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Main findings

Gender equality in the union decision-making structures and leadership positions

In their policy priorities, unions generally aim for representation of women and men in the decision-making structures and leadership positions that is proportional to their share in union membership, i.e. 71% women and 29% men. However, ETUCE’s member unions are far from achieving this goal: On average, women are underrepresented in all decision-making structures and leadership positions, compared to their share in the union membership: While more than two-thirds of union members are women, only between one-quarter and half the members of decision-making bodies and union leaders are female.

A comparison with 2009 data shows that the underrepresentation of women in decision-making bodies did not improve – rather the opposite: The representation gap increased by half in the highest decision-making body, and stayed the same in the second and third highest decision-making bodies. When it comes to leadership positions, however, the representation of women did increase strongly among deputy general secretaries and presidents, but stayed very low among general secretaries.

Looking at the union members under 40 years of age, we find that women represent an even bigger share among the membership (75%); young union leaders and young decision-makers, however, are rather male than female.

Many unions take measures towards achieving gender equality in the union structures. These measures focus particularly on three areas: facilitating the reconciliation of union work with family responsibilities; training and mentoring for female union members; as well as changing organisational procedures of the union in order to improve women's participation and widen the discussion on gender equality. In some unions, the introduction of a gender quota has led to visible improvements, while in other unions, such proposals were confronted with strong resistance.

Over half the unions have a general policy on gender equality in the education sector. Activities to implement this policy are manifold; most unions organise trainings on equal opportunities and awareness-raising activities on gender stereotypes.

Gendered effects of the economic crisis and union responses

As the data show, the economic crisis and governments’ austerity policies do have gendered effects. These effects are particularly prone to exacerbate gender inequalities through an increase in gender-based violence and in the challenge of reconciling work and family duties. On the other hand, however, unions also observe improvements, particularly when it comes to overcoming female gender stereotypes, and also in the provision of early childhood education facilities.

In some areas, unions do not have sufficient information to provide answers. This concerned particularly questions about effects of the economic crisis on gender inequalities in working conditions, or on violence against women.

Overall, 72% of the unions observe that the crisis and governments’ austerity policies exacerbate gender inequalities – at least in one area, but mostly in a number of instances. And while over three quarters of the unions have policies and organise lobbying activities or campaigns on the crisis generally, less than 40% of the unions deal with the gendered effects in the context of their crisis-related union action. In those unions that do include an explicit gender dimension, this focuses mainly on demanding a higher number of full-time permanent jobs for teachers, higher salaries, as well as improvements in maternal leave systems.
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1. Methodology

The ETUCE project “Promoting gender equality within teacher trade unions and in the teaching profession II – Implementing and reinforcing teacher trade union actions on gender equality in times of austerity” is a follow-up to the 2009 ETUCE project “Promoting gender equality within teacher trade unions and in the teaching profession”. The aim of this survey was therefore two-fold: first, to generate comparable data and thus allow us to describe a development over a 5-year period; and second, to extend our knowledge on the effects of the economic crisis as seen through the eyes of ETUCE’s member organisations.

1.1 Main guidelines for survey development

The design of the survey followed three guidelines:

1 - Keeping it short and simple: This follows the practical concern to achieve a high response rate. Questions were therefore phrased simply and clearly, and the questionnaire length was as short as possible, to avoid creating demands on the respondents’ workload that lead to high nonresponse. In order to fulfil the two aims of the survey, however, a total of 140 questions were asked, which included many opportunities for extensive comments, particularly in part 2.1. The design of the survey structure and questions made it possible to complete the questionnaire without having to spend days of research, while also allowing for extensive elaborations.

2 - Comparability with previous surveys: In the past years, ETUCE has conducted surveys both on gender issues – in the context of the predecessor of this project – and on issues relating to the economic crisis. Some of the questions of these previous surveys are repeated in the current survey in order to allow for long-term comparability of trade union development on gender issues. This allows ETUCE to analyse not only the status, but also the development of its member organisations in terms of gender equality policies and priorities, as well as of the developments in their respective countries.

3 - Mix of quantitative and qualitative data: Quantitative data was collected by requesting numbers and box ticking; qualitative data by asking for further comments, explanations and elaborations. A mix of both made it possible to address both visible, as well as more hidden elements of gender (in)equalities in trade unions’ responses to the economic crisis. Most questions are of quantitative nature, which has the advantage that they can easily be interpreted and graphically illustrated. By asking for comments, elaborations and explanations, we collected more detailed information and best-practice examples.

1.2 Structure of the survey

Overall, the survey consisted of 140 questions, some of which included multiple options for response, leading to a total of almost 300 pieces of information per union.

The first part of the questionnaire aims at direct comparison with the results of the 2009 survey, thereby allowing an analysis of the development of gender asymmetries in member organisations’ structures during the main years of the economic crisis. The questions asked in this part mirror almost exactly the questions of the 2009 survey, thereby enabling comparability.

The second part of the questionnaire dealt more explicitly with unions’ perceptions and experiences, as well as policies and activities, in the context of the economic crisis. ETUCE and EI have discussed the effects of the economic crisis, and gender equality has sometimes been added as an element of discussion; the gendered effects of the crisis have however never been comprehensively analysed. The issues raised in this part reflect the main points of recent policies of the ETUCE Standing Committee for Equality.
2. Responses

This chapter gives an overview of the response rate, the regional distribution, as well as the representation of the different education sectors.

2.1 Response rate

49 member organisations responded to the survey, representing 38% of ETUCE’s 129 member organisations. This is an increase by 9 unions, and a slight increase in the percentage of responding unions since the 2009 survey, when 40 of 110 member organisations responded to the survey, representing 36% of member unions. 25 unions participated both in 2009 and in 2014, which allows for good comparability.

The response rate is very satisfactory, particularly when we look at countries and individual membership: Unions from 32 countries responded to the survey, representing more than two-thirds of the 46 countries covered by ETUCE’s membership. In terms of individual membership, the responding unions cover over 8 million individual members, representing more than three-quarters of the total individual membership of ETUCE.

49 unions responded to the survey; of these, 25 had also participated in the 2009 survey.

80 member organisations did not respond to the survey.

Unions from 32 countries responded to the survey; from 14 countries we did not receive any responses.

The responding unions represent 8,038,002 individual members. About 2,5 million individual members of ETUCE are not represented in the survey data.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>Unions</th>
<th>Did the union also respond to 2009 survey?</th>
<th>Individual members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>CRSTESA</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>GOD-Lehrer</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>40.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>COV</td>
<td></td>
<td>38.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>SEB</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>62.324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>SEP-Podkrepa</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia-Herzegovina</td>
<td>HESUEBH</td>
<td></td>
<td>980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia-Herzegovina</td>
<td>ITUPSEBH</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>IURHEEC</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>KTOEOS</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2.473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>KTOŚ</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>OLTEK</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>DLF</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>63.994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>GL</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>SNES-FSU</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>58.299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>UNSA Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>83.241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>GEW</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>270.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>VBE</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>140.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>OLME</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>n.a. (2009: 54.031)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>SEH</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>KI</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>ASTI</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>17.468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>IFUT</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>INTO</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>39.873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>TUI</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>UIL-S</td>
<td></td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>CTUEW</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>FLESTU</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>LEETU</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>MUT</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>AOb</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>85.479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>CNV-O</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>51.920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>UEN</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>158.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>SKOWI SOLIDAROSC</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>700.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>ZNP</td>
<td></td>
<td>246.826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>FNE</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>n.a. (2009: 30.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>SINDEP</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>FSLE</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>173.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>ESEUR</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.257.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>TUS</td>
<td></td>
<td>35.605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>OZPSaV</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>35.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>ESTUS</td>
<td></td>
<td>38.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>F.E.CC.OO.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>79.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Lararförbundet</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>231.404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>VPÖD</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>36.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>EĞİTTİM-SEN</td>
<td></td>
<td>124.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>VPÖNU</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>NASUWT</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>294.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>NUT-UK</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>330.826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>UCU</td>
<td></td>
<td>113.851</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Unions from 32 countries responded. | 49 unions responded in 2014. | 25 unions responded both in 2009 and 2014. | The 2014 responses represent 8.038.002 individual members. |

Table 1: responding unions 2014 and 2009, and their individual membership

1 Changes in ETUCE membership need to be considered when interpreting this information.
2.2 Regional distribution

The following map provides an overview of where the responses come from. Countries with responding unions are coloured green, countries with ETUCE member organisations that did not respond to the survey are coloured red, and countries with no ETUCE member organisation are coloured white.

Figure 2: map of responses

2.3 Education sectors

The education sectors most widely represented in the survey responses are secondary (40 unions) and primary education (36 unions), followed by vocational (33 unions) and early childhood education (31 unions). Just over half the responding unions also represent higher education personnel (24 unions).

Some unions mentioned that they represent additional education sectors: adult education institutions, as well as non-teaching personnel (including education consultancy and special education support services).

Figure 3: education sectors represented in responses
3. Women in education unions: union membership, decision-making structures and leadership

The first part of the survey focused on the representation of women and men in the union membership, decision-making structures, and leadership. This data is particularly well-suited for comparisons. Since 25 unions responded both to this survey and the 2009 survey, and most of these unions provided information on all questions in this part, the data is “rich” enough to present developments of the past 5 years using data from only these unions. When presenting 2014 data, all respondents will of course be included.

The 2014 survey also included questions on the age profile of the members, decision-making bodies and union leadership. These questions were not asked in the previous survey; therefore no comparison is possible.

3.1 General overview

The following graph provides an overview of the percentages of women among the union membership, in the highest, second highest, and third highest decision-making bodies, as well as among general secretaries, deputy general secretaries and presidents. The green bar represents the percentage of women, the dark blue bar the percentage of men.

![Figure 4: gender ratios in union structures](image)

How can we interpret these numbers? On the one hand, this graph shows that women are underrepresented in all of the decision-making structures and leadership positions, compared to their share in the union membership (71%). Another aim could be gender parity, meaning that women and men should be represented 50:50. If this is the benchmark, then women’s representation in the highest decision-making body, and among presidents, almost achieves this goal, while all other bodies and positions fail – in particular women’s representation among general secretaries with less than a quarter women. Another benchmark could be the “magic number” of 40% women, which is the guideline in many gender equality quotas, laws and policies. In this case, it is only the second highest decision-making body, and the leadership position of general secretary, which fail this goal.

As we will see further below (part 4.3 on policies for gender equality in the union), unions rather aim for representation of women in union structures and leadership proportional to their share in union membership (30%), rather than gender parity (9%). Our data shows that, on average, unions are far from achieving this goal.

---

2 Data on presidents and (deputy) general secretaries must be treated with caution, since these positions have different roles and competencies in different organisations.
3.2 Union membership

ETUCE’s member organisations have on average 71% female and 29% male individual members. Among the 19 unions that provided this data in both surveys, the percentage of female members rose from 64% in 2009 to 71% in 2014. Women thus increasingly represent the majority of union members.

Five unions did not provide gender segregated membership data in 2014, all of them arguing that there are no overall statistics taking gender into consideration.

![Figure 5: gender ratio in union membership 2009-2014](image)

3.3 Decision-making structures

The following data illustrates the gender ratio in the unions’ decision-making bodies. We asked about the three highest decision-making bodies in the unions. Since these bodies have different names in different organisations, respondents were provided with definitions of these bodies and structures. The questions concerned not only data on gender, but also on the age ratio.

**Highest decision-making body**

The highest decision making body was defined as the supreme decision-making body of the trade union, which meets annually or less frequently. All unions except one (SEB Bulgaria) said that they have such a body in their union. In the responding organisations, this body is called “national conference”, “general conference”, “general assembly”, “congress”, “meeting of delegates”, “annual convention”, or “annual delegate conference”. The meetings range from twice a year to once every four to five years.

At the last meeting of this body, 48% of the delegates were women. This represents almost gender parity, but it is significantly lower than the percentage of female union members. Female union members are thus underrepresented in the unions’ highest decision-making bodies (gap: 23%).

A comparison with the 2009 data shows that this underrepresentation increased. If we look at the development among the 17 unions that provided information both in 2014 and in 2009, we see the following picture: In 2009, 46% of delegates at the highest decision-making body were women; in 2014, this percentage was 44%. This shows that in 2009, women were also underrepresented at the highest decision-making body, but this underrepresentation further increased in the past five years: The gap between the percentage of women among union members and delegates at the last meeting of the highest decision-making body increased from 18% in 2009 (64% members, 46% delegates) to 27% in 2014 (71% members, 44% delegates).

![Figure 6: gender ratio among delegates at the last meeting of the highest decision-making body, 2009-2014](image)
The developments in the 17 individual unions that provided information in both surveys show that in eight of these unions, the percentage of women among delegates increased, in two unions it stayed the same, and in seven unions it decreased. In two of these seven unions, the decrease was particularly high: CTUEW Lithuania came closer to representing membership relations (70% female membership) among the delegates, moving from an overrepresentation of women in 2009 (96%) to proportional representation in 2014 (72%). In DLF Denmark, the representation of female members (71%) among delegates decreased from 41% in 2009 (gap: 30%) to 11% in 2014 (gap: 60%).

**Second highest decision-making body**

The second highest decision making body was defined as the body that holds a mandate to elaborate and implement the trade union policy between the meetings of the highest decision making body. Almost all unions indicated that they have such a body (exceptions: FNE Portugal did not provide information on these questions, VBE Germany indicated they do not have such a body in the organisation). Among the responding unions, this body is called “national executive”, “executive board”, “executive council”, ”executive committee”, “central committee”, “council of trade union”, “republic board”, “leaders’ college”, “board”, ”general assembly”, “national council”, or “administrative council”.

37% of the chairpersons, and 34% of the deputy chairpersons of this decision-making body are women. Female union members are thus underrepresented among the chairpersons and deputy chairpersons of the second highest decision-making body – they only represent half the percentage of women among union members.

21 unions provided information on the gender of the chairperson, and 13 unions on the gender of the deputy chairpersons, both in 2009 and in 2014. Among these unions, the presence of women in this body increased: In 2009, 35% of chairpersons and 36% of deputy chairpersons were women; in 2014 these percentages were at 42% for chairpersons and 41% for deputy chairpersons. This increase, however, does not mean that women members are now better represented, since their share in union membership increased as well. The representation gap stayed at 30% and did in fact not change: 35% chairpersons and 64% members in 2009, 42% chairpersons and 71% members in 2014.

![Figure 7: gender ratio among chairpersons of the second highest decision-making body, 2009-2014](image)

**Third highest decision-making body**

The third highest decision making body was defined as the group that implements the trade union policies and takes decisions between meetings of the second highest decision making body. 67% of the respondents gave information on this body, which in their unions is named “executive board”, “management board”, “presidency”, “operative bureau”, “executive committee”, “council”, “national executive”, or “management committee”.

Female union members are also underrepresented in this body, which is on average composed of 40% women. Compared with their share in the union membership (71%), this leads to a representation gap of 31%.

Ten unions provided information on the gender composition of this body both in 2009 and in 2014. Among these unions, the percentage of women stayed almost the same (41% in 2009 and 40% in 2014).
Gender profile of young members in unions' decision-making bodies

On average, 36% of union members are below 40 years of age. Among the delegates to the highest decision-making body, only 17% are below 40; among chairpersons and deputy chairpersons of the second highest decision-making body, this percentage is even lower at 9%; and, similarly, among members of the third highest decision-making body, only 13% are below 40 years of age. This data clearly shows that young union members are strongly underrepresented in the union’s decision-making structures.

The following graph illustrates the gender ratio among the young union members, delegates to the last meeting of the highest decision-making body, chairpersons and deputy chairpersons of the second highest decision-making body, and members of the third highest decision-making body.

This graph paints a similar picture as the general gender ratio graph above: Young women are underrepresented in all decision-making structures, compared to their share in the young union membership, and gender parity among the young members of decision-making bodies is only reached in the highest decision-making body.

A more detailed look at the numbers shows that young union membership is even more feminized (75% women) than the general membership (71%). In the highest decision-making body, the percentage of women among young delegates (49%) is the same as the overall percentage of female delegates (48%). Similarly, in the second highest decision-making body, the percentage of women among young chairpersons and deputy chairpersons (33%) is the same as the overall percentage of female chairpersons and deputy chairpersons (34%). In the third highest decision-making body, the percentage of women among young members of this body (37%) is just a little bit lower than the overall percentage of female members of this body (40%).

In summary, the percentages of women among young members in decision-making bodies are almost the same as the overall percentages. However, if we put these numbers in relation to the more feminized young membership, the representation gap in the “young” layer of the unions is even greater than the overall representation gap: 16% (vs. 13%) in the highest decision-making body; 42% (vs. 37%) in the second highest decision-making body; and 38% (vs. 31%) in the third highest decision-making body. This
is further illustrated by taking a closer look at the chairpersons of the second highest decision-making body. In most unions, the chairperson is between 40 and 60 years of age. In two unions, the chairperson is below 40 – and in both these cases, this person is a man. In seven unions, the chairperson is over 60 years of age, and in the majority of these cases (four), these persons are women.

Young leaders, thus, are rather male than female; or: female leaders can rather be found among the higher age groups. Why is this the case? There are at least three possible explanations: The first one attests a backlash against, or at least disinterest in feminism and gender equality among the young generation of union members, reflecting a cultural change in society. The second explanation points at the reconciliation problem, arguing that women below 40 years of age carry a higher burden of family duties. This can lead to both self-selection (i.e. they hesitate, or are unable to take up union responsibilities) and to a lack of support (i.e. they are not elected or mentored because of assumptions about limited availability due to family duties). The third explanation concerns personality traits such as confidence and assertiveness. This explanation suggests that in societies and organisations, in which women are still largely underrepresented and discriminated against when it comes to the distribution of power and resources, women need to accumulate authority through experience and age in order to assert themselves and achieve positions of power.

Most likely, a mixture of these three explanations is the cause for the heightened underrepresentation of young union members in the unions' structures. Further research on this would be beneficial, since each of these different causes leads to different conclusions when it comes to developing union action towards equality: Following the first cause, unions need to build gender knowledge, raise awareness on inequalities, and organise campaigns for gender equality. Following the second cause, unions should invest in facilitating the reconciliation of (child)care duties with union work. Following the third cause, unions could create and expand leadership training and mentoring programmes for young female union members.

One last comment on the availability of gender- and age-segregated data concerning union membership: 28 unions (62% of the responding unions) did not provide this information. 16 of them said that there are no overall statistics taking age and gender into consideration, an additional three unions said that these statistics do not yet exist, but they are currently developing databases to collect and provide this information. Three unions (ZNP Poland, UNSA-Education France, and KTOEOS Cyprus) said that it is in fact trade union policy to not collect statistics on age and gender. Some unions additionally commented that they define "young members" as under 35 or even under 30 years of age (rather than 40, as in this survey), and provided information according to their standards.

### 3.4 Statutory committees

Statutory committees, or advisory committees, were defined as bodies which are based on regulations in the union statutes. They work on a specific topic, develop policies, and advise the union’s decision-making bodies. Unions were asked to describe their most important committees, particularly those dealing with gender and equality, with education policies, and with collective bargaining, salaries, pensions, health and safety. Because of the diverse working structures of ETUCE’s member organisations, it is difficult to provide an overall picture of the gender ratio in these committees. The following elaborations describe the four kinds of committees most relevant to this report, and most frequently described by unions. These committees were also focused on in the 2009 survey report, which makes it possible to describe developments over the past five years. In addition to these kinds of committees, the respondents also described committees focusing on the union’s mission, committees dealing with administrative issues, recruitment and organising, communication and PR, committees focusing on special needs education, and committees dealing with age groups, such as retired teachers or young teachers.

12 unions described statutory committees that deal with equality issues. This number includes specific committees on diversity and on special groups, for example LGBT committees or committees on ethnic minorities. In addition to these, five unions indicated that they have committees that deal exclusively with gender equality or women’s empowerment. 13 unions described education policy committees, which often focus on specific education sectors (primary, secondary, higher education etc.). Nine unions described committees dealing with collective bargaining, salaries, pensions, health and safety.
Unions were asked to provide the gender distribution among members, and indicate the gender of the chairpersons of these committees. The following graph provides an overview of the average gender ratios.

![Gender Ratio Graph]

This graph shows that in general equality committees, the genders are represented proportional to the union membership (72% of women among committee members and 75% among chairpersons), while they are underrepresented in committees dealing with education (50% of women among committee members and 43% among chairpersons) and with working conditions/collective bargaining (47% of women among committee members and 50% among chairpersons). Gender equality committees, on the other hand, are mainly composed of female members; and in all unions, that provide information on their gender equality committees, the chairperson is a woman. The 2009 data presented a similar picture: Women are widely underrepresented in union committees, except when it comes to equality structures.

### 3.5 Leadership positions

Unions were asked to provide information on the gender and age of their general secretaries, deputy general secretaries, presidents, as well as workplace and branch officers or shop stewards.

**General secretaries, deputy general secretaries, and presidents**

62% of the unions indicated they have (deputy) general secretaries, and 91% indicated they have the post of president in their organisation. As the graph in part 3.1 showed, women are highly underrepresented among all these leadership positions, particularly among general secretaries (23%). Almost half the deputy general secretaries and presidents are women (45% and 49% respectively), which fulfils the goal of gender parity, but not the goal of representation proportional to union membership.

The following graphs provide an overview of the developments since 2009:
When it comes to analysing this data, caution is warranted, because the unions are structured differently. While in one union the secretary general may coordinate the every-day work of the union and the president may fulfil a mainly representative function, in another union the president may be the one who leads the secretariat and coordinates activities.

The numbers show that in all leadership positions, but particularly among deputy general secretaries and presidents, the percentage of women increased significantly over the past five years. Among the eight to 18 unions that provided information in both surveys on the gender composition of their leadership, there are now three times as many female deputy general secretaries (from 13% in 2009 to 50% in 2014), and twice as many female union presidents (from 22% in 2009 to 44% in 2014). There was also a slight increase in the percentage of female general secretaries (from 17% in 2009 to 22% in 2014). However, the gender imbalance is still particularly extreme in this post. Considering that this is the most important leadership position in many unions when it comes to coordinating the secretariat and making day-to-day decisions, it is worth noting that a move towards gender-equal representation by a mere 5% still leaves a lot of room for improvement.

If we correlate the gender of the respective union leaders with how these posts are selected (election, appointment, or mixed procedure), we see that the percentage of women among elected positions (36%) is higher than among positions that are filled by appointment (26%).

A look at the age of the union leaders shows that, on average, general secretaries and presidents are 55 years old, and deputy general secretaries 52 years. The youngest union leaders are indicated by MUT Malta: Their general secretary, deputy general secretary and president are all between 36 and 38 years of age.

**Workplace and branch officers, shop stewards**

Workplace and branch officers, or shop stewards, were defined as union coordinators and leaders on a smaller organisational level, for example the level of schools or clusters of schools. 88% of the responding unions said that they have such positions in their organisations. On average, 53% of these positions are occupied by women. While this number is still lower than the percentage of women among union members, it is nevertheless the layer of union leadership that is the most representative of the gender ratio of the individual membership – maybe because the organisational level is hierarchically lower than that of the other leadership positions discussed above.

On average, 19% of these positions are occupied by people below 40 years of age; and among these, 49% on average are women. This reflects the same pattern as in the unions’ decision-making structures: In the age group below 40, women are slightly more underrepresented than in the age group above 40 years of age.
3.6 Union staff

The survey asked about paid union employees, differentiating between elected and non-elected staff. While most unions (87%) indicated that they have non-elected paid staff, only in half the unions some of the paid staff is elected. One union said that there is no paid staff in the union (CTUEW Lithuania).

The gender distribution differs between elected and non-elected union staff: Only 45% of elected union staff are female, while 65% of non-elected union staff are women. Compared with 2009, there were no changes in the gender composition of non-elected union staff; but among elected union staff, the percentage of women rose by almost 10%.

In order to analyse this data in more detail, we differentiated between full-time and part-time employment. Two-thirds of elected union staff, and three-quarters of non-elected union staff are employed full-time. The following graphs show the percentages of women and men within full-time and part-time union staff respectively – the first graph illustrates elected, and the second graph non-elected union staff.

While non-elected union staff reflects the pattern in general society, whereby part-time work is predominantly performed by women, this is different among elected union staff: Here, two-thirds of part-time staff are men. However, only six unions provided data on part-time union staff, which is too low to generalize our findings. Compared to 2009, the percentage of women among elected union staff increased in the group of full-time employees from one-third to almost half, and decreased in the group of part-time employees from half to one-third. Among non-elected union staff, there were no notable changes in the gender composition, except a slight shift (5%) of women away from part-time and towards full-time employment.

When asked about how staff is paid, unions indicated a difference between elected and non-elected staff: In both cases, the majority is paid out of union funds: 58% of elected, and 86% of non-elected employees. A third of elected staff is paid out of funds of their previous employer or education institution (paid leave); among non-elected staff only one union (UNSA France) indicates this as a source for the payment of elected union staff. External project funding is an exception in both groups: One union draws finances for paying elected staff from this source (FSLE Romania), and two unions for paying non-elected staff (CNV-O Netherlands and FSLE Romania).
4. Equality structures, policies and activities

The survey asked unions also about their structures, policies and activities for gender equality. In this part, many of the 2009 questions were repeated in order to allow us to describe the development of unions’ gender equality work over the past five years. The response rates, however, are lower in this part than in the part above. Therefore, rather than only describing the developments among those unions that responded to both surveys, we rely on comparing the average of all respondents in the 2009 and the 2014 surveys, and assume that they represent an average of ETUCE’s MOs.

4.1 Equality responsible

Two-thirds of the unions indicate that they have a person or department among their paid staff who works on gender equality issues – either exclusively, or as one field of work among several. Of those unions that do not have equality staff in their offices, five say that gender equality is not considered a problem, and / or is not high on the union’s agenda; three indicate that they do not have enough financial and personnel resources to have a designated person working exclusively on equality issues; and three unions explain that equality work is embedded in the work of other organisational units.

Almost all equality staff is female (86%). In 70% of the unions that have a person or department responsible for equality issues, their work on gender equality is part of a wider equality agenda; 30% of the unions have personnel that work exclusively on gender equality issues.

Half of the unions indicate that their equality responsible or departments have sufficient financial and human resources, which is less than in 2009, when two thirds of the unions were content with the resources allocated to equality work. When asked whether these resources changed in the past five years, 40% of the unions responding to this question said yes – however, only three unions gave more detailed information, all indicating that this was a positive change: new posts were created, more personnel allocated, and more financial resources invested in equality work.

4.2 Equality budget

Almost half the unions (46%) have a specific budget reserved explicitly for gender equality activities.

This money is mostly part of the trade union budget (for 89% of the unions); only two unions rely on external funding for financing their equality activities (FSLE Romania, ZNP Poland). Interestingly, no union indicated that their equality budget comes from both union funds and external sources.

Gender budgeting

The survey not only asked about equality budgets, but also about gender budgeting. Gender budgeting was described, following the Council of Europe’s definition, as the application of gender mainstreaming in the budgetary process. It is a specific, structured process in which budgets are assessed in terms of their gender impact. Gender budgeting does not mean a separate budget for women, and is not limited to budget allocations for equality activities, but encompasses the entire budget of the organisation. It means incorporating a gender perspective at all levels of the budgetary process and restructuring revenues and expenditures in order to promote gender equality. Although three unions said that they do apply gender budgeting to their union’s finances, only NASUWT UK’s further elaborations go beyond the allocation of a budget for gender equality activities, and truly reflect this definition.
When asked about their reasons for not doing gender budgeting, 11 unions gave further explanations: Five of them see no need for gender budgeting, either since the majority of teachers and union members is female, and therefore the overall budget primarily affects women anyway, or because there is no gender discrimination. Four unions indicate that gender is currently not on top of their union's priority list. One union indicates that gender budgeting is at the moment subject to a debate in the union which has not yet been concluded, and one union argues that they apply gender mainstreaming to other structures and processes of the organisation, which is already quite extensive.

### 4.3 Equality policies on gender equality in the union

Almost half of the unions (45%) have a written policy that deals explicitly with gender equality in the unions' own structures. This is a slight increase from 2009, when only 37% of the responding unions had such a policy. Six unions explained that they do not have a specific written gender equality policy as such, but alternative regulations in place, such as reports, or policies by the union federation, or they follow EI and ETUCE policy on gender equality, or they treat gender equality as a transversal issue. 40% of the unions say that they do not have a gender equality policy. This is either a matter of political priority-setting: Four unions say that the gender issue is not a current political priority of the union, three explain that the union sees no need to develop such a policy, and one union say that they are just at the beginning of dealing with gender equality. In other unions, it is a matter of union organisation: Two unions say that they generally don’t have written policy papers, one explains that such policies are organised autonomously by its sub-structures, and one union follows national equality legislation.

**Objectives**

Those unions that have written policies aiming at gender equality in the union structures were asked to indicate what these policies focus on. The following graph shows how many unions affirmed that these elements are part of their unions’ policies.

![Figure 16: elements of unions’ policies on gender equality in the union structures](image)

The first two elements refer to women’s representation in the union structures: Are unions aiming at representation proportional to the gender ratio in the union membership, or at gender parity? Since these elements are somewhat contradictory, those unions that said yes to both were not considered in these numbers. As we can see, the aim of proportional representation is shared by more unions than that of gender parity – and overall, it is the second most important element of unions’ gender equality policies when it comes to the union structures. Compared with the actual representation of women, most unions are still far away from achieving this aim.

The most widely shared policy element (40%) is to increase the presence of women in leadership positions – as opposed to increasing the presence of men in leadership positions, which only one union is aiming for (FLESTU Lithuania). Similarly to the first two elements, these two are contradictory, and therefore those unions that said yes to both were not considered in these numbers. The goal of having more women in the union leadership was also discussed in the 2009 survey, where two-thirds of the unions said that this is what their policies are aiming at. When comparing this development to the development in the gender ratios among union leaders, we can observe the following: While the presence
of women in the union leadership increased, as elaborated on earlier, the percentage of unions that want more female leaders decreased. This may be because many unions consider that they have achieved this aim – however, as we saw, women are still strongly underrepresented in unions’ leadership positions, particularly among general secretaries.

Many unions explain that they want to increase the number of both male and female members. Taking those unions that only focus on one gender, we see that increasing the number of female members is a more widely shared priority. In addition, many unions explain that they aim at increasing the number of young members. Other objectives mentioned by unions are to generally support and strengthen women, to monitor for gender issues in local structures, and to increase the representation of LGBT people in the union’s membership and leadership.

Mechanisms

Unions were asked to indicate which mechanisms the policies involve in order to ensure its good implementation. The same question and response options were asked in the 2009 survey. The following graph shows the responses in 2014 (dark blue) and 2009 (light blue).

![Mechanisms Graph]

Figure 17: mechanisms for implementing policy on gender equality in the union, 2009-2014

The most important mechanism is monitoring and the establishment of follow-up mechanisms (44%), followed by defining clear targets and responsibilities (both 36%). A comparison with the 2009 data shows that most mechanisms decreased in importance, except the definition of clear responsibilities, which became important for more unions. Interestingly, the relevance of timetables has decreased from being the most important to becoming the least important implementation mechanism. These developments indicate that unions are becoming more selective in the kind of implementation mechanisms they employ. The increase in the relevance of clear responsibility might point at the fact that more unions now have equality responsible in their union structures than five years ago.

4.4 Activities for gender equality in the union

Two-thirds of the respondents said that their union puts certain measures in place in order to improve gender equality in the union structures. This is a higher percentage than those unions that have written equality policies (less than half, see above). This indicates that when it comes to gender equality in the union structures, ETUCE’s member organisations regard action as more relevant than written policy. However, a third of the respondents said that they do not take such measures, explaining that either there is no need for such activities (one union), or that it is currently not a priority in the organisation (four unions).

The following graph illustrates which measures the unions apply towards achieving gender equality in their own structures. In all but one of these cases, a comparison with 2009 is possible. Again, 2014 data is represented in the dark blue bars and 2009 data in the light blue bars.
The most important mechanism applied by unions is to provide specific arrangements to facilitate participation in meetings, e.g. childcare (71%). In fact, measures allowing better reconciliation of union and care duties are the only element that more unions than in 2009 apply in order to achieve gender equality. UNSA-Education France, for example, decided to raise the number of women who participate in union activities, and focused on measures to reconcile care duties and union work:

“Since his election in 2012, the General Secretary has adopted a clear policy intending to involve more women and young people in all the union activities. In order to put this policy into practice, he issued a call for applications among the 22 trade unions of the Federation, highlighting that it was possible to “reconcile activism and private life”. More specifically, he encourages meeting schedules which allow everyone to attend without compromising their personal life. Furthermore, teleworking is widespread, and videoconferencing and teleconferencing happen frequently.”

UNSA-Education, France

While reconciliation measures are rarely contested, gender quotas are a polarising issue in many unions. A third of the unions have gender quotas in elections – which is less than the 60% of unions that used quotas in 2009 –, but only 10% apply gender quotas to non-elected decision-making positions and committees. In further elaborations, KTOS Cyprus and ASTI Ireland tell stories of conflict and resistance concerning quotas in their unions, while Egitim-Sen Turkey achieved success by applying the quota:

“The union does not implement a gender quota in elections. Even opening up this issue to discussions leads to heated arguments, since the majority of the board does not support this policy.”

KTOS, Cyprus

“Proposing a discussion to the Annual Convention on quotas and thresholds for the representation of women in decision-making bodies is confronted with little support - if not outright opposition - to any corrective measures to reverse underrepresentation of females. Three years ago, the Equality committee advocated co-opting female members on to standing committees if a threshold of 30% of either gender was not met. This received no support from any of the 23 members, nor was any alternative corrective measure proposed by any male of female (few) members of the standing committee.”

ASTI, Ireland

“Our union has accepted a 30% quota for women in the last General Assembly. This increased the number of women who join elections.”

Egitim-Sen, Turkey
The biggest change from the 2009 data is that only 14% of the unions (as opposed to 60% in 2009) adapt their policy priorities in order to match the concerns of the underrepresented gender. Another strong drop can be observed when it comes to trainings in negotiation skills for the underrepresented gender: Only 24% of the unions indicate that they take this measure; in 2009, this percentage was more than twice as high. Nevertheless, unions did share inspiring success stories of their training programmes:

“We tend to invest more in identifying “promising” candidates for future positions, and are looking better than before for women. Some years ago the AOb started the “AOb Academy”, a training course for future leaders. The candidates are “spotted” by other active people, proposed for the Academy, going through a selection procedure. When selected, they are trained extensively and thoroughly. Most of them end up in positions in different boards and committees, some of them also on the highest levels. We unfortunately also lose some of them, as schools also are looking for well-trained candidates for managing positions.”

AOb, the Netherlands

“We initiated a generational turnover by creating a mentoring programme in the national women’s committee. Young women have a different understanding of women- and gender policy. We make intensive use of network opportunities in the framework of wider projects on organisational development or teacher training.”

GEW Germany

“Our union has 100 qualified women who provide seminars for members of our union and education and science workers everywhere. These women have completed two-year seminars related to gender inequality and discrimination based on gender.”

Egitim-Sen Turkey

Two-thirds of the unions conduct campaigns to encourage women to put themselves forward as candidates for decision-making positions. In addition to such campaigns, some respondents elaborated on further measures that change the organisation of discussions and processes at their conferences, aiming at increasing women's participation in these procedures:

“During the past 5 years Lärarförbundet has developed the working models used in its highest decision making bodies. The aim has been to find forms that promote women’s participation in discussions and decision-making. This has been done by implementing forms that foster dialogue among the many rather than debates from a platform.”

Lararforbundet, Sweden

“In 2011 the Union monitored the gender of Conference speakers and also circulated a flyer encouraging women delegates to speak during debates. This exercise demonstrated that there was a significant gender imbalance of speakers: Male 41 / Female 28. It was agreed that further action was required. The Union recognised that its arrangements for handing in speaker’s cards was out of date and should be reviewed. The practice of standing in a queue and handing in one speaker’s card at a time, not only took an inordinate amount of time, but favoured those who were able to get into the queue early (possibly because they didn’t have childcare responsibilities). This perceived “unfair advantage” was addressed in 2012, when the Conference decided to change the arrangements so that speakers’ cards would be randomised and then put in gender order FEMALE/MALE, removing the advantage of queue position and bringing about positive change in favour of women members. At the 2013 Conference the new arrangements were put in place and whilst presenting some administrative challenges, they delivered the desired results: Female 56 / Male 47. Although not a reflection of the membership profile, it was much closer than in previous years. (...) There is more work to be done here but the strategy of randomising and arranging them in gender order has delivered a balance and more women speakers.”

NUT, UK

Further measures include the dissemination of data on the gender distribution in decision-making structures, which almost 40% of the unions do. In addition, unions explained that they organise conferences on gender inequality and create specific union structures that deal with gender equality:
The union’s organising strategy has successfully increased the number of women activists. (...) The union has achieved this by providing workshops and plenary sessions on union involvement at the Women Teachers’ Consultation Conference; introduced a new category of Workplace Contact which has encouraged predominantly women members to job share representative roles; developed and embedded a Women Members’ Development Course, which explores the union’s democratic structure and gets participants to plan their level of union involvement; promoted the role of Union Learning Representative and Local Association Lifelong Learning Officer, which has resulted in increased involvement from women members and established regional equality networks which include organised network and training events for women members.”

NASUWT, UK

4.5 Developments of unions’ equality structures, policies and activities

When asked about the developments in the unions’ equality structures, policies and activities over the past five years, some unions explained that no major changes happened. In some cases this is because their focus lies on maintaining the current status. In other cases, they observe a certain kind of backlash and negative attitudes when it comes to gender equality, or a lack of interest in the issue from young female teachers.

Other unions reported that activities intensified over the past five years. Eight unions report that they took the decision to start working on gender issues and created gender equality structures, as well as webpage sections on gender issues. One union explained that they created a working group for men as well (CNV-O, the Netherlands). In addition, five unions say that the discussion on gender issues has become more prominent, in some cases because the union leadership has pushed this discussion. Three unions changed their internal decision-making and organising procedures, and another three unions organised specific activities and programmes in order to increase the participation of women. Some of these examples were elaborated on above.
5. Equality policies and activities on gender equality in the education sector

While the data discussed so far dealt with gender equality in the unions’ own structures, the survey also asked questions about unions’ policies and activities on gender equality in the education sector.

5.1 Equality policies on gender equality in the education sector

Over half of the unions (54%) have a written policy on gender equality in the education sector. This percentage is slightly higher than that concerning a written policy on gender equality in the union structures (see above: 45%). Some unions that do not have a written policy on gender equality in the education sector explain why: Five say that the legal gender equality provisions are sufficient, or that there are no gender inequalities. Three unions explain that gender equality is currently not a priority for their organisation. And two unions argue that equality is anchored in the general policy of the organisation, and that there is no need for an additional, specific gender equality policy. However, many unions that do not have a written policy say that they are nevertheless active in this area.

When asked about the most relevant developments in the past five years, unions explained which topics are becoming more important: First, the absence of male teachers in the primary education sector is increasingly becoming a matter of discussion in the unions. Second, violence against women is regarded as an important matter of discussion. KTOEOS Cyprus, for example, carried out a survey and found that around 68% of educated women face verbal or physical violence.

5.2 Activities to implement union policy on gender equality in the education sector

Those unions that have written policies on gender equality in the education sector were asked to indicate what their core activities are to implement this policy. The 2009 survey included same question and response options (with one exception). The following table therefore gives an overview of unions’ activities for both 2014 and 2009.

![Figure 19: union activities to implement policy on gender equality in the education sector, 2009-2014](image-url)
All these activities are similarly relevant to the unions: Between 40% and 65% of those respondents that have a written policy on gender equality in the education sector indicate that they organise these activities in order to implement this policy. The most important activities are trainings on equal opportunities for male and female union members (65%) – this was also one of the most important activities in 2009 – as well as raising awareness and exchanging good practices on combating gender stereotypes in schools (67%).

When it comes to social partnership and industrial action, between 45% and 50% of the unions indicate that they change their collective bargaining priorities to match the concerns of female education staff and that they deal explicitly with gender equality in collective agreements. In both cases, the importance of these activities decreased since 2009. When it comes to monitoring the implementation of gender equality provisions in collective agreements, 40% of the unions say that they focus on this activity (same as in 2009). In addition, unions mention industrial action and strikes as important activities to implement their gender equality policy. They further said that they collaborate with other unions, NGOs and education authorities, and perform lobbying activities and legal action for gender equality in the education sector.

In the area of research, the most important is research on the specific interests and needs of women and men working in the education sector. The percentage of unions saying that this is a relevant activity to implement their equality policy (55%) increased strongly since 2009 (20%). The second most important research area is the field of obstacles and glass ceilings for women preventing them to reach leading positions in the education sector (45%). This issue was relevant to a lot more unions in 2009 (67%). Only 40% of unions say that they perform research on the gender pay gap among education staff.

When it comes to organising campaigns, more than half of the unions (55%) say that they promote men’s presence in the teaching profession. This percentage increased strongly in the past five years (from 33% in 2009), while the number of unions organising campaigns to empower women and to promote their presence at leading positions in the education sector decreased strongly from 67% in 2009 to 49% in 2014.

### 5.3 Application and use of ETUCE’s policies and information by unions

91% of the unions indicate that they use information or policy documents from the ETUCE. When asked how they use them, 12 unions explain that they publicise information on EU-level processes on their webpages and share this information through union structures. 11 unions say that ETUCE’s equality recommendations guide their equality work, as well as their discussions and strategies on gender equality. Three unions use ETUCE information and policy documents in the social dialogue with the government.

Two of those unions that do not use information and policy documents from the ETUCE explain why: Either because gender equality is not a relevant issue for the union, or because the union already has all relevant information for their work in the national context.

Unions were asked to make suggestions for ETUCE activities to further support their work on equal opportunities: ETUCE should continue to organise seminars and conferences, as well as distribute data and information; unions would like more support in their fight against austerity measures; and it would help unions if ETUCE information, in particular PR and campaigning material, was translated into more languages.
6. Gendered effects of the economic crisis and governments’ austerity policies

The second part of the survey dealt with the economic crisis and governments’ austerity policies, and in particular with their gendered effects. The questions focused on union work, education staff, the education system, and society as a whole. They were phrased in a similar way, asking whether the respective numbers, occurrences or activities increased, stayed the same, or decreased. For each question, the respondent was invited to add elaborations and specifications.

The graphs in this chapter are designed in a way that the turquoise bars on the left represent improvements for gender equality, the grey bars represent that things stayed the same, and the red bars on the right indicate detrimental effects on gender equality. The percentages reflect only those unions that responded to the respective questions. When a significant number of unions did not respond to a question, this information will be added in the elaborations.

6.1 Effects on gender equality in the union

Unions were asked whether the number of female union members generally, the number of those who compete in election, as well as those who take part in union activities, has increased, remained the same, or decreased over the past five years. The following graph illustrates the responses.

As we can see, almost no unions observed any negative developments; only four unions say that the number of female union members decreased. On the contrary, half to two-thirds of the unions say that the numbers of female union members, as well as their participation in elections and union activities, increased over the past five years. Nevertheless, we were also informed of problematic developments when it comes to the economic crisis and gender equality in union structures:

“The economic crisis has had an effect on women’s participation and representation within the union. The increased working hours for women result in less time set aside for their union. In addition, due to lack of free childcare these services are either taken on by the women, or they are paid for by the families, which is an extra burden on their budget.”

KTOS, Cyprus
6.2 Gendered effects on education staff

The survey asked a number of questions concerning developments in the past five years that affect gender equality among education staff. In the following elaborations, these questions are grouped together along thematic lines.

**Working conditions**

These questions asked whether:
- education services or institutions with a higher percentage of female education staff have experienced weaker, the same, or stronger budget cuts than education services or institutions with a higher percentage of male education staff;
- the percentage of female education staff who lost their job due to budget cuts was lower, the same, or higher than among male education staff;
- the extent of part-time employment among female education staff, compared to male education staff has risen, stayed the same, or fallen.

The following graph shows that the majority of those unions that responded to these questions do not observe any changes in these areas. Nevertheless, almost 30% did observe changes that are detrimental to gender equality: They say that job loss has cost more women their jobs in the education sector, and that part-time employment has increased more among female education staff.

![Figure 21: gendered crisis effects on education staff - working conditions](image)

These questions show a particularly high non-response: Between a third and half of the unions did not respond to these questions, saying that they do not have the necessary data and information.

**Gender pay gap**

Unions were asked whether the gender pay gap among education staff on the one hand, and on the other hand government and NGO initiatives to tackle the gender pay gap, have increased, stayed the same, or decreased over the past five years. Most unions were able to answer this question: Only one-fifth to one-quarter of the unions did not have the information necessary to respond.

![Figure 22: gendered crisis effects on education staff - gender pay gap](image)

Over two-thirds of the unions do not indicate any change. ASTI Ireland, one of the five unions indicating that the gender pay gap among education staff increased, explain that since 2011 there are three pay scales for teachers, instead of one. The two additional pay scales are lower and disproportionately impact on female teachers.
Five unions observe that government and NGO initiatives to tackle the gender pay gap among education staff decreased: Lararforbundet Sweden, for example, explain that there are fewer salary surveys and job evaluations including a gender dimension, and that the national agency for non-discrimination takes on fewer cases. Similarly, AOb from the Netherlands, state that many government subventions or grant schemes to tackle the gender pay gap were stopped due to the crisis. On the other hand, three unions indicate that there are now more initiatives than five years ago – among them FLESTU Lithuania:

“In Lithuania, the gender equality policies are set out in the National Programme on Equal Opportunities for Women and Men for 2010-2014. A considerable number of measures are targeted towards improving the situation for women and men in the labour market. One of the priorities is to reduce the gender pay gap, which includes actions to increase salaries in female-dominated sectors such as education, arts and culture and social work.”

FLESTU, Lithuania

Reconciliation of work and family duties

These questions asked whether:

- the challenge for education staff to reconcile work and family duties has become smaller, stayed the same, or become bigger;
- childcare facilities to support education staff with children have been expanded, stayed the same, or been reduced;
- facilities for education staff with children (such as parental leave, paternity and maternity leave, flexible working arrangements) have been expanded, stayed the same, or been reduced.

Almost all unions were able to answer these questions; only the first question posed some difficulties, with a quarter of the unions indicating that they do not have the necessary data to give this information.

The responses show that positive developments outweigh negative developments when it comes to supportive arrangements and childcare facilities – not by a great margin, however. The most striking element of this data is that more than half the unions indicated a turn to the worse in the challenge to reconcile work and family duties.

Figure 23: gendered crisis effects on education staff - reconciliation of work and family duties

KTOEOS Cyprus, for example, explains that the rights and salaries for newly employed teachers have deteriorated, which forces them to take up additional employment at private education institutions in order to earn a sufficient salary. This makes the reconciliation of work and family responsibilities more difficult. Gl. Denmark observed an increase in teachers' breakdowns under the burden of reconciling work and family duties, as well as an increased need for professional aid, psychologists and coaches.

Six unions indicate that supportive arrangements and childcare facilities have been reduced. For example, ASTI Ireland explains that parental leave, while still available, is unpaid, and that compensatory leave for teachers whose maternity leave overlaps with holiday periods has been abolished. However, UNSA-Education from France describe a legal change in 2012, whereby parental leave can be taken simultaneously by both parents. Furthermore, the person taking parental leave keeps the full rights to advancement on the pay scale during the first year, and half the advancements for the following years; and parental leave is counted in the pension scheme.
Women’s careers and promotion

In these questions, unions were asked whether government programmes for supporting the career development of female education staff, as well as opportunities for and attainment of promotion for female education staff have been expanded, stayed the same, or been reduced. A third of the unions indicated that they do not have the information necessary to respond to these questions.

Those unions that did answer these questions are about equally divided between observations of positive developments (25% and 27%), observations of no change (46% and 50%), and observations of developments detrimental to gender equality (29% and 23%).

Figure 24: gendered crisis effects on education staff - career and promotion

UNSA-Education France is one of the 7 unions that describe a positive development:

“In 2013, a charter for professional gender equality was signed (President Hollande’s government). The aims of the charter are:
- Transparency and objectification of the human resource management processes at every stage of the career (recruitment, mobility, training);
- Raising awareness and training on the equality challenges and on the prevention of discrimination;
- Review of the content of the trainings in order to eliminate any stereotype;
- Social dialogue as a key element to promote equality;
- Action plans in cooperation with the social partners, etc.”

UNSA-Education, France

6.3 Gendered effects on the education system

Questions on gendered effects of the crisis and governments’ austerity policies on the education system centered around two groups: Provisions for gender equality in schools, and gender stereotypes in education.

Gender equality provisions

Unions were asked whether gender-sensitive assessments of curricula and school materials, training on gender mainstreaming for education staff, as well as school policies and strategies that commit the education institution to gender equality have been expanded, stayed the same, or been reduced. One-quarter to one-third of the respondents did not have the data to provide this information.

Among the responding unions, observations of positive development outweighed observations of negative developments, particularly when it comes to gender-sensitive assessments: 40% say that efforts to evaluate the impact of curricula and school materials on both genders have been expanded; only 12% observe the opposite. About half the responding unions indicate that things stayed the same when it comes to gender-sensitive assessments, and also school policies for gender equality. Three-quarters observe no change in gender trainings for education staff.

According to UNSA-Education France, the new teacher training systems established in 2013 include gender mainstreaming as an integral element in initial education. GEW Germany describes programmes that tackle prejudice in pedagogics, such as “school without racism – school with courage”, as well as conferences on trans- and inter-sexual youth.
Gender stereotypes

These questions asked whether efforts to promote technical and scientific professions among girls and women, as well as efforts to promote social and care professions among boys and men have been expanded, stayed the same, or been reduced. One-quarter to one-third of the unions did not respond to this question due to lack of data.

As the following graph shows, there have been significant positive changes when it comes to tackling female stereotypes, aiming to bring girls and women into technical and scientific professions. Particularly the German unions GEW and VBE describe extensive programmes such as “girls’ days” to inform girls about technical and scientific areas, and “boys’ days” to bring boys closer to social and care fields. GL Denmark report that the newly introduced subject of biochemistry attracts many girls/women to science.

Nevertheless, unions also mentioned problematic developments. NASUWT UK, for example, describes cuts in provisions for careers information, advice and guidance, which threaten previous work to promote technical and scientific professions among girls and women. UEN Norway offers a more general assessment on the development of gender stereotypes:

“A green paper on equality was launched in 2011, which was in many ways alarming regarding the younger generation’s attitude towards equality, but also pointing out negative developments in the education sector. It was alarming to observe very traditionally gendered choices students make when deciding about their future work place: nurses for girls and engineering for boys.”

UEN Norway

Ethnic minorities

Last but not least in the field of gendered effects of the crisis on the education system, unions were asked whether support and empowerment measures for girls from ethnic minorities in education have been expanded, stayed the same, or been reduced. Almost half the unions could not provide information on this question. Among the responding unions, 70% did not observe any change; and a quarter indicated that these measures were expanded in the past five years.
6.4 Gendered effects on society as a whole

In the fourth block of questions on the gendered effects of the crisis and governments’ austerity policies, unions were asked about developments affecting society as a whole, beyond education staff and students.

Provisions for reconciliation of work and family duties

These questions asked whether provisions of the education system, such as early childhood education facilities and possibilities for afternoon supervision of students have been expanded, stayed the same, or been reduced. This affects not only education staff with children, but mothers and fathers in society as a whole. Almost all unions provided information on these questions.

Many unions observe changes in these areas, and in the majority of cases, these changes are positive: 38% of the unions say that possibilities for afternoon supervision have been expanded, among those SEH Hungary. They describe a new law, which stipulates a daily school programme for the whole day in secondary school.

Half of the unions describe positive changes in the development of early childhood education facilities: INTO Ireland explains that a free pre-school year was introduced, consisting of three hours per day for three-to-four-year-olds; VBE Germany tells us that from the age of three, each child has a right to a place in Kindergarten; and VPOD Switzerland tells the following story:

*“A public financing programme aimed to incite early childhood care facilities. This led to about 25,600 new places for preschool children and about 19,500 places for schoolchildren over the last 10 years.”*  
VPOD, Switzerland

Nevertheless, although these accounts illustrate positive developments very well, one-fifth to one-quarter of the unions observe cuts and reductions in early childhood facilities and possibilities for afternoon supervision of students.

Violence against women

The issue of violence against women is continuously raised as an important issue by ETUCE’s member organisations, which is why this survey included two questions on this subject: Whether incidents of violence against women have decreased, stayed the same, or increased; and whether support systems for victims of violence against women have been expanded, stayed the same, or been reduced. Almost half the unions could not respond to the first question, and one-third did not have information on the second questions.
As the following graph illustrates, almost 80% of the responding unions observe an increase in incidents of violence against women. Further data is provided by KTOS Cyprus:

“Violence against women has become more visible in the past five years. There has been an increase in the number of reported incidents of rape and sexual harassment. According to a study conducted in the northern part of Cyprus, the percentage of women who have been subjected to psychological violence is 86.3% and the percentage of those subjected to physical violence is 74.7%.”

KTOS Cyprus

Figure 29: gendered crisis effects on society - violence against women

NUT UK also reports that violence against women has increased in the past five years, and that this is related to austerity pressures. At the same time, they observe that centres and organisations supporting women who are victims of domestic violence have been closed due to cuts. NASUWT UK provides similar information. Also ASTI Ireland describes a 10% cut in support services for victims of violence against women. Nevertheless, 43% of the responding unions say that provisions for victims of violence have been expanded. ESTUS Slovenia, on the other hand, report positive developments:

“Support systems have increased, as well as public awareness about violence against women. More help is offered to victims.”

ESTUS Slovenia

Monitoring

The last question concerning the gendered effects of the crisis asks whether monitoring activities to control the implementation of national laws and regulations for gender equality have been expanded, stayed the same, or reduced. The responses are illustrated in the following graph, which shows that most unions observe positive or no developments in this area.

Figure 30: gendered crisis effects on society - monitoring of implementation

Among the positive accounts are SEB Bulgaria, who explain that there now is a special person responsible for equality in every ministry. Also KTOEOS Cyprus observes positive developments: The new government formed a committee focusing on the rights and protection of women, LGBTQ people, and children.

On the other hand, ASTI Ireland reports cuts to the budget of the Equality Authority. Also NASUWT UK observes worrying developments:

“The Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) has had its enforcement powers curbed under the Coalition Government. This has included the slashing of legal protections for workers from discrimination and harassment; the introduction of fees for accessing justice through employment tribunals; cuts made to compensation levels; extending the qualifying period for unfair dismissal cases; the scrapping of employment tribunal questionnaires; and steps to undermine the powers of statutory enforcement agencies that are in place to prevent acts of discrimination.”

NASUWT UK
7. Education unions’ policies and activities in the context of gendered effects of the crisis

As the elaborations in the previous chapter show, the economic crisis and governments’ austerity policies do have gendered effects. These effects are particularly prone to exacerbate gender inequalities through an increase in gender-based violence and in the challenge of reconciling work and family duties. On the other hand, however, unions also observe improvements, particularly when it comes to overcoming female gender stereotypes, and also in the provision of early childhood education facilities. The data in the previous chapter also shows that unions need better data and information on developments in many areas, particularly concerning job loss due to budget cuts, as well as incidents of violence against women.

In a last block of questions, unions were asked what they do about the economic crisis and its gendered effects: Which policies do they develop, which lobbying, campaign and PR activities do they organise? The following graph illustrates the responses.

![Figure 31: union policies and activities on the crisis, with and without gender dimension](image)

The data shows that the majority of the unions (green and blue bars together) react to the economic crisis and governments’ austerity measures through their policies (75%), lobbying activities (89%) and campaigns and PR work (92%). Only few unions do not have a policy or organise lobbying and campaign activities related to the crisis. Most of these unions explain that this is because so far the crisis has not had specific effects on their countries, or on their education systems.

However, among those unions active in relation to the economic crisis, less than half of the lobbying, campaigning and PR activities, and less than one-fifth of the policies explicitly include a gender dimension. To put this in relation to the data from the previous chapter: Overall, 72% of the unions observe one or more effects of the crisis that exacerbate gender inequality – but less than 40% of the unions that responded to the survey have policies, lobbying activities and campaigns that deal with the gendered effects of the crisis.

When asked why they do not include an explicit gender dimension in their crisis activities, some unions explain that gender equality is currently not a political priority of the union, that there is no gender discrimination, or that cuts and austerity affect all education workers independent from their gender. Other unions argue that this issue is covered by a general statement on equal opportunities, or that they do not have the necessary resources and gender knowledge to integrate an explicit gender dimension in their crisis-related activities. In those unions that do include an explicit gender dimension, this focuses mainly on demanding a higher number of full-time permanent jobs for teachers, higher salaries, as well as improvements in maternal leave systems.

The data in the previous chapter shows that the gendered effects of the crisis are often small and subtle, incremental changes. Services and legislation for gender equality and women’s empowerment, which in many cases were the achievement of trade unions’ fight for gender equality, are being reduced step by step. In order to counter this development, trade unions will have to take targeted action. Including a gender dimension in all analyses, policies and activities related to the crisis is a first and necessary step.
**Glossary**

**Gender** refers to the roles and responsibilities of men and women that are created in our families, our societies and cultures. It also includes the expectations held about the characteristics, aptitudes and likely behaviours of both women and men (femininity and masculinity).

In 2003, the European Commission has defined gender as the social differences between women and men that are learned, changeable over time and have wide variations both within and between cultures.

**Gender analysis** is the collection and analysis of sex-disaggregated information. Men and women both perform different roles. This leads to women and men having different experience, knowledge, talents and needs. Gender analysis explores these differences so that policies, programmes and projects can identify and meet the different needs of men and women. Gender analysis also facilitates the strategic use of distinct knowledge and skills possessed by women and men.

**Gender budgeting** is the application of gender mainstreaming in the budgetary process. It is a specific, structured process in which budgets are assessed in terms of their gender impact. Gender budgeting does not mean a separate budget for women, and is not limited to budget allocations for equality activities, but encompasses the entire budget of the organisation. It means incorporating a gender perspective at all levels of the budgetary process and restructuring revenues and expenditures in order to promote gender equality (Council of Europe, 2005).

**Gender equality** means equal visibility, empowerment and participation of both sexes in all spheres of public and private life (Council of Europe, 1998).

**Gender mainstreaming** is the (re)organisation, improvement, development and evaluation of policy processes, so that a gender perspective is incorporated in all policies at all levels and at all stages, by the actors normally involved in policy-making (Council of Europe, 1998).

Gender mainstreaming means: Systematically incorporating the specific conditions, priorities and needs of men and women into all policies in order to promote activities based on gender equality or to mobilise all general policies and measures specifically for the purpose of achieving equality by actively and openly taking into account at the planning stage their possible effects on the respective situations of men and women, monitoring them and assessing them (Commission Communication COM(96) 67 final of 21 February 1996).

**Pay gap**, or **gender pay gap**, is the difference between the average wages of men and women expressed as a percentage of male pay (Council of Europe 2010).

**Representation gap**, or **gender representation gap**, is the difference between the percentage of women among union members and the percentage of women in decision-making bodies and union leadership positions.

**School**: When talking about “school”, this report refers not only to primary and secondary education institutions, but to all education institutions at all levels.

**Teacher**: Similarly, when talking about “teachers”, this survey refers to all staff in education.
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