



EQUAL4EUROPE

GENDER EQUALITY PLANS

Report on Policy Evaluation

D7.4

© Copyright 2023 EQUAL4EUROPE Consortium

All rights, amongst which the copyright, on the materials described in this document rest with the original authors of the text, except where referenced. The information provided in this document is confidential for use within the EQUAL4EUROPE consortium only; it is not intended for publication. This document may not be reproduced or brought into circulation without the prior written consent of the authors and Fundación ESADE, as the project coordinator. Without prior permission in writing from the authors and the Fundación ESADE, this document may not be used, in whole or in part, for the lodging of claims, for conducting proceedings, for publicity and/or for the benefit or acquisition in a more general sense.

Legal Disclaimer

The European Commission's support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents, which reflect the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.



CC BY-NC-ND 4.0 DEED

Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 4.0 International

PROGRAMME	H2020 SCIENCE WITH AND FOR SOCIETY
GRANT AGREEMENT NUMBER	872499
PROJECT ACRONYM	EQUAL4EUROPE
DOCUMENT	D7.4
TYPE (DISTRIBUTION LEVEL)	PUBLIC VERSION OF A CONFIDENTIAL DOCUMENT
DUE DELIVERY DATE	1/12/2023
DATE OF DELIVERY	24/11/2023
STATUS AND VERSION	Version 1
NUMBER OF PAGES	10
Work Package / TASK RELATED	WP7
Work Package / TASK RESPONSIBLE	Task 7.3
AUTHOR (S)	Maria Guadalupe, Daisy Pollenne, Kaisa Snellman

Foreword

Equality between women and men is a fundamental right and a precondition for effective democracy and lasting economic growth. It is one of the European Union's founding principles and a building block of its future. Gender equality contributes to jobs, growth, fairness and democratic change. Achieving Gender Equality in research has been a priority of the Council of Europe since 2005 (EC, 2005). In 2012, gender equality and gender mainstreaming in research formed one of the five ERA priorities, to end the waste of talent which we cannot afford and diversify views and approaches in research and foster excellence (EC, 2012). Through their 2012 Communication, the European Commission committed to promoting and funding projects that design and implement so-called Gender Equality Plans (GEPs) for Research Performing Institutions (RPIs) in the European Research Areas (EC, 2012). These projects were initially funded under Framework Programme 7 (FP7) and thereafter by the Horizon 2020 programme (as part of the "SwafS" – Science with and for Society). EQUAL4EUROPE is part of this large group of projects.

In this context, all 6 of the Research Performing Institutions in the E4E consortium distributed a survey across staff, faculty, students and young researchers in December 2020. The objective of this Gender Equality Survey was to gain qualitative insight on potential barriers to women's career progression in academia. As part of the project, INSEAD conducted an in-depth analysis of survey responses provided by staff and faculty members to shed light on these dynamics. The analysis concluded with several tentative suggestions as to how institutions can improve the workplace for all individuals, across genders and occupations. In the following brief, we summarize some of the key findings.

Introduction to the Research Report

In analysing responses to the Gender Equality Survey, the aim was to explore both gender and occupational differences in individuals' career dynamics. Several considerations have structured this choice of focus. First, we acknowledge vast evidence that men and women differ in important organisational outcomes, at the forefront of which progression towards more senior occupations (Buckles, 2019; Cullen and Perez-Truglia, 2023). Second, features of RPIs may result in large gender differences within academic occupations (Casad et al., 2021; García-González et al., 2019; Huang et al., 2020). Third, there is a multiplicity of channels sustaining occupational gender gaps, ranging from discrimination (Bertrand et al., 2005; Blau and Kahn, 2017) preferences (Fernández et al., 2004; Croson and Gneezy, 2009; Eckel et al., 2021), stereotypes (Nosek et al., 2009; Grossman and Lugovskyy, 2011; Carlana, 2019; Chen and Houser, 2019) to features of work environments (Bertrand et al., 2010; Weeden et al., 2016; Antecol et al., 2018), all channels which have received varying degrees of attention.

As such, the full report which we summarize in this brief has several important contributions. The first is our analysis of who individuals surround themselves with and their perceptions of the workplace environment. When looking at features of research environments, there is already important evidence on gender differences in aspects such as task allocation, co-authorship or collaboration (Babcock et al., 2017; Ductor et al., 2021; Lundberg and Stearns, 2019) all which have implications for women's career progression in academia. We contribute to this channel by examining gender differences in individuals' network composition and opportunities for mentoring. Next, while we know that individuals' perceptions drive career behaviours and outcomes, much of this research has drawn on gender differences in individuals' perceptions about their professional ability/competence, and that of their peers (Coffman, 2014; Bordalo et al., 2019). We extend this approach by measuring their perceptions of the workplace (Allgood et al., 2019).

The second contribution relates to identifying the specificities of academia as an occupational environment. Research has often focused on faculty members when explaining gender differences in academia. We build on this approach by including staff respondents in our analysis. Arguably, this helps us better isolate what in academia, if anything, is unique in perpetuating gender gaps in important occupational outcomes. By doing so, we also answer

recent calls to examine gender dynamics in female-dominated occupations (Adams and Lowry, 2022a), as is the case with staff across the RPIs.

Methodology of the Research Report

The Gender Equality Survey collected information on individuals' socio-demographics, their experiences and perceptions of the workplace, and important outcomes. For this purpose, we selected a set of questions from validated measurement scales (see Appendix Table 11). This is an important step of the methodological design as it ensures that the analysis is based on accepted survey measures. Table 1 below summarises the number of responses we use throughout the analysis.

Table 1 - Survey responses by occupation and gender

	Male respondents	Female respondents	Total
Faculty	187	199	386
Staff	649	177	826
Total	836	376	1212

Next, in analysing responses to the survey, there are several methodological points worth developing. First and foremost, the analysis conducted provides *descriptive* statistics on associations between individuals' workplace experience and important outcomes. If a review of theoretical and empirical evidence guided our reflection as to the direction or nature of these associations, we recognize the potential for reverse causality and of no causality at all. As such, results of such an analysis should be considered as descriptive as opposed to causal.

Second, we focus on gender and occupational differences. Throughout the report, gender differences refer to differences between respondents who identify as male or as female in the survey. We focus on this distinction given the focus on the E4E project. However, we acknowledge full well that the gender binary is reductive and does not allow us to capture the entirety of gender dynamics which manifest in academic settings.

Third, we do not make any strong claims that the sample of respondents across the RPIs is either representative of each unique institutional context, or of academia more broadly. Before turning to the results, the following paragraphs present further information on our

sample respondents by gender and occupation. With this in mind, the final section of this brief outlines the key findings.

Main findings and recommendations of the Research Report

The responses to the E4E focusing provided much insight on barriers female academics face in their career progression.

Importantly, female faculty are more likely to report having experienced harassment, and yet less likely to report that their institution has an official harassment policy. In parallel, this also materialises in how female faculty view the workplace, where perceptions of masculinity culture are particularly high among female faculty. These potentially indicate areas for further research. However, the report provided the opportunity to highlight some positive findings. For one, female faculty have the second lowest turnover intentions. In addition, they have the highest workplace well-being across the sample. As such, although there still is an over-arching need to redress gender imbalances across academic institutions, future efforts from academic institutions need to focus on their workforce as a whole.

When focusing on this workforce, we found no stark differences in how individuals' mentoring, networks and perceptions associate with turnover intentions and well-being. Knowing that only 50% of all respondents have a mentor, and that 70% of these are informal, there is a clear need to develop these initiatives for all, at an institutional level. Importantly, there is a clear need not only to decrease harassment, since almost 20% of our sample has experienced some form of harassment, but to provide further support in the event of harassment. This is an area that would benefit female faculty particularly. Indeed, female faculty reported both more harassment and less awareness of what support, if any, is available in the event of harassment.

In parallel, a significant contribution of our report was in highlighting how important individuals' perceptions of their workplace are. We focused on aspects such as Masculinity Contest Culture and Climate for Inclusion. For example, excessive masculinity, which is known to be more pervasive in academia, is detrimental to retention and well-being, and this is true across gender and occupation. At the opposite, there is a clear indication that higher institutional belonging promotes both well-being and retention, although, as highlighted, it is the case for female faculty only that sense of inclusion is more beneficial still. On this point,

there is an important avenue for further research in understanding why two positive perceptions, belonging and inclusion, would show different trends over time.

We highlighted this as a central contribution for several reasons. First, policies aiming to improve the workplace for individuals tend to focus on crucial, tangible dimensions such as formal hiring and promotion criteria or work-life balance policies. However, our findings suggested a need for this to be doubled with efforts to improve how individuals feel in their workplace. Second, this is noteworthy in that perceptions of Masculinity Contest Culture and Climate for Inclusion both decline over time. This means that interventions need to promote a better workplace environment not only for recent hires, but for those individuals who stay within their institution for years, if not decades.

Annexe

Annexe Table 1 - Full scales of items included in the E4E Gender Equality Survey

Concept	Full scale (included survey items in bold)	Source
Climate for inclusion	<p><u>Fairly implemented practices that help to eliminate bias:</u> My institution has a fair promotion process. The performance review process in my institution is fair. My institution invests in the development of all its employees. Employees in my institution receive “equal pay for equal work”. My institution provides safe ways for employees to voice their grievances. My institution commits resources to ensuring that employees are able to resolve conflicts effectively. <u>Integration of individual differences:</u> My institution is characterized by a non-threatening environment in which people can reveal their “true” selves. My institution values work-life balance. Employees of my institution are valued for who they are as people, not just for the jobs that they fill. In my institution, people often share and learn about one another as people. My institution has a culture in which employees appreciate the differences that people bring to the workplace. <u>Inclusion in decision-making processes:</u> In my institution, employee input is actively sought. In my institution, everyone’s ideas for how to do things better are given serious consideration. In my institution, employees’ insights are used to rethink or redefine work practices. Top management exercises the belief that problem-solving is improved when input from different roles, ranks, and functions is considered.</p>	Nishii, L.H., 2013. The benefits of climate for inclusion for gender-diverse groups. Academy of Management Journal, 56(6), pp.1754-1774.
Masculinity Contest Culture	<p><u>Show no weakness:</u> Admitting you don’t know the answer looks weak. Expressing any emotion other than anger or pride is seen as weak. Seeking other’s advice is seen as weak. The most respected people don’t show emotions. People who show doubt lose respect.</p>	Glick, P., Berdahl, J.L. and Alonso, N.M. (2018), Development and Validation of the Masculinity Contest Culture Scale. Journal of Social Issues, 74: 449-476.

	<p><u>Strength and stamina:</u> It's important to be in good physical shape to be respected. People who are physically smaller have to work harder to get respect. Physically imposing people have more influence. Physical stamina is admired. Athletic people are especially admired.</p> <p><u>Put work first:</u> To succeed you can't let family interfere with work. Taking days off is frowned upon. To get ahead you need to be able to work long hours. Leadership expects employees to put work first. People with significant demands outside of work don't make it very far.</p> <p><u>Dog eat dog:</u> You're either "in" or you're "out," and once you're out, you're out. If you don't stand up for yourself people will step on you. You can't be too trusting. You've got to watch your back. One person's loss is another person's gain</p>	<p>https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12280</p>
<p>Eudaimonic workplace well-being</p>	<p><u>Interpersonal dimension:</u> Among the people I work with, I feel there is a sense of brotherhood/sisterhood. I feel close to the people in my work environment. I feel connected to others within the work environment. I consider the people I work with to be my friends.</p> <p><u>Intrapersonal dimension:</u> I am emotionally energized at work. I feel that I have a purpose at my work. My work is very important to me. I feel I am able to continually develop as a person in my job.</p>	<p>Bartels, A.L., Peterson, S.J. and Reina, C.S., 2019. Understanding well-being at work: Development and validation of the eudaimonic workplace well-being scale. PloS one, 14(4), p.e0215957.</p>
<p>Turnover intention</p>	<p>I am likely to accept another job at the same compensation level should it be offered to me. During the past year, I have often considered leaving my job. During the past year, I was often frustrated when not given the opportunity at work to achieve my personal work-related goals.</p>	<p>Bothma, C.F. and Roodt, G., 2013. The validation of the turnover intention scale. SA journal of human resource management, 11(1), p.12.</p>