

Report of intellectual output 2 of the
LAWGEM project
—
Mapping gender equality at Saarland
University

Saarland University
January 27 2021

Thomas Giegerich
Christina Backes
Mareike Fröhlich
Nana Pazmann

Content

INTRODUCTION	3
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	3
SAARLAND 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
CULTURAL/GENERAL LEVEL	11
INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL	12
EDUCATIONAL LEVEL	14
ANALYSIS.....	15
CULTURAL/GENERAL LEVEL	15
INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL	15
EDUCATIONAL LEVEL	16
LIMITATIONS.....	16
CONCLUSION.....	16
REFERENCES	18
APPENDIX 1. EMPIRICAL SURVEY TOOL – EST	19

Introduction

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

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 to various resources (in Serbian context, cf. Babović, 2010). This is the consequence of the interaction of structural and cultural (implicit) patterns. Having this in mind, we assume that gender (in)equality is reproduced in social and University environments 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.

Saarland University

Founded in November 1948, Saarland University was originally established as a bilingual university that combined French and German educational traditions while offering a unique European perspective. The university, which was established with the support of the French Government and the University of Nancy, was the first to be founded west of the River Rhine after the Second World War. At the time Saarland found itself in the special situation of being partly autonomous and linked to France by economic and monetary union.

The university teaches various disciplines and has 6 faculties: Human and Business Sciences, Medicine, Mathematics and Computer Science, Natural Sciences and Technology, Humanities and Law. 16.700 students study at the Saarland University, 20% of whom are international students.

The Faculty of Law is one of the original faculties of Saarland University. Law is among the most popular subjects, and the Saarbrücken Law Faculty has one of the lowest dropout rates in Germany. The so called "Saarbrücken Model" of legal education is unique in Germany and is characterised by a number of specifics, including a considerable number of exams to be passed in each term and a strong focus on international and European law. The study programme has not been adapted to the Bachelor's/Master's system pursuant to the Bologna process. Instead, it culminates in two state examinations. The first one takes place after four years of study and consists of the compulsory state part and an area of specialisation selected by the students which is conducted by the law faculty. This is followed by the second state examination after two years of post-graduate legal apprenticeship outside the university. Whoever passes the second state examination is a fully qualified for the legal professions inside and outside public service. Another characteristic of the Law Faculty (unique in Germany) is the possibility of obtaining the French law degree "licence en droit" through the integrated "Centre Juridique Franco-Allemand", which is offered in cooperation with the French Ministry of National Education and the Universities of Metz, Strasbourg and Paris 2. Moreover, the Faculty offers a postgraduate master programme (LL.M) in German law and one in "Information Technology and Law". The Europa-Institut offers domestic and foreign students a master programme in "European and international Law".

The Europa-Institut of Saarland University (USAAR) as part of the Faculty of Law is the second oldest institution of its kind in Europe. As already mentioned above, the Europa-Institut successfully conducts the one-year postgraduate master programme in "European and international Law" with students enrolled from over 30 countries. The programme is characterised by five special study units – European Integration, European Economic Law, Foreign Trade and Investment, International Dispute Resolution and European Protection of Human Rights. Successful participants are awarded the title Master of Laws (LL.M.). In addition to professors teaching at Saarland University, the teaching staff of the Europa-Institut includes international guest professors and lecturers from many countries. The Europa-Institut of Saarland University has been certified by the international accreditation agency ACQUIN in line with the system accreditation of Saarland University. The programme accreditation officially certifies that the Europa-Institut of Saarland University represents excellent research as well as high-quality education. In addition, the Europa-Institut has been awarded the Certificate for Quality of Internationalisation (CeQuInt).

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 as well as wider socio-economic positions and opinions of the university staff according to three dimensions of gender (in)equality. It has been developed based on ASSET's (Athena Survey of Science, Engineering, and Technology) questionnaire¹, European Social Survey, European Quality of Survey, Eurobarometer, as well as a pre-test questionnaire carried out at the University of Belgrade. Each part will be further explained. For the full EST see Appendix 1.

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

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).

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 considered. Last question in the background group (Q10) is aimed to detect the involvement of the respondents in the care tasks of dependent children or relatives², and could be interpreted in connection with Q18, Q19 and Q20 regarding institutional support to work and family life balance.

1. **Cultural/ general level**– This theme consisted of 4 questions (Q11-Q14) with a total of 14 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 gender issues in academia: personal estimate of the necessity of gender equality, how it should or could be reached, do women have equal capacities and/or equal opportunities, what “fair share of private and professional duties” should mean, what should be a family friendly institutional design.
2. **Institutional framework** – This theme consisted of 8 questions (Q15-Q22) with a total of 48 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 behaviour 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 quality of gender (in)sensitivity of the study programmes, syllabi and textbooks (Vujadinović & Petrušić, 2017), as well as of the pedagogical approach and “the hidden curriculum”: value statements, prejudices, and stereotypes implied in the

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.

communication and relation between academic staff in itself and between professors and students.

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 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 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 Saarland university the following analysis where done:

- The sub-index for Cultural/general level consists of 14 questions. The value ranges from 14 to 59. The Cronbachs alpha value was 0.65.
- The sub-index for institutional level consists of 38 questions. The value ranges from 38 to 214. The Cronbachs alpha value was 0.90
- The sub-index for Educational level consists of 8 questions. The value ranges from 8 to 48. The Cronbachs alpha value was 0.65.
- The total index consists of all three levels, with 60 questions. The value ranges from 64 to 315. The Cronbachs alpha value was 0.86.

Sample

The EST was sent to all professors and all research and teaching associates of the faculty and the Europa-Institut. We only excluded student assistants without graduation and administrative staff since they do not have any teaching obligation.

Of the 102 staff members who received the EST, the response rate was 30 % ($n= 31$).

Procedure

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

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

Analysis

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

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

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

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 faculty of law at Saarland university. Data was collected from official records of the university. Data represents the study year 2019/2020 and was collected in June 2020. In total 2024 students were enrolled in courses/programs of any level of education during the study year, and 269 staff were employed at the faculty for the same period.

The results shown in table 1 reveal that there were gender differences concerning the faculty staff, where women are less likely to be represented in teaching staff positions (20.0%). Also, proportionally speaking, more men achieve an PhD diploma (81.82 %). Women are more likely to be enrolled in master studies (57.94%).

Gender ratios concerning the number of graduates and enrolled students showed no noticeable difference. Deans are appointed by an automatic rotation principle and are not chosen according to their suitability or ability, so the gender balance is not decisive.

Table 1. Descriptive data from the faculty of law at Saarland university per academic year for 2019.

Question	Women (Fq, %)	Men (Fq, %)
Students enrolled to all educational programs/courses	55.43%	44.57%
Students graduated	50.33%	49.77 %
Students enrolled to master studies	57.94%	42.06%
Students enrolled to doctoral studies	43.14%	56.86%
Students with achieved MA	0%	0%
Students with achieved PhD diplomas	18.18%	81.82%
Faculty management and leadership positions	50.00%	50.00%
Faculty teaching staff	44.16%	55.84%
- Teaching assistant	50.00%	50.00%
- Assistant professor/ PhD Lecturer	00.00%	00.00%
- Associate Professor	00.00 %	00.00%
- Full Professor	20.00%	80.00%
Permanent positions	not available	not available
Temporary positions	not available	not available

Background information of the sample as presented in the survey

In total 31 (30%) of the staff at the faculty of law at Saarland university performed the EST. They are hereafter named respondents, of which 20 (64.5%) were female, 11 (35.5%) were male, and 0 (0%) other gender. Their mean age was 33.41 years ($SD=9.22$ years). Their marital status was single (60.0%) married or partnership (40.0%) or something else (0%). 6 (20.0%) of the respondents stated that they were parents. There was one missing answer for these questions.

The academic degree presented for the respondents in the EST was having a BA (3.3%), Master/State Examination (76.7%) and PhD (20.0%) degree. Respondents stated that they held a part time contract (58.1%), or a full-time contract (41.9%). Concerning the duration of the contracts, there were temporary positions (77.4%), permanent positions (6.5%) and civil servants (16.1%). Their professional category was teaching assistant (71.4%), graduate teaching assistant (7.1%), associate professor (3.6%), and professor (14.3%). Three (9.7%) did not answer.

Overall, all of the respondents, 31 (100%) 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 5 (71.4%) of 7 Every day, Feeding 4 (57.1%) of 7 Every day, Taking them to school 2 (50.0%) of 4 Every day, After-school activities 3 (42.9%) of 7 for both every day or several times a week, School tasks 2 (40.0%) of 5 Every day, Going to the park 3 (37.5%) of 8 Once or twice a week, Other leisure activities 3 (33.3%) of 9 for both Several times a week and Every day, Cooking and housework 6 (75.0%) of 8 Every day, and Caring for elderly/ disabled relative 3 (60.0%) of 5 Several times a week.

It is difficult to make a conclusive statement, since more than 70 to 80 % of the respondents did not consider the questions to be relevant and therefore most of the questions were answered by less than 5 persons. However, gender differences were found for Q10_3, where women were more likely to taking children to school. Q10_4 and 5 show, that women are more likely to do after-school activities and school tasks. A gender difference is also evident in cooking and the household, as more women take on this task every day.

Empirical Survey

The index for the overall EST was 188 (SD = 35.87). There were no gender differences on the index level where women (184, SD= 31.83) had equal index values to men (194, SD= 43.26), $t(29)= 0.69$, n.s.

Results for each theme is presented separately.

Cultural/general level

The results from the cultural/general level show that a certain level of gender equality has been achieved in the 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 genders go close to 4 for the statements that it is legitimate that men cry, that it is not the most important role of a women to take care of her home and family (Q 11_3) and that it is not the most important role of a man to earn money (Q 11_4). 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, and that men should not have priority for getting job when there is a lack of jobs.

Overall, the results show that mean values are high, indicating gender equality is not present.

Table 2. Gender comparative result for the cultural/general level by 31 respondents at Saarland university for questions 11 to 14.

Question1	Missing values	Women (m. sd)	Men (m. sd)	Gender differences2
Q11_1	2	4.0 (0.0)	3.9 (0.3)	NO
Q11_2	3	2.9 (0.9)	2.7 (1.1)	NO
Q11_3	2	3.9 (0.3)	4.0 (0.0)	NO
Q11_4	2	3.9 (0.4)	3.6 (0.5)	NO
Q12_1	3	2.3 (1.0)	2.4 (0.9)	NO
Q12_2	3	2.0 (0.9)	2.4 (0.9)	NO
Q12_3	2	1.7 (0.8)	2.1 (0.8)	NO
Q13_1	1	3.7 (0.9)	3.3 (0.9)	NO
Q13_2	1	3.5 (1.0)	3.5 (0.7)	NO
Q13_3	3	3.5 (1.0)	3.4 (1.0)	NO
Q13_4	2	3.5 (0.9)	3.4 (0.5)	NO
Q14_1	1	4.3 (0.8)	4.0 (1.1)	NO
Q14_2	2	4.6 (1.0)	4.5 (0.8)	NO
Q14_3	3	4.8 (0.7)	4.5 (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 cultural/general level was 45 (SD= 9,6). There were no gender differences on the index level where women (46, SD= 7.25) had equal index values to men (42, SD= 12.77), $t(29)= -1.19$, n.s.

Institutional level

The results from the first part of the institutional level (Q15-Q19 and Q22) concerning attitudes and experiences showed that institutional framework at the Faculty of Law (Saarland) has reached a certain level of gender equality, which however is still far from satisfactory. Overall, the results show that mean values are relatively high, indicating a gender equality is present to a certain extent.

Table 3. Gender comparative result for the institutional level by 31 respondents at Saarland university for questions 15 to 19 and 22 ranging from 1 to 6.

Question1	Missing values	Women (m. sd)	Men (m. sd)	Gender differences2
Q15_1	1	3.5 (1.7)	3.7 (1.7)	NO
Q15_2	0	4.4 (1.1)	4.9 (0.8)	NO
Q15_3	4	4.8 (1.2)	5.1 (1.0)	NO
Q15_4	2	3.7 (1.7)	4.6 (1.8)	NO
Q15_5	5	4.3 (1.2)	4.6 (1.6)	NO
Q16_1	2	4.4 (1.3)	4.8 (1.8)	NO
Q16_2	2	5.3 (1.0)	5.5 (0.5)	NO
Q16_3	7	4.4 (1.4)	4.9 (1.3)	NO
Q16_4	2	4.0 (1.4)	5.2 (0.9)	YES
Q16_5	5	4.2 (1.3)	5.4 (0.7)	YES
Q17_1	9	4.5 (1.4)	5.3 (0.8)	NO
Q17_2	9	4.4 (1.0)	5.4 (0.7)	YES
Q17_3	6	4.7 (1.0)	5.3 (0.9)	NO
Q17_4	2	4.6 (1.2)	5.4 (0.9)	NO
Q17_5	5	4.4 (1.2)	5.3 (1.0)	NO
Q18_1	4	5.0 (1.0)	5.0 (1.2)	NO
Q18_2	5	4.8 (1.3)	5.5 (0.5)	NO
Q18_3	5	5.6 (0.6)	5.4 (0.7)	NO
Q18_4	4	5.3 (0.9)	5.5 (0.7)	NO
Q18_5	6	5.5 (0.7)	5.5 (0.8)	NO
Q19_1	9	4.9 (1.2)	4.8 (1.7)	NO
Q19_2	16	3.8 (1.8)	2.4 (1.1)	NO
Q19_3	2	4.9 (1.4)	5.3 (0.7)	NO
Q19_4	3	3.9 (1.4)	4.2 (1.6)	NO
Q19_5	2	4.2 (1.5)	4.5 (1.6)	NO
Q22_1	1	1.6 (0.8)	1.9 (1.2)	NO
Q22_2	2	2.8 (1.4)	2.4 (1.6)	NO
Q22_3	8	2.4 (1.1)	2.3 (1.3)	NO
Q22_4	8	2.2 (1.0)	2.7 (1.7)	NO
Q22_5	7	1.9 (1.1)	2.4 (1.7)	NO
Q22_6	9	2.1 (1.2)	2.1 (1.6)	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

Gender differences were found in relation to representation in leading positions, or whether this is independent of the respective gender (16_4). The distribution of administrative tasks is also classified by women as clearly gender-dependent on women, whereas men do not perceive this in

the same way (16_5). Gender differences were also found for question 17_2 which refers to access to informal groups with influence. That shows that gender equality is present more for men than women, in the sense that women are more critical towards statements that men and women are treated equally, and that the Faculty has been devoted to promoting gender equality.

As mentioned above, the index for this level was 118.13, which should be placed in the frame of scores from 42 to 208. There were no statistically significant gender differences on the index level. 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 the opinion that there is much 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. Gender differences were not found for any questions, indicating that gender equality is present for women to a higher or lower degree than men.

Table 4. Gender comparative result for the institutional level by 31 respondents at Saarland university for questions 15 to 22 ranging from 1 to 6.

Question1	Missing values	Women (m. sd)	Men (m. sd)	Gender differences2
Q20_1	30	3.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	NO
Q20_2	27	2.0 (0.0)	3.0 (1.4)	NO
Q20_3	30	1.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	NO
Q20_4	30	0.0 (0.0)	2.0 (0.0)	NO
Q20_5	29	2.0 (0.0)	4.0 (0.0)	NO
Q20_6	30	0.0 (0.0)	2.0 (0.0)	NO
Q20_7	29	1.0 (0.0)	4.0 (0.0)	NO
Q20_8	30	0.0 (0.0)	2.0 (0.0)	NO
Q20_9	30	0.0 (0.0)	4.0 (0.0)	NO
Q20_10	28	2.5 (2.1)	4.0 (0.0)	NO
Q21_1	0	1.0 (0.0)	1.0 (0.0)	NO
Q21_2	0	1.2 (0.7)	1.0 (0.0)	NO
Q21_3	0	1.3 (0.9)	1.0 (0.0)	NO
Q21_4	0	1.0 (0.0)	1.0 (0.0)	NO
Q21_5	0	1.2 (0.6)	1.0 (0.0)	NO
Q21_6	0	1.1 (0.4)	1.0 (0.0)	NO
Q21_7	0	1.2 (0.7)	1.0 (0.0)	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 institutional level was 118 (SD= 29.52). There were no gender differences on the index level where women (111, SD= 29.10) had equal index values to men (131, SD= 27.15), $t(29) = 1.82$, n.s.

Educational level

The index for this level was 26.24, which should be placed in the frame of scores from 8 to 48. There were no 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 rather lower for men than women, meaning that women have been more oriented in favor of gender equality in the educational dimension than men.

Gender differences were found for 23_4 (As a rule, classes do not provide a gender perspective when learning about legal institutes), where women express much more critical (towards gender equality-oriented opinion) than men.

Gender differences were also found for 23_6 (Additional education of teaching staff on matters of gender equality is necessary at my Faculty), in a sense that women are much more in favor of this approach than men.

Gender differences were also found for 23_7 (Introducing gender perspective in higher education curricula should be regulated by law), in a sense that again women are much more in favor of this approach than men.

Table 5. Gender comparative result for the educational level by 31 respondents at Saarland university for question 23 ranging from 1 to 6.

Question1	Missing values	Women (m. sd)	Men (m. sd)	Gender differences ²
Q23_1	6	3.4 (1.8)	4.1 (1.2)	NO
Q23_2	3	2.9 (1.6)	1.7 (1.1)	YES
Q23_3	2	4.1 (1.8)	3.2 (1.4)	NO
Q23_4	5	5.1 (0.7)	4.0 (1.1)	YES
Q23_5	4	3.8 (1.6)	4.2 (1.2)	NO
Q23_6	3	3.6 (1.6)	2.4 (1.3)	YES
Q23_7	3	3.1 (1.7)	2.1 (0.9)	YES
Q23_8	2	3.7 (1.8)	2.8 (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

The index for the educational level was 26 (SD= 8.48). There were no gender differences on the index level where women (28, SD= 9.16) had equal index values to men (23, SD= 6.06), $t(29) = -1.58$, n.s.

Analysis

If one places the index score of the Faculty of Law of Saarland University at 188, one comes to the conclusion that although it is in the upper midfield, it is definitely still too low. This shows the necessity of systematic work to counteract this existing gender distinction. Although the number of students enrolled differentiated by gender demonstrate a majority of females (55.43% female and 44.57% male), that majority is less with regard to the number of graduated students (50.33% female and 49.77 % male). There thus is a loss of female students during the course of studies, but the number do not show if they quit studying at all or changed the subject or university. While both genders are equally represented at the level of teaching assistants (50% female and 50% male) and females are almost equally represented at the level of the teaching staff (44.16% female and 55.84% men), the ratio changes drastically when it comes to the position of full professors (20% female and 80% male).

Cultural/general level

The index for this level was 45 which shows that a certain level of gender equality has been achieved in cultural/general mindset. The answers to questions Q11-14 show that the mindset of the respondents is in favour of gender equality and promoting gender equality is important for more than 75.0% of all respondents for ensuring a fair and democratic society, companies and economy, faculty and personally. This demonstrates that gender equality is accepted as a common value but the majority does not see it achieved in politics, professional life or in leadership positions in companies and organisations. Interestingly, it is precisely in the latter that gender equality is rejected by 77.4% whereas for politics and work a bit more than the half of the respondents reject equality (51.7% and 58.1%).

By analysing the results it has to be kept in mind that 64.5% of the respondents are female which could have an influence on Q12 and 13. Moreover, regarding Q11 and 14 represents the mainstream understanding in well-educated levels of societies.

Institutional level

The institutional level index was 118 and shows that a certain gender equality exists at the faculty but needs some improvement. First of all, it has to be noted that the Q20 and 21 are not representative since only 4 out of 31 respondents have been on parental leave. The questions do not reflect when the parental leave took place so that it is difficult to analyze which regulations have been in place at the faculty and in Germany. Since 2007 there has been a big change in the law and since then all parents who stay home for parental leave get a transfer payment instead of their salary. More meaningful information would be available when asking the administrative staff. Academic staff usually leave the university before starting to build up a family.

In general, Q15 shows that the faculty has reached some level of gender equality and is aware of the topic. Moreover, Q16-19 concerning attitudes and experiences show that gender equality is present to a certain extent. But also the results have shown that gender equality is present more for men than women due to the fact that women are more critical when it comes to questions about gender equality than men. This applies especially to the representation in leading positions (Q16_4), the distribution of administrative tasks (Q16_5) and the access to informal groups (Q17_2). Here, women answered that this is still a gender-dependent decision. Although legal regulations ask for equality, in these three areas it is hard to prove that discrimination took place. Furthermore, it should be noted that

often teams at the faculty are either men- or women-heavy, so that the experiences regarding their career or tasks are mostly not gender-based. Finally, the majority of academic staff are not confronted with situations regarding their career or promotion by superiors, as most leave the faculty after completing their doctorate.

Educational level

The index was 26 and the results show that that women have been more oriented in favor of gender equality in the educational dimension than men (especially Q4, 6 and 7).

In general, there is a certain level of gender-sensitivity in legal education at the faculty and the gender perspective is found relevant by the majority of the respondents when it comes to the quality of legal education and the following professional life. However, this did not lead to the agreement that textbooks should be revised (58.1% against) or that the consideration of gender aspects in curricula should be regulated by law (61.4% against). Such an approach allegedly contradicts the self-determination of the universities and the constitutionally guaranteed freedom of science, so that any legal regulation is met with scepticism. In this context, a revision of textbooks is also seen as an interference in academic freedom or freedom of opinion and is viewed critically. But only 42.0% of the respondents disagree that students should have the ability to understand and apply the principles of gender equality. Such an informal approach reflects the assumption that the gender perspective is relevant for better quality in legal education and professional life.

Limitations

While conducting the desk analysis and EST, we were faced with different data protection regulations so that some data was not approachable for us. Moreover, the division of the final graduation examination (first legal examination) in a state-regulated part and a university part created problems by generating the different datasets. Additionally, the results concerning the situation of parents was only answered by 7 out of 31 participants. Finally, it has to be mentioned that most of the respondents were research fellows/assistants with a limited contract.

Conclusion

The analysis shows that a certain level of gender equality has been reached but this is not satisfactory. Interestingly, the attitude towards gender equality is mostly positive and supporting but the experiences in personal life, at the faculty and in life in general differ from this, especially mainly women have a different perception. In case of parental obligations and reconciliation of work and family life the figures are not representative since only few respondents answered and the temporal classification is not possible and prevents a detailed analysis. The part on attitudes and experiences in the area of work, career and professional development must be seen in the context that a large proportion of employees only stay at the faculty for a short time to complete a doctorate. The faculty itself has 15 professors, of which only 3 are female, who are employed on a permanent basis. Their appointment, in turn, is a special process. There is no provision for qualification as a professor (assistant and associate professor) at one's own faculty, but rather candidates apply to other faculties after successful habilitation (around 500 pages monograph about own research) and are appointed there. This process disadvantages women, as such an appointment is made at the age of about 40. By this time, families have already been established and a support system has been created that makes it difficult to leave one's own faculty and apply to another, all the more since the appointing faculty expects new professors to move their household to the vicinity. A change in the system would

enable more women to become professors and would probably change the way of teaching to a more gender-sensitive approach.

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.
- International Labour Office (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.
- Sacksofsky, Ute/Stix, Carolin (11.09.2018). „Daten und Fakten zur Repäsentanz von Frauen in der Rechtswissenschaft“, https://www.jura.uni-frankfurt.de/73356125/Daten_und_Fakten_zur_Repr%C3%A4sentanz_von_Frauen_in_der_Rechtswissenschaft_Sacksofsky_Stix_2018.pdf (assessed: 14.12.2020)
- Schulz, Ulrike/Böning, Anja/Peppmeier, Ilka/Schröder, Silke . „De jure und de facto: Professorinnen in der Rechtswissenschaft, Geschlecht und Wissenschaftskarriere im Recht“, 1. Auflage, Baden-Baden 2018, <https://doi.org/10.5771/9783845287225-1> (assessed: 14.12.2020)
- Schulz, Ulrike (2019). „Genderaspekte bei der Karriere in der Rechtswissenschaft – Warum gibt es so wenig Juraprofessorinnen ?“, <https://csl.mpg.de/de/aktuelles/genderaspekte-bei-karrieren-in-der-rechtswissenschaft-warum-gibt-es-so-wenige-juraprofessorinnen/> (assessed: 14.12.2020)
- Statistisches Bundesamt, „Anzahl der Jura-Studenten in Deutschland“, (2019). <https://www.lto.de/jura/studium-zahlen/anzahl-der-jura-studenten/> (assessed: 14.02.2020)

Appendix 1. Empirical Survey Tool – EST

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Background questions

Q1) Age: _____

	YES	NO	No answer
Q2) What is your gender			
Q2_1. Male	1	0	9
Q2_2 Female	1	0	9
Q2_3 Other gender	1	0	9
Q3) What is your marital status			
Q3_1 Single	1	0	9
Q3_2 Married or partnership	1	0	9
Q3_3 Divorced	1	0	9
Q3_4 Widow or widower	1	0	9
Q3_5 Something else	1	0	9
Q4) Are you a parent?			
	1	0	9
Q5) Academic degree			
Q5_1 BA	1	0	9
Q5_2 Master	1	0	9
Q5_3 Magister of science	1	0	9
Q5_4 PhD	1	0	9
Q6) Type of contract:			
Q6_1 Part time	1	0	9
Q6_2 Full time	1	0	9
Q7) Are you on a substitute position?			
	1	0	9
Q8) Duration of contract			
Q8_1 Temporary position	1	0	9
Q8_2 Permanent position	1	0	9
Q8_3 Civil servant	1	0	9

Q9) Professional category: _____

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

	Every day	Several times a week	Once or twice a week	Less often than once a week	Never	Not relevant
Q10_1: Hygiene, bathing	5	4	3	2	1	9
Q10_2: Feeding	5	4	3	2	1	9
Q10_3: Taking them to school	5	4	3	2	1	9
Q10_4: After-school activities	5	4	3	2	1	9
Q10_5: School tasks	5	4	3	2	1	9
Q10_6: Going to the park	5	4	3	2	1	9
Q10_7: Other leisure activities	5	4	3	2	1	9
Q10_8: Cooking and housework	5	4	3	2	1	9
Q15_0: Caring for elderly/ disabled relatives	5	4	3	2	1	9

Cultural/general level

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

	Totally agree	Tend to agree	Tend to disagree	Totally disagree	No answer
Q11_1: It is acceptable for man to cry	4	3	2	1	9
Q11_2: Women are more likely than men to make decisions based on their emotions	1	2	3	4	9
Q11_3: The most important role of a women is to take care of her home and family	1	2	3	4	9
Q11_4: The most important role of a man is to earn money	1	2	3	4	9
Q12_1: Gender equality has been achieved in _____ (<i>inscribe a particular Consortium university and delete this</i>) in politics	4	3	2	1	9
Q12_2: Gender equality has been achieved in _____ at work	4	3	2	1	9
Q12_3: Gender equality has been achieved in _____ in leadership positions in companies and other organizations	4	3	2	1	9
Q13_1: Promoting gender equality is important to ensure a fair and democratic society	4	3	2	1	9
Q13_2: Promoting gender equality is important for companies and for the economy	4	3	2	1	9
Q13_3: Promoting gender equality is important for your faculty	4	3	2	1	9
Q13_4: Promoting gender equality is important for you personally	4	3	2	1	9

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

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

Institutional level

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

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Partly disagree	Partly agree	Agree	Strongly agree	No answer
Q15_1: In general, men and women are equally well represented (in terms of numbers) in my faculty	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
Q15_2: In general, men and women are treated equally in my faculty	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
Q15_3: My faculty is committed to promoting gender equality	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
Q15_4: If I had any concerns about gender equality in my faculty, I would know who to approach	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
Q15_5: My faculty is responsive to concerns about gender equality	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
Q16_1: Allocation of desirable and sought-after tasks or roles are distributed independently from gender							
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							
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