

Ivana Barać, LL.M.*

Vujadinović, Dragica, Zorana Antonijević, eds. 2019. *Rodna ravnopravnost u visokom obrazovanju: Koncepti, prakse i izazovi*. Novi Sad: Akademska knjiga, 363.

The gender equality, although analysed by many scholars within different academic disciplines, still faces great hurdles, mainly stemming from the traditionally closed and patriarchy-oriented society, ignorant to the need of improvement of women's position both in their personal and professional life. This becomes more apparent when analysing the position of gender equality in higher education.

One would expect that academia, i.e. higher education, presents a perfect opportunity for performing multidisciplinary activities aimed at improving gender perspectives and understanding of the so-called women's question. However, the truth remains elusive, as the problem of gender (in)equality in academia persists.

Although the latest research, as cited in literature, goes to prove that the gap existing between men and women in higher education is becoming smaller, the patriarchal view that the exclusivity in academia belongs solely to men allows us to understand the background leading to the collection of articles uniformly covered within the book titled *Rodna ravnopravnost u visokom obrazovanju: Koncepti, prakse i izazovi* (Gender equality in higher education: concepts, practices and challenges), edited by Dragica Vujadinović and Zorana Antonijević. It encompasses five different sections, consisting of research papers written in both Serbian and English language.

The book was preceded by the international conference Gender Equality in Higher Education: International Good Practice and Local Context, organised at the University of Belgrade Faculty of Law in October 2017. The conference was a strong impetus for the editors to gather researchers and academics and offer up-to-date analysis of emerging problems and challenges of gender equality in higher education.

* Assistant Lecturer, University of Belgrade Faculty of Law, ivana.barac@ius.bg.ac.rs.

The authors aim to address the ever-present questions of male dominance in academia, absence of gender sensitive study programmes, ignorance of the impediments women face in balancing their private and professional lives, obvious discrepancy of normative compliance and assertive dedication to gender equality in higher education and in that respect propose measures and actions that could address the question of gender equality in a more profound and substantive manner.

The first section of the book, titled *Kritički pristup visokom obrazovanju iz rodne perspektive* (Critical approach to higher education from a gender perspective) focusses on the existing, as well as the newly-founded concepts of gender equality within higher education. It opens with Marina Hughson's paper *Rodnost i proizvodnja znanja na poluperiferiji: Pravo na izvrsnost?* (Gender and education production at the semi-periphery: the right to excellence?), where the author opts for a two-way approach to elaborate on gender equality in higher education. Better said, she focusses on the position of women in the former Yugoslavia and present-day Serbia, with the intention of proving that the "semi-periphery" is not falling behind in knowledge related to the scientific position of women, as existing in the "centre". It is worth noting that in the context of this research paper, present-day Serbia represents the semi-periphery in comparison to different progressive countries, being the centre.

That being said, the author opposes the idea that ready-made measures from the "centre" present an adequate mechanism to improve the position of women scientists in semi-periphery, mainly because the two areas have specific characteristics that should be dealt with differently. In order to prove this, the paper examines the right to excellence from both a general and an individual perspective. Hughson concludes that it is important to understand the great difference existing in the institutional environment in the semi-periphery, as oppose to that existing in the centre, as the semi-periphery can and most often is subject to the so-called „twist“ caused by its specificity. It would also represent an oversight to this specificity to merely implement the solutions from the centre without applying appropriate adaptations.

The contribution *Men and Masculinities in Academia, Higher Education and Science: Approaches, Applications and Actions*, by Jeff Hearn, discusses academia, higher education and science from a critical viewpoint of studies on men and masculinities. He argues that there is a need to refocus „the standpoint on gender, framed with a focus on women, either women's experience or even women as the problem and the need to change women“. Hence, Hearn takes a different view and concentrates on men in academia as equally gendered. Taking critical studies on men and masculinities as his theoretical point of departure, Hearn offers an in-depth analysis of approaches that could lead to a better understanding of gender

regimes in academia and science. He proposes actions on an individual, organisational and (trans)national level, in academia, higher education and science, as he considers that there is a need to inspect the double complexity of men. Thus, he suggests an action plan which should, on an individual and interpersonal level, focus on changing individuals, while on the organisational level, it should address the need for systematic and structural changes. Finally, on the national and international level, Hearn propounds that there is a need to find creative transnational responses for changing men transnationally.

A new aspect for resolving gender inequality in academia can be sought in Ana Kolarić's contribution titled *Pedagogija i aktivizam: Osvrt na eseje Adrijen Rič o obrazovanju* (Pedagogy and activism: a look at Adrienne Rich's educational essays). Specifically, and due to the newly emerging trends of promoting right-wing ideology and conservatism, the author considers that core values of democratic society are in jeopardy. As a response, Kolarić provides an overview of essays by Adrien Rich¹ on the subject of education and pedagogy, with the aim of improving education and teachers in today's society. The author presents Rich's teaching experience and views on education, which derive from a feminist perspective, and as such primarily relate to her understanding of the power of language in education. In the end, the author elaborates on the possibility of using language as a powerful tool for changing modern-day perspectives on gender equality, through actions carried out both by students and teachers in higher education. Kolarić concludes that academia should promote social justice and democratisation of knowledge rather than its commercialisation.

The second section of the book, titled *Urođnjavanje visokog obrazovanja i istraživanja: Izazovi prakse i mogućnosti institucionalizacije u evropskom kontekstu i Srbiji* (Gendering of higher education and research: the challenges of practice and possibilities of institutionalisation in the European context and in Serbia), on one hand sheds light on the practice of gendering of higher education in Nordic countries and Slovenia, while on the other it provides an overview of gender inequalities existing in scientific researches globally. The first paper is *Gender Equality in Nordic Academia: Advances and Challenges*, by Liisa Husu, which offers insight on the existing paradox within Nordic countries in tackling gender inequality. To be specific, the author presents an overview of rather contradictory perceptions on the matter of gender equality, by addressing the existence of three paradoxes (paradox of

¹ Adrienne Rich was a prominent American poet, essayist and a radical feminist and social activist during the civil rights movement. The author underlines that the key essays written by Adrienne Rich can be found in the collection titled *On Lies, Secrets and Silence*.

change, paradox of excellence, and paradox of interventions) present in Nordic countries. To this end, Husu acknowledges that the high level of political will, national initiatives, action plans and mechanisms aimed at fighting gender inequality in higher education in Denmark, Sweden, Finland, Iceland and Norway contributed to the countries' high ranking in the overall gender equality of society globally. Despite that, she emphasises that Nordic countries still face challenges in favouring men and masculine perspectives in higher education and science.

Veronika Tašner and Milica Antić Graber's paper *Educational Meritocracy and Gender Equality in Slovene Academia* examines the concept of educational meritocracy and its effect on the educational system in Slovenia. The authors presented a historical background of the developments of education in Slovenia and thus acknowledged the importance of educational meritocracy regarding the equality of women and men in the field of academia/education. However, they advise caution as meritocracy cannot and should not be the sole criterion for achieving gender equality. Instead, they conclude that meritocracy and hegemonic structures should be subject to scrutiny and, as such, modified. Consequently, that would result in the adoption of new perspectives that would include a higher number of well-educated individuals.

As previously stated, this section allows us to inspect the existing practical issues of gender inequality in academia as well. Admittedly, the next author, Ljiljana Čičkarić, in her paper *Rodne nejednakosti u naučnim istraživanjima* (Gender inequalities in scientific research), analyses the position of women in the international scientific arena, by presenting valid arguments on their inequality in comparison to men scientists. In that respect, she elaborates on the lower proportion of women scientist compared to men scientists, on the gross disparity in the number of research papers published by men compared to women, on the vast difference in income based on gender, etc. Čičkarić argues that there is a need for structural changes, consisting of measures and mechanisms focussed on achieving balance of private and professional lives of women. On that note, the author underlines the importance of gender diversity in scientific projects and the increase of women's participation in scientific work, which would subsequently lead to the raising of both the efficiency and the quality of the scientific work.

Section 3 of the book, *Rodna ravnopravnost, diskriminacija i segregacija u visokom obrazovanju u Srbiji: Kritički osvrt* (Gender equality, discrimination and segregation in higher education in Serbia: a critical overview), deals with a) the contemporary issue of gendering in academia by providing examples of gendering in higher education institutions (primarily research and development institutions) and b) the issue of discrimination and segregation in higher education in Serbia.

The first research paper in this section, *Razumevanje koncepta rodne ravnopravnosti u normativnom okviru visokog obrazovanja u Srbiji* (Understanding gender equality in the normative framework of higher education in Serbia), presents a critical overview of the concept of gender equality in academia, which authors Jelena Čeriman and Irena Fiket detect by conducting a thorough analysis of Serbia's general normative framework of gender equality, hence covering the norms concerning higher education and academia. The authors argue that the universities in Serbia in no manner differ from the general normative framework when dealing with the persisting gender inequalities, gendered career possibilities and unequal working conditions in academia for women and men. They further support their stance by presenting narratives of interviews conducted with academic members of the University of Belgrade. Čeriman and Fiket conclude by stressing that their overview testifies to the existence of misinterpretation and false recognition of the importance of gender equality. This is mainly deduced from the fact that academia fails to implement provisions dealing with gender sensitive language, gender sensitive curriculum and study programmes.

The contribution *Rodna segregacija u visokom obrazovanju na primeru Srbije* (Gender segregation in higher education in Serbia), by Ankica Šobot, remains in the area of gender segregation. The author presents an analysis of gender segregation in higher education institutions in Serbia and argues that such an analysis testifies to the existence of both vertical and horizontal segregation. Šobot connects the existence of gender segregation to the perspectives of the traditional roles of women and men, and to the organisation of scientific work and realisation of scientific projects. Such data, as stated by the author, corresponds to the data on the position of higher education institutions in the European Union Member States. That being said, Šobot considers two approaches that could potentially ease the position of highly-educated women. She underlines the necessity to overcome both cultural barriers of gender roles within society and the perception of women's scientific work, their carrier paths as well as the manner of organising scientific work.

Valentina Janev and Sanja Vraneš provide a rather refreshing approach to the issue of gender equality. Particularly, their paper, *Sprovođenje politike rodne ravnopravnosti u organizacijama istraživanja i razvoja: Studija slučaja iz Srbije* (Implementation of gender equality policies in research and development organisations: case study from Serbia), analyses the results of implementation of the Action Plan for the Promotion of Gender Equality, launched as part of the GenderTime (Transferring Implementing Monitoring Equality) Project² within

² The aim of the GenderTime Project was the implementation of action plans for gender equality in different educational and scientific institutions throughout Europe.

the Mihajlo Pupin Institute (hereinafter: Institute), one of the oldest, most renowned and largest research and development institutions for information and communication technologies (ICT) in Southeast Europe. The aim of the action plan was to examine the issue of gender equality within the Institute by employing a set of new qualitative and quantitative methods for gender equality analysis. After primarily addressing the existing Serbian normative framework in regards to gender equality policies, the authors focus on an overview of the newly-implemented methods within the action plan (hiring policies, promotions of women researchers, measures for balancing private and professional life, etc.). In this respect they elaborate on the most important results achieved through the action plan, such as the improvement of women researcher's professional careers, the increase in the number of women holding managing positions, the increase in the number of prizes won by women, and most importantly, the improved motivation of young women researchers. On the other hand, they underline that there is still room for improvement within the Institute. Therefore, Janev and Vraneš conclude that the next steps in the implementation of gender equality plans must focus on the greater inclusion of female researchers, both in scientific commissions and in various decision-making boards, primarily at the Institute but also within the academic community in Serbia.

Further assessment of gender equality in academia in Serbia is presented by Marija Babović, Branka Drašković and Ivanka Popović in their paper *Rodne strukture, politike i kulture u organizacijama visokog obrazovanja: Kvalitativno istraživanje na državnom i privatnom fakultetu u Beogradu* (Gender structure, policies and cultures in higher education organisations: quality research at state and private faculties in Belgrade). The authors chose to present a comparative analysis of the gender structure, policies and cultures in two rather different surroundings: the Department of Psychology of the Faculty of Philosophy – University of Belgrade (state university), and the Faculty of Economics, Finance and Administration, (private university), by interviewing both male and female lecturers from the said higher education institutions. When elaborating on their discoveries, the authors indicate that a high level of both horizontal and vertical segregation exists in academia, as a result of a multitude of factors (such as the misinterpretation of gender roles within the family/society). Additionally, the authors note that there is a high presence of indirect and covert inequalities against women, which present an important issue as they are hidden and usually more difficult to recognize. Henceforth, the authors conclude by underlining the lack of institutional mechanisms and policies of gender equality and stress the need to discuss gender equality and introduce institutional changes.

In the paper *Etnicitet i rod: (Ne)vidljive predrasude u akademskoj zajednici u Srbiji* (Ethnicity and gender: (in)visible prejudices in Serbia's academic community), author Karolina Lendák-Kabók connects contemporary problems of gender equality and ethnicity by conducting a survey of ethnic Hungarian, Slovakian and Romanian professors at the University of Belgrade and the University of Novi Sad, in order to examine whether women from ethnic minorities can become part of the academic community despite the two-layered obstacles (their ethnicity and gender). Specifically, Lendák-Kabók explores whether women from national minorities have more difficulty building an academic career and whether they can be elected to higher positions in academia. In an attempt to answer these questions, the author presupposes the existence of biases related to ethnicity and gender and opts for a narrative, intersectional and discursive analysis of the issue by conducting interviews. Consequently, the results demonstrate the merit of the author's hypothesis as the survey indicates that respondents truly feel that there is bias and that they face difficulties when building their careers. Nevertheless, the survey indicated that women fail to engage in a joint fight against gender inequality, as they lack both solidarity and empathy, and consider ethnicity to be the main cause of the existing bias against them. Thus, they opt for different strategies³ in order to explain their position in academia, and by doing so they disregard the gender dimension of the issue.

Section 4 of this collection of articles, titled *Urođnjavanje disciplina i rođnost kao disciplina* (Gendering of disciplines and gender as a discipline) begins with the paper *Studije srpske književnosti: Mit o urođnjavanju višeg obrazovanja* (Serbian literature studies: myth on gendering of higher education), by Svetlana Tomić. This paper analyses the curricula of undergraduate programmes at the University of Belgrade Faculty of Philology and the University of Novi Sad Faculty of Philosophy, with an aim of providing a critique of Serbian literature studies from the standpoint of gendering. This analysis also looks back in time with focus on the course *Serbian Literature in the Second Half of the 19th Century*, which, as understood by Tomić, presents an „academic fantasy“. Particularly, she offers a critical view of perspectives on female authors in 19th century. In that regard Tomić elaborates that male authors, distinguished literary critic Jovan Skerlić amongst other, led to the creation of the „blank field“ concept in Serbian literature. The said concept created an understanding of male dominance in literature and the absence of female authors and their writings. Consequently, it broke the connection that exists between the education level and the

³ These strategies are: strategy of minority complex, strategy of scientific excellence, strategy of political background, strategy of self-deception, and language barrier strategy.

activities of professional women in Serbia and resulted in the exclusion of female literature authors from the referential syllabi. The issue is still present. Despite the fact that the previously mentioned higher education institutions do offer students the possibility to opt for gender-oriented courses, it cannot be ignored that a) such possibilities exist only in the master's study programmes and b) that they represent an optional rather than an obligatory course. Accordingly, the author suggests alterations and a set of measures, by offering examples from both obligatory and elective courses. In that respect, Tomić proposes amendments within the Serbian Realism course, in order to promote gender equality and to eliminate the so-called academic fantasy.

The stance that gender equality does indeed intertwine with different areas is further supported by Tatjana Đurić Kuzmanović in her paper, *Feministička ekonomija i rodne studije u Srbiji: Mogućnosti i izazovi* (Feminist economy and gender studies in Serbia: possibilities and challenges), which offers a different perspective on the understanding of economy. Specifically, she focusses on feminist economics and underlines its importance as a scientific discipline that reconsiders the economic power relations of women and men by addressing the presence of an invisible and gender-biased position of women in the economy. Đurić Kuzmanović concentrates on the issue of gender economics in Serbia and in that respect explores the existing gaps in economics regarding the subject matter. Namely, Đurić Kuzmanović points out that despite some individual efforts to make this discipline a mandatory subject in study programmes at universities, Serbia fails to act uniformly and institutionally on this matter. The author states that on one hand there is a need to examine the reasons why feminist economics is side-lined, and on the other, that there is a need to face the persisting social and political barriers related to gender inequality. Đurić Kuzmanović calls on policy makers to address the issue of implementing gender-sensitive economic policy, as well as gender-sensitive approach within economics as a scientific discipline.

The contribution *Izazovi u praksama institucionalizacije i izvođenja ženskih studija* (Challenges in the process of establishing and institutionalising women's studies), by Daša Duhaček, primarily deals with the issue of gender equality in academia and in that sense addresses concerns focussing on a) conceptual differences in naming study programmes „women“ or „gender“ studies, and b) tensions related to efforts of including women/gender studies in mainstream disciplines, also known as gender mainstreaming. These concerns are further developed by interpreting a case study from Serbia. Namely, Duhaček describes the creation and development of the Centre for Women's Studies, in Belgrade. To that end, the author notes that the Centre endured different

dilemmas and difficulties as it was in complete opposition to the ruling political party in Serbia at the time. Regardless, the Centre's main goal—to provide for institutionalisation of gender studies—was ultimately achieved as the University of Belgrade Faculty of Political Science incorporated gender studies in its study programme. Nevertheless, the question of institutionalising women's/gender studies remains a focal concern and thus leads to the marginalisation of gender studies within academia.

Isidora Jarić's contribution, *Javni i skriveni kurikulumi rodnih studija u Srbiji (1978–2018) i njihovo integrisanje u sistem visokog obrazovanja (Overt and hidden curricula of women's studies in Serbia (1978–2018) and its implementation within the higher education system of Serbia)*, gives a historical overview of incorporating gender studies within the curricula of the higher education system in Serbia. In that respect, the author argues that gender studies were subject to three different phases, as supported by the analysed data. The first phase led to the emergence of the so-called women's question, consequently leading to the increased activity on that topic as well as the formation of different centres for women's/gender studies. The second phase is connected to the activities at universities as it resulted to the implementation of gender studies within the University of Belgrade curricula.⁴ Logically enough, these activities brought about the need to address the issue of gender equality in higher education more seriously and profoundly, and this consequently led to reform activities (the Bologna Process). Jarić stresses that Serbia should implement different standards related to the inclusion of gender studies in its higher education system, such as: prevention of prejudice existing in regard to gender studies, endorsement of both institutional and non-institutional practice that promote gender studies and reform of the predetermined behaviour patterns existing and exercised by individuals.

The final section of the book, *Teorijska i strateška pitanja urođjavanja pravničkog obrazovanja (Theoretical and strategic questions of gendering of legal education)*, covers the issues of gendering of legal education as well as concrete examples of gender equality policies and its institutionalisation through action plans. It begins with a contribution by Zorica Mršević, who explores feminist jurisprudence through the comparison and correlation of feminism and jurisprudence in her paper *Jurisprudencija i feminizam (Jurisprudence and feminism)*. The author emphasises the importance feminist jurisprudence has to the issue of gender equality. Along these lines she discusses the unresolved issue

⁴ The University of Belgrade Faculty of Philosophy was the first to incorporate gender studies into its study programme. This initiative was later followed by different higher education institutions (University of Belgrade Faculty of Political Science, and University of Belgrade Faculty of Law, amongst others).

of gender equality through the prism of views emerging from feminist jurisprudence. In Mršević's point of view, the area of law is deeply rooted in tradition and patriarchy-oriented, both theoretically and practically speaking. Hence, she considers feminist jurisprudence to be a mechanism for the creation of a different social perspective of the issue of gender equality, as well as a means to initiate implementation of gender sensitive provisions and strategies aimed at their affirmation.

Equality Adds Quality: On Upgrading Higher Education and Research in the Field of Law, by Susanne Baer, deals with the issue of improving the quality of higher education by implementing gender studies and hence improving the perspectives on gender equality within academia. The author presents her views that gender equality is an important factor which could in turn lead to the improvement of quality in higher education. Although the author is not neglecting the importance of gender equality within other areas of our lives, she underlines that academia, especially faculties of law, present the perfect starting point for developing and upgrading the idea of excellence related to gender equality. In that respect, Baer offers examples of activities already carried in Germany showcasing the reasons why gender equality is genuinely important to higher education and research. She argues that a gender analysis as well as the promotion of gender diversity should be carried out in order to allow for a better understanding of gender inequality and discrimination. That being said, the author highlights that individuals focussed on improving gender equality in higher education and research should expose and educate, insist and integrate, and demand as well as do, in order to achieve gender competent knowledge and diversity of actors.

Marijana Pajvančić's contribution, *Integrisanje rodne perspektive u pravne studije – primer Ustavnog prava* (Integration of gender perspective in legal studies – example of Constitutional Law), investigates the possibility of gender mainstreaming within humanities, particularly within the field of law. The paper presents an overview of the existing curricula, study programmes as well as textbooks of faculties of law which, in the author's opinion, are the basis for refocussing and accepting gender mainstreaming. The author specifically deals with Constitutional Law and detects areas adaptable to gender mainstreaming. Pajvančić considers that „the inclusion of the issue of gender is possible in any area that relates to the standard constitutional matter“. Specifically, she underlines that such a need exists in the following sections: introductory remarks, basic principles of the constitutional array, the human rights' section, and the horizontal and vertical organisation of powers. The author is convinced that syllabi and textbooks fail to implement gender perspective in the educational process and instead only superficially tackle gender-related

issues. In that sense, she believes that students should be given an opportunity to interpret comparative constitutional orders and not solely focus on the system of the Republic of Serbia. Ultimately, this paper leads to the conclusion that gender mainstreaming within education at all levels is none other than the result of compliance of the Republic of Serbia with its contractual obligations stemming from multilateral and bilateral agreements, rather than proof of a real change in the approach to gender equality.

Gender mainstreaming of higher education was also the subject of scrutiny by Dragica Vujadinović and Nevena Petrušić in their paper *Neophodnost urođjavanja studijskih programa prava i pravničkih predmeta – predlozi rodno senzitivnih silabusa za Sociologiju prava i Porodično pravo* (The necessity of gender mainstreaming of study programmes of law and legal subjects – suggestions of gender sensitive syllabuses for Sociology of Law and Family Law). The starting point of the authors is that gender equality represents an important prerequisite for improving quality in higher education. Accordingly, the authors conducted a gender analysis of undergraduate study programmes at two eminent state universities (the University of Belgrade Faculty of Law, and the University of Niš Faculty of Law) in order to assess whether and to what degree gender perspectives form part of their study programmes. It was deduced that both faculties lack gender-sensitive profiling of the aims, outcomes and content of legal studies. Accordingly, Vujadinović and Petrušić propose a set of measures to be performed from “above” and “below” in order to create gender perspective in higher education. The „above“ measures relate to interventions at the state university level, which should be performed by creating and implementing gender oriented public policies, while the “below” measures are related to the creation of gender sensitive study programmes at all levels of studies. The authors submit that making legal education gender-sensitive would provide a better understanding of the importance of gender equality within our society, based on human rights and the rule of law.

The book ends with a rather insightful paper co-authored by Dragica Vujadinović, Ljubinka Kovačević and Tanasije Marinković, titled *Postizanje rodne ravnopravnosti na Pravnom fakultetu Univerziteta u Beogradu – nacrt akcionog plana* (Achieving gender equality at the University of Belgrade Faculty of Law – a draft action plan). It relates to their common intent to embark on a pioneering journey of gendering higher education in Serbia, by using University of Belgrade Faculty of Law as their starting point. More precisely, the authors pursued their idea by drafting an action plan, related to the subject matter, for the University of Belgrade Faculty of Law, which would hopefully motivate other

higher education institutions to act in the same manner and draft and implement gender action plans. With that in mind, the authors underline the importance of understanding the history of the legal invisibility of women and the need for reviewing all legal disciplines from a gender-sensitive perspective. For this reason, and in order to draft a proper gender equality plan, the authors initiated a two-phased undertaking: they first conducted a gender-sensitive statistical analysis and an empirical survey of the questionnaires on different issues related to gender equality, previously answered by the academic staff from the said institution. The second phase was the preparation of a draft action plan (gender equality plan) with a set of measures to be implemented in order to achieve the predetermined and previously mentioned goals at the University of Belgrade Faculty of Law. The authors concluded that a review of all legal disciplines from a gender-sensitive perspective can contribute to the better study of law and, consequently, the better understanding, implementation, and interpretation of the law. In other words, it is not just a matter of internal significance for the improvement of teaching and scientific research and working conditions at the Faculty of Law, but that an action plan for achieving gender equality at the University of Belgrade Faculty of Law could play a wider, general role in society.

A mere glance at this book distinguishes it as a rather valuable and important contribution to the subject of gendering of higher education. It represents a response to the need to improve the current position of gender perspectives in higher education, seeing that the issue of gender (in)equality persists. To that end, it allows us to inspect and understand the basis of gender (in)equality, its development, continuing struggle of women scientists and the challenges that they face. In other words, we are introduced to a rather systematic and detailed analysis of different perspectives and directions on gender issues within academia. More importantly this book presents a sort of guideline for our future actions related to the question of gender equality. More precisely, various research papers offer a myriad of mechanisms and measures that should be implemented and (re)considered in order to promote and implement gender perspectives in higher education institutions. This becomes even more significant if we bear in mind that gender mainstreaming is most commonly regarded as rather artificial, aimed at opposing patriarchy-oriented society. As the truth remains on the other side, there is also a need to promote gender sensitive and gender competent study programmes, curriculum and syllabi, and as such allow for gender equality, which in turn will result in the improvement of the quality of higher education and research. Such a need is very clearly understood and articulated in this book, as the authors present their intent to provide for the gendering of legal education and consequently of higher education institutions in

general. It is therefore safe to conclude that this book will be of great importance for individuals tackling gender inequalities. In other words, researchers, higher education teachers and lecturers, students, public policy drafters should undoubtedly consider it, as it is a valuable tool for assessing gender equality, gender segregation, as well as biases regarding the position of women scientists in academia.