promoting gender equality is important for your faculty* showed that women to a higher degree than men totally agreed with these statements.

Table 2. Gender comparative result for the cultural/general level by 40 respondents at Örebro University for questions 11 to 13 (R=1-4) and 14 (R=1-5).

Question ¹	Missing values	Women (m. sd)	Men (m. sd)	Gender differences ²
Q11_1	0	3.9 (0.6)	3.9 (0.3)	NO
Q11_2	1	3.5 (0.9)	3.5 (0.6)	NO
Q11_3	0	3.6 (0.7)	3.7 (0.7)	NO
Q11_4	0	3.8 (0.7)	3.8 (0.6)	NO
Q12_1	1	2.6 (0.8)	2.1 (1.0)	NO
Q12_2	1	2.4 (0.9)	2.1 (0.9)	NO
Q12_3	3	2.0 (1.0)	1.7 (0.9)	NO
Q13_1	1	4.0 (0.0)	3.8 (0.6)	NO
Q13_2	2	4.0 (0.2)	3.4 (0.6)	YES
Q13_3	1	4.0 (0.2)	3.7 (0.5)	YES
Q13_4	0	3.9 (0.3)	3.8 (0.6)	NO
Q14_1	0	4.4 (1.1)	3.6 (1.4)	NO
Q14_2	0	4.9 (0.4)	4.4 (1.3)	NO
Q14_3	0	4.9 (0.4)	4.4 (1.4)	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 49 (SD= 4.89). There were gender differences on the index level where women (51, SD= 4.37) had a higher index values than men (47, SD= 4.92), $t(38) = -2.50$, $p < .05$.

Institutional level

Table 3. Gender comparative result for the institutional level by 40 respondents at Örebro university for questions 15 to 19 and 22 (R=1-6).

Question ¹	Missing values	Women (m. sd)	Men (m. sd)	Gender differences ²
Q15_1	1	3.3 (1.6)	3.0 (1.5)	NO
Q15_2	2	3.5 (1.6)	4.0 (1.2)	NO
Q15_3	1	4.3 (1.3)	4.3 (0.8)	NO
Q15_4	1	4.1 (1.8)	4.6 (1.1)	NO
Q15_5	5	3.8 (1.5)	4.3 (0.9)	NO
Q16_1	2	3.5 (1.4)	3.9 (1.2)	NO
Q16_2	5	4.8 (1.5)	5.1 (1.2)	NO
Q16_3	8	4.1 (1.6)	4.6 (1.3)	NO
Q16_4	3	3.8 (1.7)	3.9 (1.5)	NO
Q16_5	3	3.6 (1.4)	4.1 (1.4)	NO
Q17_1	3	4.0 (1.8)	4.6 (1.1)	NO
Q17_2	0	3.5 (1.7)	3.9 (1.6)	NO
Q17_3	7	4.4 (1.5)	4.3 (1.3)	NO
Q17_4	0	4.0 (1.5)	4.3 (1.5)	NO
Q17_5	9	4.5 (1.2)	4.7 (1.4)	NO
Q18_1	8	4.2 (1.4)	5.0 (1.0)	NO
Q18_2	3	4.1 (1.6)	4.7 (1.1)	NO
Q18_3	6	4.1 (1.7)	4.1 (1.5)	NO
Q18_4	6	4.4 (1.5)	4.6 (1.2)	NO
Q18_5	22	4.1 (1.7)	4.4 (1.3)	NO
Q19_1	7	4.4 (1.7)	4.6 (1.2)	NO
Q19_2	9	3.4 (1.9)	3.3 (1.4)	NO
Q19_3	3	4.5 (1.0)	4.2 (0.9)	NO
Q19_4	0	3.7 (1.3)	3.6 (1.0)	NO
Q19_5	0	3.7 (1.5)	3.9 (1.1)	NO
Q22_1	2	2.3 (1.4)	1.7 (1.0)	NO
Q22_2	5	2.4 (1.6)	1.9 (1.0)	NO
Q22_3	10	2.7 (1.7)	2.2 (1.5)	NO
Q22_4	12	2.1 (1.5)	1.6 (0.8)	NO
Q22_5	10	2.1 (1.3)	1.8 (1.5)	NO
Q22_6	7	1.8 (1.2)	1.8 (1.2)	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

In table 3, results from the first part of the institutional level (Q15-Q19 and Q22) concerning attitudes and experiences can be seen. The results showed that mean values varied across questions and ranged from disagree (1.8) to agree (4.7), which can be seen in table 3. Overall, the results show

that mean values for Q15-Q18 regarding equal representation and equal treatment in the institution and the institution's willingness to promote gender equality, be concerned, and responsive to gender equality were high. In contrast, mean values for Q19 regarding individual work-life balance were low. No gender differences were found for questions Q15-Q19 and Q22 at the institutional level, indicating that gender equality was present equally for women and men. Missing values of 55 % were reported for *Q18_5. Appointments to editorships of journals are done independently from gender*, which could be due to the university's lack of these assignments.

The results from the second part of the institutional level (Q20 and Q21), which were filtered questions and only applied to parents, showed that women and men have equal parental support from the institution, which can be seen in table 4. Overall, the results show that mean values were high, indicating gender-equality is present.

No gender differences were found for questions Q20 and Q21 at the institutional level, indicating that gender equality was present equally for women and men.

Table 4. Gender comparative result for the institutional level by 13 respondents at Örebro university for Q20 (R= 1 – 3) and Q21 (R= 1 - 4).

Question ¹	Missing values	Women (m. sd)	Men (m. sd)	Gender differences ²
Q20_1	28	1.4 (0.5)	2.0 (1.2)	NO
Q20_2	27	2.4 (1.1)	4.0 (0.0)	YES
Q20_3	31	2.8 (1.5)	2.6 (1.5)	NO
Q20_4	28	1.0 (0.0)	1.8 (1.5)	NO
Q20_5	28	1.0 (0.0)	1.8 (1.5)	NO
Q20_6	31	1.0 (0.0)	2.0 (1.7)	NO
Q20_7	30	1.0 (0.0)	1.0 (0.0)	NO
Q20_8	35	3.3 (1.5)	4.0 (0.0)	NO
Q20_9	26	2.5 (1.6)	2.2 (1.5)	NO
Q20_10	25	1.3 (1.0)	1.0 (0.0)	NO
Q21_1	0	1.2 (0.6)	1.2 (0.8)	NO
Q21_2	0	1.1 (0.4)	1.2 (0.8)	NO
Q21_3	0	1.1 (0.4)	1.2 (0.8)	NO
Q21_4	0	1.3 (0.8)	1.2 (0.8)	NO
Q21_5	0	1.4 (0.8)	1.3 (0.9)	NO
Q21_6	0	1.2 (0.6)	1.2 (0.8)	NO
Q21_7	0	1.1 (0.6)	1.2 (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

The index for the institutional level was 109 (SD= 32.11). There were no gender differences on the index level where women (108, SD= 35.64) had equal index values to men (109, SD= 27.06), $t(38)= 0.04$, n.s.

Educational level

The educational level results showed that mean values ranged from disagree (2.0) to agree (4.9), which can be seen in table 5. Overall, the results show that mean values were high, indicating gender equality is present. Although, for *Q23_4 As a rule, classes do not provide a gender perspective when learning about legal institutes*, and *Q23_5 Gender perspective in legal studies is utterly irrelevant to the quality of content and the meaning of acquired legal knowledge* missing values were 70 % and 35 % respectively. This is probably due to the sample's composition, where the majority of the respondents do not teach these specific subjects.

Gender differences were found for one question *Q23_6 Additional education of teaching staff on matters of gender equality is necessary at my faculty*, where results showed that women to a higher degree than men agreed to this statement.

Table 5. Gender comparative result for the educational level by 40 respondents at Örebro university for question 23 (R= 1 - 6).

Question ¹	Missing values	Women (m. sd)	Men (m. sd)	Gender differences ²
Q23_1	4	4.4 (1.4)	4.4 (0.9)	NO
Q23_2	2	3.8 (1.6)	3.4 (1.1)	NO
Q23_3	2	5.7 (0.6)	5.1 (1.2)	NO
Q23_4	28	2.8 (1.5)	2.0 (0.0)	NO
Q23_5	14	5.4 (1.3)	5.6 (0.9)	NO
Q23_6	4	4.7 (1.2)	3.7 (1.4)	YES
Q23_7	4	3.8 (1.7)	2.9 (1.5)	NO
Q23_8	0	4.9 (1.3)	4.6 (1.0)	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 educational level was 29 (SD= 7.07). There were no gender differences on the index level where women (30, SD= 7.35) had equal index values to men (26, SD= 5.93), $t(38) = -1.97$, n.s.

Analysis

The overall results show an existing awareness of gender equality among men and women who work as teaching staff at the School of Law, Psychology and Social Work (JPS) and the School of Humanities, Education and Social Sciences (HumUS) at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences at ORU. More women than men participated in the survey, although the total index results show no significance in mean difference, meaning respondents' gender does not affect the outcome.

The desktop analysis shows that female students are the majority of students enrolled at the university. Furthermore, female students tend to graduate to a higher degree than male students as well. For doctoral-level studies, female students are still more, although male students are increasing proportionally. The same can be seen with teaching staff. More women are employed as adjunct/junior lecturers, and the more advanced academic positions, the fewer women can be seen. More women study at the university, but at the top of the academic positions, there are still more men, i.e., most full professors are still men. These results indicate that something along the academic career path makes it more difficult for women than men to achieve the highest academic positions.

Cultural/general level

Based on the respondents' answers to questions 11-14, overall gender equality is present at the cultural/general level, where the index (49) was 85 % of the maximum. However, more women than men believe that promoting gender equality in companies and the economy is important, as well as promoting gender equality for the faculty. The high index value for this level reflects this as well. It indicates that organizational culture is embedded with cultural stereotypes, gender bias, and prejudice against women, ultimately affecting the companies, economy, and faculty. Thus, promoting gender equality is sought at the cultural/general level.

Institutional level

Based on the responses to questions 15-18, almost all respondents agree or tend to agree that men and women are equally represented and treated equally at their institution. They also agree that their institutions are committed to promoting gender equality. Overall, the responses to questions 19-21 show that organizational policies regarding family and parental leave based on gender equality principles are in place. Thus, both men and women indicate that they have received equal parental and childcare supports from their institutions. However, satisfaction with family and work-life balance is shown low for both men and women. The main analysis here, however, is that anti-discrimination policies and equal employment opportunity policies are enforced at the institutional level at ORU.

As for the question on sexual harassment at the faculty level, both men and women either agree or strongly agree that sexual harassment occurs in their institutions and is tolerated and expressed by senior academics to those with lower positions. Moreover, the results show that the respondents agree that the cases of sexual harassment are hidden. This manifests the need for more robust gender equality policies to reduce sexual harassment at the institutional level, which can also be linked to the cultural patterns of genderism and sexism at the individual level.

The above analysis of the results is supported by the relatively low index (109), 59 % of the maximum. There is a high awareness of gender equality at ORU, which could explain that even

though the staff is aware of the inequalities that exist, there is still more active work that needs to be done towards gender equality in everyday work-life.

Educational level

The index for the educational level was (29), 67 % of the maximum. According to the responses, both men and women agree or tend to agree that curricula at their institutions are sensitive to gender equality and that gender equality perspective in legal studies is important. Moreover, the number of women is higher than men who think that additional education of teaching staff on matters of gender equality is necessary at their institutions. For the two questions Q23_4 and Q23_5, there are high numbers of missing values, probably due to many of the respondents not teaching classes in law. Therefore the results for the educational level from ORU might reflect studies in social sciences and humanities overall and not only law studies. In sum, the results show that gender equality in higher education teaching exists, but additional education for teachers is deemed necessary to apply a gender perspective in their teaching.

Limitations

Data for the desk analysis was drawn from existing documents, which may not reflect the realities entirely. One must assume a slight delay in updating all documentation concerning staff composition and post holders. It is possible that someone still noted as a junior lecturer may have defended their Ph.D. at the time of the survey and thus self-identify as a senior lecturer in the EST.

One further limitation that needs to be mentioned was the time at which EST was sent to respondents. This took place at the beginning of the summer holiday period, which is likely to have had a negative impact on the number of respondents.

Lastly, mention should be made about the questionnaire being translated, which may have impacted some of the questions and made them more difficult to understand.

A further limitation in the analysis is that the questionnaire does not enable an intersectional analysis, as the designed questions do not include age, disability, race/ethnicity, nationality, or sexuality as variables for analysis.

Conclusion

ORU's organizational culture, consisting of the teaching staff's attitudes towards gender, promotes gender equality. However, there is more room for developing organizational policies and organizational culture on sexism and sexual harassment perpetrated by senior academics towards junior staff/those in lower positions. Although gender equality policies on family and parental leave are implemented at the institutional level, organizational culture could help teach staff to balance family and work-life. More robust and structural work needs to be done on several different university levels to make the academic career path more gender-equal to promote both men and women to achieve high academic positions.

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. (2015a). „Rodni režimi na poluperiferiji“. *Zeničke sveske - Časopis za društvenu fenomenologiju i kulturnu dijalogiku* 21:255-265, <https://www.cceol.com/search/article-detail?id=749917>
- Hughson, M. (2015b). *Poluperiferija i rod: pobuna konteksta*. Institut za kriminološka i sociološka istraživanja, Beograd.
- International Labour Office, ILO (2012). *A Manual for Gender Audit Facilitators - the ILO Participatory Gender Audit Methodology - 2nd Edition*. Geneva.
- Pajvančić, M., Petrušić, N. M. (2014). „Značaj institucionalnih mehanizama za ostvarivanje rodne ravnopravnosti“. *Zbornik radova Pravnog fakulteta u Nišu*, br. 67
- 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

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, 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
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
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