

ELTE research

Attitudes and experiences regarding various forms of gender inequality

Academic year 2015-2016

(summary)

Mandated by the ELTE Rector's Cabinet and the ELTE Student Union

Edited by Anikó Gregor



Budapest, January 2017

Contents

General introduction (Anikó Gregor)	3
Sampling and weighting (Dr. Dávid Simon)	11
Gender attitudes (Mónika Kovács – Mónika Szabó)	14
Experiences and personal involvement (Anikó Gregor)	17
Summary of the results of the qualitative interview research (Johanna Giczi – Margit Eszter Zabolai)	21
Sources.....	26

General introduction (Anikó Gregor)

Precedents

The research the first results of which are summarized here was conducted within Eötvös Loránd University of Sciences and was prompted by several events. In February 2013 the so-called 'listing case' came to light, in which some members of the student union and organizers of the freshmen's camp at the Faculty of Humanities collected information from students' community website profiles and added their own, often homophobic and sexist comments. On August 30 2014 a student was raped at the freshmen's camp of the Faculty of Primary and Pre-school Education, and a few weeks later similar rape cases became public from the Faculty of Law freshmen's camp a year earlier.

On September 17 2014, a short time after the rape case at the Faculty of Primary and Pre-school Education freshmen's camp gained publicity, ELTE issued a press release, which included the following:

"It is our conviction and experience that for the majority of the ELTE community the rejection of gender-based discrimination is natural. The disadvantages present in general society are much less present in university life, several of our professors and researchers are experts in this problem and take an active role in public life. With their help (and involving respected social organizations in this field) we will initiate programs that sensitize our community to gender discrimination, offer support for the survivors of abuse and facilitate prevention."¹

The passage quoted above helped phrase the most important research question of our study, as well as served to support its relevance. One of the central questions of our study was: is it really true that the majority of the ELTE community (including students, faculty and other staff) clearly reject gender discrimination and do not share sexist attitudes and beliefs, including ones relativizing rape, that would legitimate, justify and reproduce inequalities in society and within ELTE itself? As in the first round we had no opportunity to conduct a study within all the three groups mentioned above, we focused first on students, who are the most numerous of the three and represent the lowest level of university hierarchy². Through their opinions we hoped to get answers for the following questions:

- (1) (How) is gender inequality present in the organizational culture of ELTE and of the individual faculties?
- (2) To what extent do students share various sexist attitudes at different faculties of ELTE?
- (3) To what extent do students share various unfounded beliefs connected to rape, including ones relativizing it?

¹ Press release on ELTE's fact-finding study and measures, p. 4. Accessible at: http://www.elte.hu/file/vizsgalat_kozlemeny_20140917.pdf Last viewed June 6 2016.

² We know that the group of students is heterogeneous, as due to other social factors and their position within the organization individual members have different amounts of agency. However, compared to the other two groups mentioned, students do have less power. A good illustration for this is that the only perspective from which we have information about the organizational gender culture at ELTE is that of professors (Joó 2013).

- (4) What do students think the dominant norms are in connection to these questions and gender equality among their fellow students, professors and outside the university?
Furthermore:
- (5) Within the university, what sexist or gender-based discriminatory practices have students experienced and how often, personally or based on someone else's account, by other students, professors or other ELTE staff?
- (6) What proportion of university students have personal experience and/or involvement in gender-based violence and of what kind, be the perpetrator from the university community (student, faculty, other staff) or outsider?

General theoretical foundations

The university as an institution saturated with gender inequalities

Following Joan Acker (1990), the sociologist most often cited as studying institutions from a gender perspective, in this study we view ELTE and its faculties as a gendered institution, that is, as a hierarchical institution saturated by gender relationships (mostly unequal to the disadvantage of women) that get interpreted on different levels. As Acker (2006) points out, various institutions and organizations, their functioning, organizational culture and dominant norms are cross-cut and shaped by not only gender but also other inequalities (e.g. class, ethnicity or other minority status). These unequal relationships then affect the institution itself, usually by reinforcing the dominant or hegemonic culture within it. It is also important to emphasize that ELTE and its community do not exist in a vacuum but surrounded by a multi-layered social context, which can also influence what views, norms and (even unconscious) practices are formed or become dominant within the university concerning gender relations.

Acker (1990, 146) lists five mechanisms of how gender relations get intertwined with the processes shaping the organization and its internal culture.

- (1) *Gender boundaries within the organization*: this may include vertical or horizontal gender segregation (that is, glass ceilings and glass walls), e.g. at ELTE (as at other universities too) at certain faculties almost all students are women (Faculty of Primary and Pre-school Education, Faculty of Special Education), while at others the great majority are men (Faculty of Informatics), or the fact that towards the top of the institutional and academic hierarchy the proportion of women decreases (no faculty at ELTE has a woman dean, while in April 2016 13 of the 25 vice-deans were women). Another manifestation of this is the gendered division of labor (e.g. that departmental and other administrative jobs are typically done by women), but also the way institutional segregation can physically create spaces dominated by one or another gender.
- (2) *Symbols, images and signs representing and expressing the boundaries between genders at the organization*, which make these boundaries visible by strengthening or crossing them. Examples for this include the opening ceremony of academic year 2015-2016, when three faculties, for the first time in the university's history, delegated a woman to carry the faculty scepter. Another symbolic expression of university culture is that in the public spaces of various campuses the pictures, statues or classroom names mostly represent men. The gender norms of university institutional culture are also expressed by its visual culture, such as the sometimes strongly sexualized female figures advertising

university parties, the representation of gender relations and roles, the illustrations of faculty student papers or in sexist (e.g. 'blond') jokes.

- (3) *Interactions between women and men, women and women, men and men* may express gender inequalities in their contents or dynamics. Both in the questionnaire and the interviews we asked students whether they had experienced comments that were sexist, discriminative based on gender or making fun of gender inequalities, and whether they have seen interactions at exams or during classes which express unequal power relations between genders (e.g. who answer questions without putting their hands up, who are more likely to influence the direction of the discussion, who interrupt others, what examples do professors bring to illustrate abstract concepts, does anyone make degrading and offensive comments on people on the basis of their gender or on one of the genders in general etc.).
- (4) *The cognitive knowledge of people in the organization and related actions*, which in the present research may include sharing attitudes that are sexist or relativize rape, norms connected to this within the organization, noticing or being involved in gender-based discrimination and gender-based violence.
- (5) *A particular logic of the organization's functioning*, which according to Acker on the surface is gender-neutral and gives equal opportunities for women and men within the organization, but deeper analysis reveals that it is intertwined with the processes detailed above and creates a complex mixture, which almost unnoticeably influences the existence of women and men in the organization, usually to the disadvantage of women.

In close connection with each other, these mechanisms create within the organization a specific gender regime, which entails internal governing structures, rules, norms, attitudes and beliefs that put male and female members of the organization in different positions and roles and strongly influence their presence, opportunities and capacities for movement within the organization (Acker 1994). Part of this organizational gender regime is how students see and experience the phenomena that embody the rules and norms of the regime, and what attitudes they themselves have concerning gender inequalities and sexism. Through student accounts we also tried to find out about sexist behavior on the part of faculty³.

Some key terms and concepts used in the study

Sexisms

As Mónica Szabó (2008, 16) puts it, “[s]exism in the broadest sense means those legitimizing myths of increasing hierarchies which give intellectual and moral justification for the difference and inequality of genders”.

In this research report, following Swim et al. (1995), we make a difference between old-fashioned or traditional and modern sexism. The former includes beliefs that confirm and legitimize traditional unequal gender roles and the discrimination based on these. Modern sexism, on the other hand, denies the existence of any discrimination creating disadvantages for women, does not support or sympathize with the fight against women’s oppression (given that it does not even

³ It is important to emphasize that we do not believe the whole of ELTE, with its eight different faculties, shares a unified gender regime, neither do we think the individual faculties are homogeneous in their organizational gender culture. Still, in this analysis faculties will be the smallest organizational units we use for comparison and for drawing conclusions.

recognize this oppression), ignores the existence of social forces causing gender inequalities, and seeks the causes of such inequalities on the individual level. Thus it indirectly justifies the differential treatment of women and men.

Another categorization of sexism differentiates between hostile and benevolent sexism, the combination of which produces ambivalent sexism (Glick and Fiske 1997). Hostile sexism means views and beliefs that are antagonistic to women; women often figure in these as wanting to rule men and exercise control over them with the help of their sexuality or of feminist ideologies. Benevolent sexism idealizes women, attaches to them otherwise positive values that make the dominant group's (here: men's) patronizing, protective behavior – which at the same time reproduces group hierarchies – seem natural and positive towards the oppressed group and make them feel they should be grateful for it. It is this seemingly positive content that makes benevolent sexism more socially accepted and thus capable of pacifying members of the oppressed group, who thus do not speak up against the disadvantages and injustice resulting from inequality. Benevolent and hostile sexist attitudes have a positive correlation⁴.

Sexism at the university

Roxana Ng (1993, 44) distinguishes two approaches to the study of sexism in higher education. The so-called individualistic approach considers sexism and sexist attitudes a characteristic of the individual, so the focus is on the individual, psychological level in its measurement (e.g. individual questionnaires) and solutions (e.g. sensitizing and consciousness-raising campaigns targeting individuals or groups of individuals). The so-called systemic approach assesses the institutional forms of sexism in higher education, the power inequalities between university actors of different genders, and the characteristics of the structure and system that maintains and reproduces these inequalities. This approach from the side of organizational sociology considers sexism a systemic phenomenon on the structural level, therefore successful responses to it must also be collective and affect the whole system.

Our study combines these two approaches; blending the approaches of social psychology and sociology, at different stages of the research we tried to draw conclusions concerning the system on the basis of individual responses.

We measured gender discrimination and sexism through situations which normally occur within a university context between the actors that are likely to come into contact (in more detail, see the chapter Experiences and personal involvement).

One might ask why we focus so strongly on mapping institutional sexism when the cases triggering this study were mostly those of sexual violence. But research shows that the acceptance of

⁴ We must shortly discuss whether attitudes and behaviors reflecting negative or ambivalent views about men could be considered a form of reversed or, as it is sometimes called, second sexism (see Benatar 2012). If we approach sexism on the level of individual attitudes, we can accept Mónica Szabó's (2008, 16) argument that negative or ambivalent attitudes towards men can be included in the concept of sexism, and consequently, as our questionnaire shows, during our research we measured experiences of sexism from both a male and a female perspective. It is a more controversial question whether on the institutional level the result of ambivalent or negative attitudes towards men may reverse the situation and create a systemic disadvantage for men as a group relative to women. We think that on the institutional level such attitudes maintain rather than erode the unequal gender relations that result in the dominant position of men.

so-called rape myths that relativize sexual violence and blame the victim (Burt 1980) go hand in hand with sexist attitudes (Aosved and Long 2006). Studies have also demonstrated that both benevolent and hostile sexism strengthens the acceptance of rape myths (Viki and Abrams 2002; Abrams et al. 2003).

All this makes clear that a sexist institutional culture, a sexist social environment around the university and a social order based on gender inequalities are a breeding ground for a rape culture and the flourishing of myths concerning rape. Rape culture entails all the norms, dominant beliefs and social practices that eroticize the dominance of men as a group, do not find the sexual objectification and/or exploitation of women problematic, consider cases of sexual violence acceptable or justifiable, acquit the perpetrator or blame the victim and question her truthfulness (Herman 1984, Brownmiller 1975). Beliefs concerning rape are both causes and effects of a social environment where rape culture is present.

Violence, gender-based violence, harassment, sexual harassment

We use the term violence in the sense Mary R. Jackman does, that is, including all forms of “physical, verbal, or written actions that inflict, threaten, or cause bodily, psychological, social, or material injury” (Jackman 2006, 277). For all forms of violence that are influenced by various gender roles, statuses and inequalities we use the term gender-based violence (Russo and Pirlott 2006, 181). From the possible forms of violence (verbal, psychological, physical, sexual and economic violence or the threat of these) our research concentrates on various types of sexual violence and present results on this, as well as on experiences of everyday sexism. Thus we will discuss sexual abuse, inappropriate sexual advances, sexual harassment and sexual violence that the ELTE students in our sample have suffered from other ELTE students, faculty or other staff. And while these forms of violence are usually regarded as gender-based and targeting women, we have also asked male students whether they have ever been subjected to or experienced any of them.

In 2012 the European Union Fundamental Rights Agency (FRA) did a representative survey in the Member States, including Hungary, on the experiences of different types of violence among women over 15 years of age (FRA 2014). In our research we often applied the detailed categories used in this survey.

The relevant publication of the Equal Treatment Authority (EBH, 2015) as well as Act CXXV of 2003 on the Equal Treatment and the Promotion of Equal Opportunities (Ebkvt.) define harassment as “a conduct violating human dignity related to the relevant person’s characteristic defined in Article 8 [including gender – A.G.] with the purpose or effect of creating an intimidating, hostile, degrading, humiliating or offensive environment around a particular person” (Ebkvt. Art. 10. (1), cited in EBH 2015, 2). The types of behavior offending human dignity typically include but are not limited to verbal offenses and attacks, which have a negative effect on the victim’s self-esteem and sense of dignity. Hungarian legal practice concerning sexual harassment is governed by Directive 2002/73/EC⁵, which defines sexual harassment as any form of unwanted verbal, non-verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature; as it usually takes place in secret, without the presence of

⁵ DIRECTIVE 2002/73/EC OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL of 23 September 2002 amending Council Directive 76/207/EEC on the implementation of the principle of equal treatment for men and women as regards access to employment, vocational training and promotion, and working conditions
Downloaded from: http://www.nefmi.gov.hu/letolt/EU_jogszabalyok/foglalk/2002_73_egk_iranyelv.doc Last viewed on November 20 2016.

others, here „creating an intimidating, hostile, degrading, humiliating or offensive environment” does not necessarily take place (EBH 2015, 4).

The structure of the research

Our research group started work in the fall of 2015. Due to the interdisciplinary nature of the study, it was important to include representatives of different disciplines, who occupy different levels in ELTE's organizational structure with different levels of attachment, so we could approach the topic and its context from a vertically and hierarchically varied standpoint. The seven members of the team and their field of responsibility were:

1. Anikó Gregor PhD (sociologist, assistant professor, ELTE Faculty of Social Sciences): research coordinator, experiences and personal involvement focus
2. Johanna Giczi (sociologist, assistant lecturer, ELTE Faculty of Social Sciences): qualitative interview research
3. Mónika Kovács PhD (social psychologist, associate professor with habilitation, ELTE Faculty of Education and Psychology) attitudes towards sexism and rape myths
4. Anna Sára Ligeti (minority policy expert, alumna of ELTE Faculty of Social Sciences): research management
5. Dr. Dávid Simon (statistician, assistant lecturer, Faculty of Social Sciences): quantitative survey, sampling, weighting
6. Mónika Szabó PhD (social psychologist, assistant professor, ELTE Faculty of Education and Psychology): attitudes towards sexism and rape myths
7. Margit Eszter Zabolai (MA student in Applied Linguistics, ELTE Faculty of Humanities): qualitative interview research

The institutional background for the research and the operation of the research group was provided by the Research Centre for Methodology of ELTE Faculty of Social Sciences.

Pillars

Our research consisted of three pillars.

40 semi-structured in-depth interviews were conducted between December 15, 2015 and January 31, 2016 with a self-selected sample of ELTE students, 6-4 people from each faculty; 15 students were male, 25 female. The interviewers were MA and PhD students⁶ who had a background in psychology or social sciences and had had experience in qualitative interviewing, but were also specifically prepared for this research due to its special nature on a training session.

The second pillar of the study was an online questionnaire focusing on attitudes to various types of sexism, rape myths and norms related to sexist beliefs, which was completed by a representative probability sample⁷ of ELTE students between February 22 and March 15, 2016.

The third pillar was another online questionnaire completed by a representative probability sample of ELTE students (different ones than in the first survey with no overlaps) between May 10

⁶Namely Petra Balázs, Lilla Balla, Gergely Galovics, Zsófia Kelemen, Ágnes Losonczi, Boglárka Nyúl, Csaba Schuller, Márton Szakonyi.

⁷For a description of the sampling and the weighting of databases (in order to handle disproportionate data resulting from sampling and other mistakes in order to ensure representativeness) see the chapter Sampling and weighting.

and 29, 2016, which asked about experiences of sexist behavior at ELTE on the part of students, faculty or other staff and about personal involvement in various types of violence.

In November 2015 we discussed the draft questions for the qualitative interview as well as the first, pre-testing versions of the online surveys at two roundtable discussions of 1.5-2 hours with experts⁸ who, at ELTE or elsewhere, do research in this field or could improve our measurement tools through their expertise in some other way.

Based on feedback at these roundtable discussions we prepared the test versions of the online questionnaires⁹. These were tested on December 10 and 11, 2015 by respondents studying at different faculties of ELTE on different levels. Then cognitive interviews (Willis 1999) were conducted with them with the help of MA students of psychology or social sciences who have experience in survey-based research¹⁰: they went through the blank questionnaire with the respondents, who gave feedback on the questions and possible responses. This feedback was incorporated in the final, Hungarian and English-language¹¹ versions of the questionnaire.

On December 14 2015 the Scientific Committee of ELTE Faculty of Social Sciences, on the basis of the research documentation, on the request of the research coordinator issued a statement confirming that the research adheres to relevant research norms and supported its completion.

⁸ Participants of the expert roundtable discussions: Dr. Csanád Bodó (associate professor with habilitation, ELTE Faculty of Humanities), dr. Éva Inzelt PhD (assistant professor, ELTE Faculty of Law), dr. Ágnes Kövér PhD (associate professor with habilitation, ELTE Faculty of Social Sciences), Dr. Nguyen Luu Lan Anh (associate professor with habilitation, ELTE Faculty of Education and Psychology), Réka Lőrinczi (Student Union, BA student in Social Studies, ELTE Faculty of Social Sciences), Noá Nógrádi (PATENT), dr. Zoltán Pozsár-Szentmiklósy (Rector's Commissioner General for Student Affairs, Rector's Cabinet, assistant professor, ELTE Faculty of Law), Bea Sándor (PATENT), Júlia Spronz (PATENT), Olga Tóth CSc (Hungarian Academy of Sciences Centre for Social Sciences, Institute of Sociology), Luca Váradi PhD (Central European University, alumna of ELTE Faculty of Social Sciences), Dániel Váry (Student Union, MA student in Sociology, ELTE Faculty of Social Sciences), Éva Cserhádi (NANE), Éva Horváth (NANE). The roundtable participants did not see the test and final versions of the questionnaires, the questions included there are the sole responsibility of the research team and its leader.

⁹ The roundtable participants did not see the test and final versions of the questionnaires, the questions included there are the sole responsibility of the research team and its leader.

¹⁰ Namely: Dóra Andorkó, Márton Bagyura, Zsanett Dobra, Dávid Ferenczy, Ágnes Gonda, Máté Király-Gyeőry, Luca Molnár, Annamária Sebestyén

¹¹ In order to enable the participation of foreign students studying at foreign language BA, MA and PhD programs of the university (but excluding temporary exchange students) we also prepared an English version of the questionnaire. However, due to the small number of respondents (<20) their answers were not included in the analysis.

Sampling and weighting (Dr. Dávid Simon)

The sampling process

We used two different questionnaires with two different samples, but the sampling process was the same. We planned to study two independent populations: students studying in Hungarian and those studying in a foreign language. As the population of those studying in a foreign language was not unambiguously identifiable and based on the estimates they comprised only a small proportion of the population, we handled the two groups together by creating an English version of the questionnaire for non-Hungarian speakers.

Therefore we understand **population and research population** as comprised of those students who were enrolled in and had an active student status on at least one university, college or further education course or specialized training at ELTE during spring term 2015/16 as full-time, part-time or correspondence students on any level (bachelor's/master's/single-cycle/PhD) in Budapest or another city where courses are offered, or who, though not having an active student status at this time, had an active student status during academic year 2015/2016.

The planned **gross sample size** was around 600 people/faculty, which would give $8 \cdot 600 =$ around 4,800 people. We calculated with a 33% response rate, that is, of at least 200 students completing the questionnaire per faculty (net sample size).

We used **randomized starting point, systematic stratified probability sampling** at each basic faculty. The criteria for stratification were, in the order of stratification:

1. gender
2. number of semesters of active student status
3. active study programme at the student's home faculty

During the sampling process we first excluded repeated respondents by filtering out all students from the database of a given faculty for whom that faculty is not the home one. Then we did the sampling by faculty. We organized students at the given faculty according to the bases of stratification into homogenous blocs, then we calculated which students plus the ones immediately following them (and thus very similar in their characteristics) would be chosen based on the number of items (students) in the database. E.g. if there were 2000 students at a faculty, every 3rd student was chosen (number of items per faculty/600) plus the one immediately following them (altogether 600+600.) Then using a random integer generator we decided which student it would be, between the first and the (number of items per faculty/600)th item, where the counting would start.

Forwarding the questionnaires to the students

ELTE's Directorate of Education gave the list of the chosen students to the ELTE Directorate of Informatics (IIG) without the involvement of the researchers, so IIG would send a letter requesting participation and written by the researchers to the students' email addresses as registered in the university database. The letter was bilingual, Hungarian and English, and contained a link to the online questionnaire (there were separate links to the Hungarian and the English version). There were no individualized links to the questionnaire, and during the course of the research students only received one standardized email. The online questionnaire database did not store any personal identificatory information, respondents were given individual identification codes.

Following the original email requesting research participation, IIG sent two reminders at the request of the researchers.

The average response rate was 26% for the attitude research and 16% for the personal experiences and involvement research. Within the individual faculties, the response rate was 16-37 and 10-26 per cent respectively.

Weighting

To compensate for the distorting effect of non-responses we used stratification on the basis of known characteristics also used in the sampling process (gender, number of active semesters, study programme) in order to establish their joint occurrence within the population, as well as the distribution of the sample.

Besides this, we also weighted the sample according to the number of students per faculty in order to get a representative sample for the whole university.

The validity and reliability of the samples, estimates about the whole population

The validity of the samples is limited by the response rate. The whole (gross) sampling targeted about 22% of the student population for each research. Consequently, the frequency of a given event, at the *lowest estimate*¹², will be 4.5 times the absolute number¹³ of the 'yes' answers (assuming that among those not responding the frequency is zero).

Considering the proportion of net sample, the *medium estimate* will be 17.5 times the frequency in the first (attitude) study and 29.5 times the frequency in the second (personal experience) study,

The reliability of the sample: based on calculations typical of simple random sampling, 95% confidence intervals can be calculated according to table 1. An observed frequency other than 50% and layering diminishes, weighting increases the likelihood of errors (the numbers in the chart are percentage points). In the slideshow we indicated confidence intervals with the observed frequencies and average values with grey.

¹² This estimate makes it possible to make up for the effect of non-responses on the result, assuming that all those with personal experiences completed the questionnaire. This, however, also means that our estimate will be the lowest possible frequency, and the real number is probably higher.

¹³ Number of cases(N) × percentage of yes answers within the sample (%), see the relevant slides.

Table 1.: 95% confidence intervals with random sampling, in the case of 50% occurrence within the sample (percentage points)

	Attitude research	Experience research
Faculty of Law	±10	±13
Bárczi Gusztáv Faculty of Special Education	±8	±10
Faculty of Humanities	±7	±10
Faculty of Informatics	±9	±12
Faculty of Education and Psychology	±8	±11
Faculty of Primary and Pre-School Education	±8	±10
Faculty of Social Sciences	±5	±7
Faculty of Science	±7	±10
altogether (ELTE)	±3	±4

Gender attitudes (Mónika Kovács – Mónika Szabó)

The aims of the attitude research

The main aim of the study was to explore what beliefs, values, attitudes and norms are shared by ELTE students concerning gender (in)equality (in situations at and outside the university), and what similarities and differences there are in this respect between students according to certain dimensions (gender, faculty).

Our research examines, among others:

- various sexism and traditional male role ideologies that uphold everyday inequalities;
- various rape myths that contribute to blaming the victims.

Sample and processing

1465 persons participated in the online questionnaire research between February 22 and March 15 2016. On the first day of data collection we sent an invitation to the pre-selected sample of ELTE students, and on the first day of the second and third week we sent them a reminder. The sample was representative of the ELTE student community in terms of faculty, gender and number of active semesters (see in more detail in the chapter Sampling and weighting).

The gender proportions differ according to faculty. At the Faculties of Special Education and Primary and Pre-School Education we have virtually no male respondents, at the Faculty of Informatics there are five times more men than women. The Faculty of Sciences has the most gender-balanced sample, while the Faculties of Law, Social Sciences, Humanities and Education and Psychology have a female majority (in increasing order). These gender imbalances are typical of the faculties, but we took them into account during our analysis.

Key concepts of the study

Rape myths

Rape myths are attitudes and opinions whose function is to deny or justify sexual aggression against women (see Payne et al. 1999, 29). In our research we used the Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (IRMA) in a shorter version (IRMA-SV, Payne et al. 1999). Based on factor analysis we could identify four subtypes of the rape myths: (1) “it wasn’t violence/rape” (2) “it wasn’t on purpose” (3) “it is her fault (too)” (4) “she is lying”.

Attitudes towards gender

To measure attitudes towards gender we used a short version of the already mentioned Ambivalent Sexism Scale (ASI, see Glisk&Fiske, 1996), which is often used in other studies as well, and the Adolescent Masculinity Ideology in Relationships Scale (AMIRS, see Chu et al, 2005). Based on previous research we assumed that those who are more likely to accept sexist ideologies and the norm of hegemonic masculinity will be more likely to justify traditional relations of dominance, including violence against women.

Results

Sexisms, attitudes towards gender hierarchies

- the acceptance of gender hierarchies on an ELTE average was not particularly high (on a five-point scale the acceptance of benevolent sexism was 2.70 [with an insignificant gender difference of 2.72 for men and 2.67 for women], that of hostile sexism was 2.48 [2.74 for men and 2.37 for women], and that of masculinist ideology 1.37 [2.04 for men and 1.60 for women]).
- There was no gender difference in the acceptance of benevolent sexism, but male students were more likely than female ones to accept hostile sexism and male ideology, though significant differences between gender averages are small.¹⁴

Rape myths

- The acceptance of rape myths is relatively low in the whole sample (on a 7-point scale the ELTE average was 2.45 [2.74 for men and 2.37 for women]).
- In terms of prevention it is an important result that the most widely accepted myth was “it is her fault (too)” – that is, explicitly blaming the victim - , the next one was “it wasn’t on purpose”, which acquits the perpetrator, and the idea that the victim “is lying”. The least common opinion was denying the fact of rape (“it wasn’t rape”).
- On the whole, rape myths are more accepted by male than female students, in the case of all subscales – except for “it wasn’t on purpose” – the same gender difference appeared (that is, men shared the myths more than women, but significant gender differences were small¹⁵).

Correlations between the attitudes measured

- Similarly to earlier research results (e.g. Viki and Abrams 2002; Abrams et al. 2003) there is a positive, significant, low intermediate to intermediate strength correlation¹⁶ between various sexist attitudes, masculinist ideology and agreement with rape myths, which is true for both male and female students. Therefore we can state that benevolent and hostile sexist attitudes do not only reinforce each other but provide a fertile ground for views that relativize rape.

Conclusions and suggestions

Gender prejudice is present at ELTE like everywhere else in society, but we have no reason to suppose that they cannot be changed. This is not only something that can be expected of the leading institution of higher education in the country, but also a moral responsibility to provide a safe and empowering environment for all students and staff. ELTE’s international reputation also commands that it should not adapt to Hungarian practices but become an exception and a model in providing gender – and other types of – equality and prevent discrimination and violence.

Prevention can be effective if institutional policies and individual sensitization operate side by side in the everyday life of the university.

Institutional level:

¹⁴ $p=0,000<0,05$, $\max(\eta^2) = 0,33$

¹⁵ $p=0,000<0,05$, $\max(\eta^2) = 0,23$

¹⁶ $p=0,000<0,05$, $\min(\text{Pearson's } r) = 0,35$, $\max(\text{Pearson's } r)=0,65$

- (1) As faculty are also affected both as victims and as upholders of prejudice and discrimination, in the next stage of research we must measure faculty attitudes to get a complete picture of the institution.
- (2) While ELTE's Code of Ethics in principle contains the norms and prohibitions that would support equality and contribute to the prevention of discrimination and violence, few know and subscribe to these norms (an English version is not even available on the ELTE website). Students should meet this text already during 'welcome weeks', orientation days and at registration, not only in a formal way but through discussion of the contents.
- (3) Not only students but also faculty and other staff must be sensitized and gender discrimination must be monitored at all decisions (e.g. acceptance of PhD students, promotion of faculty, electing leaders etc.)
- (4) The creation of a position of university gender equality coordinator should be considered and adequate resources provided for her/his work, so that this issue should not only come to the surface campaign-like – usually as a response to scandals – but in the everyday functioning of the university (freshmen's camps, courses, sensitizing trainings, victim protection, investigating and sanctioning the breach of norms etc.). The gender equality coordinator could help and monitor the activity of individual faculties with the help of faculty-level coordinators, could make recommendations for faculties, publicize international good practices, initiate research projects in the field, evaluate the situation in yearly reports, help student unions (especially with regards to organizing freshmen's camps and other events), Lifestyle Counseling and the International Relations Office in this area.

This complex set of activities basically means a form of gender auditing after assessment, and on the long run the creation of various gender-sensitive institutional practices.

Individual level:

- (1) It is necessary to educate the university community on processes hindering gender equality and the problems unearthed by our research. Without awareness of sexism there is little chance that such problems would disappear. Students, faculty and other staff should get an opportunity to find out from ELTE's gender experts about relevant literature and research results in this field.
- (2) Besides the Code of Ethics, members of the university community should be aware of their rights and opportunities to ask for and get help if they experience harassment, violence or gender-based discrimination. ELTE's website should provide the necessary information for this in an explicit way.
- (3) Often prejudice-based actions or even harassment can happen because witnesses do not support the victim. Therefore prevention should pay special attention to the role, responsibility and possible courses of action of witnesses.

Experiences and personal involvement (Anikó Gregor)

The aims of the experience study

The main aim of the research was to find out in what form and on whose part (other student, faculty and/or other staff) ELTE students have experienced sexist and gender discriminatory views and behaviors as well as sexual abuse, inappropriate sexual advances, sexual harassment and/or sexual violence.

Sample and data processing

The online questionnaire was completed by 853 people between May 10 and 29, 2016. On the first day of data collection we sent an invitation to the pre-selected sample of ELTE students, and on the first day of the second and third week we sent them a reminder. The sample was representative of the ELTE student community in terms of faculty, gender, number of active semesters and study programme (full-time, part-time, correspondence)(see in more detail in the chapter Sampling and weighting).

Measurement of the phenomena studied

In the summary we have already discussed what we mean by sexism. We defined 'experience' in a multi-layered way: it included cases when somebody is the subject (1) or witness (2) of an event, or has been informed about it by others (3), so has no first-hand information. In this summary we focus only on the proportion of students who claim to have experienced sexist behavior as subjects (1).

There are three types of actors on whose part students may have experienced sexism: other students, faculty and other staff. Several factors may cause a higher number of experiences at a given faculty. It is possible that sexism in general is more widespread, but also that due to the special subjects studied students at a given faculty have a higher awareness and sensitivity to sexism; it is also possible that there is person exhibiting sexist behavior in a central position of the unit, who gets into contact with most or many students.

In this research we measured various types of experiences with the following questions:

- *Sexism or gender discrimination against women:*

Have you ever experienced that a student/faculty member... ("I have been subject to it several times" or "I have been subject to it once" – any of the cases listed below)

- Told a joke about women or a group of women,
- Used an offensive or denigrating word for women or a group of women due to their gender,
- Questioned women's professionalism, expertise or academic abilities due to their gender,
- Showed a hostile or denigrating attitude towards women in general,

- Ignored or clearly did not take seriously something a female student said in a conversation (during or outside class) because of her gender,
- Made fun of or ridiculed the topic of gender equality
 - *In the case of faculty, additional situations were:*
 - Showed favoritism towards women in class,
 - Gave women a better grade at an exam due to their gender, or
 - Gave women a worse grade at an exam due to their gender
- *Sexism or gender discrimination against men:*

Have you ever experienced that a student/faculty member... (*"I have been subject to it several times" or "I have been subject to it once" – any of the cases listed below*)

- Told a joke about men or a group of men,
- Used an offensive or denigrating word for men or a group of men due to their gender,
- Questioned men's professionalism, expertise or academic abilities due to their gender,
- Showed a hostile or denigrating attitude towards men in general,
- Ignored or clearly did not take seriously something a male student said in a conversation (during or outside class) because of his gender,
- Made fun of or ridiculed the topic of gender equality
 - *In the case of faculty, additional situations were:*
 - Showed favoritism towards men in class,
 - Gave men a better grade at an exam due to their gender, or
 - Gave men a worse grade at an exam due to their gender
- *Sexual abuse or inappropriate advances:*

Have you ever experienced that a student/faculty member... (*"I have been subject to it several times" or "I have been subject to it once" – any of the cases listed below*)

- Offered certain advantages or positive evaluation in return for sexual services,
- Made comments of a sexual nature about another person's body, body part or general appearance that made the other person uncomfortable,
- Started a conversation on an openly sexual topic that made the other person uncomfortable and embarrassed,
- Made a sexual advance verbally and/or another way that made the other person uncomfortable,
- Consciously and with sexual intentions touched, grabbed or groped part of another person's body without this person's permission

- *Sexual harassment:*

Has it happened to you since you have been studying at ELTE that someone in a way offensive or uncomfortable for you... (*"yes, and the person was a member of the ELTE community" – yes answer for any of the cases listed below*)

- Made an openly or ambiguously sexual remark or joke about you,

- Touched you, groped you or rubbed against you with a sexual intent,
 - Showed you her/his genitals against your will,
 - Sent you an openly sexual picture, photo, text message or email against your will,
 - Made you watch pornographic material against your will.
- *Sexual violence:*
 - **Has it happened to you since you have been studying at ELTE that someone...** (*“yes, and the person was a member of the ELTE community”* – yes answer for any of the cases listed below)
 - Tried to force you, with physical force or any other way, to do sexual intercourse (oral, anal, vaginal) or any other sexual activity,
 - forced you, with physical force or any other way, to do sexual intercourse (oral, anal, vaginal) or any other sexual activity,
 - involved you in sexual activity against your will or without your consent,
 - involved you in sexual activity making use of the fact that you were not in a condition to give consent,
 - involved you in sexual activity that you were afraid to resist.
 - *Inappropriate invitation to dates:* that someone aggressively pressured you to go on a date with him/her against your will (*“yes, and the person was a member of the ELTE community”*)

Results

(1) Experiences of sexism and gender discrimination at the university

- 4% of female and 2% of male students said that they had been subject to sexism or some other gender-based discrimination by another (in most cases male) student during their university studies.
- A higher proportion of students have experienced this on the part of faculty: 12% of female and 10% of male students.
 - Female students have mostly experienced positive or negative gender-based discrimination from male faculty, male students from both male and female faculty.
- There are two reasons for the higher occurrence from faculty. On the one hand, in the university environment directly felt discrimination is more likely to occur between parties that are in a hierarchical relationship. On the other hand, as the indicators themselves suggest, there are more situations between teacher and students where respondents could become the subjects of some gender-based discrimination.

(2) Experiences of sexual abuse and unwanted solicitation

- 10% of female and 8% of male students have directly experienced some kind of sexual abuse or unwanted solicitation by a fellow student (the great majority of these were male). There is no significant difference between the individual faculties. Calculating with the lowest estimate of occurrence, this means at least about 500 students (about 350 women and 150 men) having such experience at the university level.

- Only female students reported sexual abuse or unwanted solicitation on the part of faculty: about 5% of female students have experienced this, always from male faculty. At the university level this means at least 200 students.
- There was no significant difference between the faculties in this question either.

(3) Experiences of sexual harassment

- 2% of male and 6% of female students reported having experienced sexual harassment from another member of the ELTE community since the beginning of her/his studies at the university. Calculating with the lowest estimate of occurrence, this means at least 250 victims on the university level.
 - Every third female and every tenth male student has experienced sexual harassment during their university years from people outside university.

(4) Experiences of sexual violence

- 1% of male and 3% of female students reported having experienced sexual violence from another member of the ELTE community since the beginning of her/his studies at the university. Calculating with the lowest estimate of occurrence, this means at least about 140 victims on the university level.
- 6% of female and 1% of male students have suffered sexual violence during their university years from people outside university.

(5) Experiences of inappropriate invitation to go on a date

- 1% of male and 3% of female reported having been aggressively, harassingly invited on a date during their studies at ELTE by a member of the ELTE community.

Summary of the results of the qualitative interview research (Johanna Giczi – Margit Eszter Zabolai)

The aim of the study was to map students' opinions about the existence of open or indirect sexism within the university.

During our research we separated the *private* and the *institutional sphere*, bearing in mind the spillover effect between the two, but clearly focusing on the institutional sphere. During the interview we examined various groups within each sphere as a guiding thread.

During the qualitative research we made altogether 40 interviews within the following 8 student target groups:

- (1) Faculty of Law (5 interviews – 2 male 3 female)
- (2) Bárczi Gusztáv Faculty of Special Education (5 interviews – 1 male 4 female)
- (3) Faculty of Humanities (6 interviews – 2 male 4 female)
- (4) Faculty of Informatics (5 interviews – 3 male 2 female)
- (5) Faculty of Education and Psychology (5 interviews – 2 male 3 female)
- (6) Faculty of Social Sciences (5 interviews – 2 male 3 female)
- (7) Faculty of Primary and Pre-school education (4 interviews – all female)
- (8) Faculty of Sciences (5 interviews – 3 male 2 female)

When organizing the interviews, we paid special attention to map the opinions of students studying at different faculties. Further differentiation was made on the basis of gender, taking into consideration the gender proportion of students within each faculty. We published a call for interviewees, which described the aim of the research as examining the achievement or failure of gender equality within and outside university; part of the interviewees applied voluntarily for this, another part was recruited with the snowball method. The interviews lasted 60-90 minutes, each respondent received an Eötvös Pont voucher in the value of HUF 3000 in return.

It is important to note that the sample of interviewees is not representative of the student body of the university, neither was this pillar of the research designed to make quantifiable statements about student opinions. Heterogeneity in terms of gender and faculty aimed to bring forth a variety of opinions and discourses. Thus this part of the research is not representative in the classic statistical sense, but in the sense of representing everyday discourses and their patterns within the target group (Feischmidt 2014, 92).

Main results

The university as an institution is not only present in students' lives as a place of study; it also gives a framework to their everyday relationships and social network. Groups of friends and the quality of relationships between students affect university norms, and are affected by them in turn.

Based on the accounts, **besides benevolent sexism, traditional sexism is also frequently experienced in university classrooms and corridors**, it is present in the norms of communities, targeting primarily female and/or non-heterosexual students.

The student narratives clearly reflect a lack or partiality of training in gender inequality. Even those who do deal with gender relations as part of their studies or due to individual interest often interpret feminism as man-hatred, or think they can only become successful if they leave stereotypically female values and topics behind; topics considered 'women's issues' can only be discussed if there are no male students around. This approach also appears in female students' narratives, who often position themselves – as followers of stereotypically male models – higher in the hierarchy among women than those who follow more stereotypically female models in their appearance or interests. This misunderstood feminism – that women can only become equal to men by being similar to them – contributes to the preservation of the status quo in gender relations.

The survival of gender inequality and of sexist practices is probably reinforced by preconceptions about gender roles that students bring with them (e.g. from their family or friends) and which also reflect a lack of gender consciousness.

A strong presence of indirect sexism is also indicated by student answers to the question about how they react when they hear a sexist joke among friends. While everyone openly condemns sexism, sexist jokes – that is, sexist discourse – are often accepted. Even those who do not accept it rarely do anything against it or criticize it openly, either because they do not want to enter a conflict where they would take a side against the institutionalized practice, or because they simply do not know what, if anything, they could do about it.

At faculties with fewer female students benevolent sexism remains, especially in terms of preconceptions about gender roles, for instance it is assumed that female students studying natural sciences are not interested in their looks, consequently attractive women must be studying some less 'serious' or 'masculine' subject, or that women think differently than men. In accounts of freshmen's camps, which socialize students for university life, female humanities students – who are supposed to be studying less 'masculine' subjects and thus to be more 'feminine' and 'attractive' – appear as 'living décor', transported by student organizations especially to events of faculties with an extreme male majority, for the entertainment of male students.

Both relevant literature and interviews confirm that the lack of social network correlates with the danger of sexual harassment, as marginal members of the community are more likely to be targeted by microaggression and sexual and other exploitation, it is harder for them to ask for and get help. However, events and practices that should facilitate integration into the community often **prepare the bedding for sexism and microaggression.** Some tasks in freshmen's camps are humiliating, sexist or even painful, though for many students this is the primary space of socialization into university life. But the same applies to parties advertised with sexist images or slogans, or parties that are organized between several faculties to compensate for gender imbalances, which may sound innocent but in fact facilitate sexual abuse.

At later stages **the university does not make efforts to integrate students at the institutional level,** and when it does, these efforts are not always successful. Our interviewees say that university parties are permeated by sexism already in their themes and advertisements, their posters objectify women and strengthen a heteronormative approach. Students consider alcohol consumption as a legitimate means of getting rid of inhibitions and easing the stress of meeting others, but at the same time it may create an atmosphere where others feel less safe.

It is unrealistic to expect the few gender-aware students to change the gender approach of the student community, and not only because it is not their responsibility to change the institutional and organizational climate. On the one hand, due to the lack of appropriate training, they themselves are not prepared to handle everyday sexism, on the other hand both open and indirect sexism are so deeply interwoven with the everyday life of the university community that many consider them natural, self-evident and thus unchangeable, or even something that need not be changed, and their opportunities for action are limited.

Abuses of power in exam situations have special importance in a university environment. A sexist remark by the teacher during an exam, an atmosphere uncomfortable for the student or negative discrimination based on the student's gender have negative psychological and also practical consequences: they may lead to worse performance, worse grades, failing or not students completing their studies in time. Therefore it is the university's responsibility to ensure an institutional environment where students can perform under fair and equal circumstances, and in case this is not realized, there is a unit they can make a complaint to about discriminatory practices.

In exam situations female students report both benevolent and hostile sexism. Male students, if they mention this, emphasize **benevolent sexism**, while female students recall cases of obvious negative discrimination. There is a widespread belief that women may have 'advantage' in an exam situation if they are willing to sexualize themselves, but students' personal experiences point to the contrary.

According to female students, **sexism in exam situations is usual** at some faculties. One common form is **objectification**, which may create exam circumstances for women that are not worthy of the university. Another mechanism of inequality is the **emphasizing and legitimization of male superiority**, when from an initially equal situation the teacher elevates male students into a position of power, for instance makes them evaluate the performance of the female examinee.

Students have also brought examples when in an exam situation the teacher **commented on the appearance of female students**. For the student it is uncomfortable in an exam situation if the teacher regards her as a woman and comments on her womanhood, as **her gender or appearance is not relevant** in this situation. When a teacher makes compliments to the student during the exam, moves her out of the theoretically gender-neutral but otherwise hierarchical situation and creates a male-female relation that is alien to the situation, and where the male (the examiner) is clearly in the dominant position.

Many students claim that **other teachers and even faculty leadership know which teachers show sexist behavior**, but if they have ever been reprimanded, news about it have not reached the student community and it has not had much effect, as the person continues his sexist behavior.

During the interview research **we have not found a single person who has reported the experienced power abuses at any institutional unit of the university.**

Recommendations and conclusions

Several students emphasized that they **do not at present have the vaguest idea where they could turn or what opportunities they would have** if they became victim to gender-based abuse at the university, or if they wanted to make a complaint against a fellow student or faculty member. The majority of interviewees **welcomed the idea** that there should be a possibility for victims and other affected people to get help within the university in an organized way, and that there should be a body or committee that they could make a complaint to in a case of violence, gender-based discrimination or sexism. Such a body would be important not only for its activity – regardless of how much it would be used – but **its very existence it would send a message** to the whole university community about **the values the university professes in terms of gender equality**, and about not tolerating gender-based discrimination and violence. The **mere presence** of such an organ would be **a form of prevention**, may become part of the organizational culture and gender regime of the university, and may affect other spheres as well.

While **setting up a separate body** to deal with these issues is a message in itself, it can only be successful if the gender culture of the institution surrounding it does not hinder but rather supports its activity, and encourage those suffering harm to articulate their complaints and consider them legitimate. Thus an important criterion concerning the activity and efficiency of this unit or committee should be its **complete transparency, including detailed information concerning the protocol** of the process itself. Another important criterion of this transparency was emphasized by those interviewees who encouraged the publication of **statistics** about the activities of this body or unit at regular intervals, thus making its functioning more visible.

One student thought the success of such a unit also depends on whether an **organizational culture can take root** that encourages victims or those who suffer injustice to **dare to speak up**. There is no point in a unit or committee if **students** do not feel entitled to speak up against the injustice they have suffered.

Trust plays a crucial role in the efficient functioning of such a unit or committee and in cases that become visible. **Anonymity** and the confidential treatment of personal data came up as a key requirement towards this body or committee in the interviews.

Opinions were divided among participants concerning **who they would turn to** and who they would talk to about their complaints or injuries. Our analysis has found that whether students find it realistic to turn directly to **a faculty member teaching at their faculty** depends very much on the individual faculty's **organizational culture**. This organizational culture is probably closely connected to and feeds on the organizational culture of the departments that make up the faculty.

Students also mentioned that such a body or committee should contain both **male and female members**, so those who suffered injustice could have a choice about the gender of the person they talk to about what happened to them.

Prevention was also emphasized in the interviews. Many suggest that certain values should be expressed clearly already **at the students' first entry** at the university, but **caution against this happening in the framework of some mandatory lecture**. Some participants suggested that

participation in sensitizing programs and the related sharing of **information** should not be limited to students but they find it necessary to extend these to **faculty members as well**.

The **two services** that those who wanted the university to give some support to victims (especially of violence) most often mentioned as necessary is **psychological and legal counseling**. In terms of psychological help, the interview research confirmed what the online questionnaire has already revealed: that **many students are unaware of or has limited knowledge about services already provided by and functioning at the university**.

Several interviewees mentioned that when promoting these already existing services within the university, the advertisements should try to break down the widely shared notion that **asking for psychological help is “embarrassing”**. If the university fights against this stigma, it may change attitudes not only within but beyond the university as well, as graduates already during their studies will have met the message that asking for help when faced with psychological problems is not a sign of weakness.

Free psychological and lifestyle counseling provided by the university turned out to be especially important also because students, having no or only small independent income, **cannot afford** market-based private psychological services. Thus social inequalities are reproduced: mental health is available only for those who have the means to pay for it.

With regard to **psychological and legal counseling** it is also important that clients affected by gender-based violence or sexism should be able to speak to counselors within the university-based services who have relevant knowledge and competence to handle such **special cases**, or if not, there are available protocols or referral systems to ensure that the victim gets efficient expert help as soon as possible.

With regard to **data protection**, several interviewees mentioned that although ELTE has in principle strict restriction regarding access to personal data, from **the university database and other public databases** students (or even teachers and other staff) can gain information about people’s personal data, contact information or even class schedule. This gives an opportunity for perpetrators to organize and realize their harassment or attack on the grounds of the university.

Therefore we must **reconsider** whether data protection in its present form is efficient, and what information should be electronically accessible for different members of the ELTE community.

Sources

2003. évi CXXV. törvény - az egyenlő bánásmódról és az esélyegyenlőség előmozdításáról szóló. [Act CXXV of 2003 on the Equal Treatment and the Promotion of Equal Opportunities] <http://net.jogtar.hu/jr/gen/hjegy_doc.cgi?docid=A0300125.TV>

Abrams, Dominic et al. (2003): Perceptions of stranger and acquaintance rape: The role of benevolent and hostile sexism in victim blame and rape proclivity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 84(1): 111-125.

Acker, Joan (1990): Hierarchies, jobs, bodies: A Theory of Gendered Organizations. *Gender & Society* 4(2): 139-158.

Acker, Joan (1994): The gender regime of Swedish banks. *Scandinavian Journal of Management* 10(2): 117-130.

Acker, Joan (2006): Inequality regimes: Gender, Class and Race in Organizations. *Gender & Society* 20(4): 441-464.

Aosved, Allison C. – Patricia J. Long (2006): Co-occurrence of Rape Myth Acceptance, Sexism, Racism, Homophobia, Ageism, Classism, and Religious Intolerance. *Sex Roles* 55(7): 481-492.

Benatar, David (2012): *The Second Sexism: Discrimination Against Men and Boys*. Malden – Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Brownmiller, Susan (1975): *Against our will. Men, women, and rape*. New York: Ballantine Books.

Burt, Martha R. (1980): Cultural Myths and Supports for Rape. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 38(2): 217-230.

Chu, Judy Y. – Michelle V. Porche –Deborah L. Tolman (2005). The adolescent masculinity ideology in relationships scale development and validation of a new measure for boys. *Men and Masculinities* 8(1), 93-115.

Egyenlő Bánásmód Hatóság (2015): *A munkahelyi zaklatás megelőzése és a jogérvényesítés formái*. EBH-füzetek. Budapest.

<http://www.egyenlobanasmod.hu/app/webroot/files/img/articles/b88c321410754fba7ca7910d46b1be1e/EBH-f%C3%BCzetek_Munkahelyi%20zaklat%C3%A1s.pdf>

Feischmidt Margit (2014): A nemzet varázsa és a szélsőjobboldali szimpátia a fiatalok körében. In Feischmidt Margit, Glózer Rita, Ilyés Zoltán, Kasznár Veronika Katalin, Zakariás Ildikó: *Nemzet a mindennapokban*. Budapest: L'Harmattan. 82-155.

FRA-European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights. 2014. *Violence against women: an EU-wide survey. Main results*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union. <http://fra.europa.eu/sites/default/files/fra-2014-vaw-survey-main-results-apr14_en.pdf>

Glick, Peter – Susan T. Fiske (1997): Hostile and Benevolent Sexism. Measuring Ambivalent Sexist Attitudes Toward Women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 21(1): 119-135.

Herman, Dianne F. (1984): The Rape Culture In: Freeman, Jo (szerk.): *Women: A Feminist Perspective*. Mayfield Publishing Company.

7." In Janet Saltzman Chafetz (szerk.) *Handbook of the Sociology of Gender*, New York: Springer, 275-317.

Joó Mária (2013): Egyetemi életképek – Kis magyar patriarchátus. *TNTeF* 3(1): 113-124.

Ng, Roxana (1993): Sexism and Racism at the University. Analyzing a Personal Experience. *Canadian Woman Studies* 14(2): 41-46.

Payne, Diana. L. - Kimberly A. Lonsway – Louise F. Fitzgerald. (1999). Rape Myth Acceptance: Exploration of Its Structure and Its Measurement Using the Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale. *Journal of Research in Personality* 33(1), 27-68.

Russo, Nancy Felipe – Angela Pirlott (2006): Gender-Based Violence. Concepts, Methods, and Findings. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 1087: 178-205.

Swim, Janet K.et al. (1995): Sexism and Racism: Old-Fashioned and Modern Prejudices. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 68(2): 199-214.

Szabó Mónika (2008): *A társadalmi nemekkel kapcsolatos dinamikus nézetrendszerek szociálpszichológiai vizsgálata: ideológiák és sztereotípiák, nemi tipizáltság és társas identitás*. PhD disszertáció. Budapest, ELTE.

Viki, G. Tendayi – Dominic Abrams (2002): But She Was Unfaithful: Benevolent Sexism and Reactions to Rape Victims Who Violate Traditional Gender Role Expectations. *Sex Roles* 47(5-6): 289-293.

Willis, Gordon B. (1999): *Cognitive Interviewing. A „How To” Guide*. (kézirat) <<http://www.hkr.se/pagefiles/35002/gordonwillis.pdf>>