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ABSTRACT

Despite extensive research into women’s leadership representation and roles, little is known about the role of women in Iraqi leadership and academics. Most of the literature on academic imperialism and the relegation of women to secondary roles in higher education is authored by Westerners; thus, it may not accurately depict the level of gender inequality in academia. The aim of the current study is to explore the prospects of career progression for women in Iraq based on the insights presented by both male and female professionals. The study also sought to determine whether the interaction between lecturers and students was influenced by gender stereotypes and the inclusion of women in departmental administration. Hence, a quantitative research method was used, and data required to sufficiently address the research questions was collected using questionnaires. The sample population consisted of 59 male and female professionals and 114 students of both genders and across departments. The collected data was then analyzed on SPSS version 2.0. The research found that male employees had a better prospect of career progressions than their female counterparts; 57.6% of male professional participants strongly agreed that their prospects of career progression are high, while 50% strongly agreed to this prompt. Moreover, female lecturers reported that female students were freer with them than their male counterparts. Also, females felt less represented in departmental administration than their male counterparts. Although Iraq’s academia has come a long way in bridging the gender inequality gaps, more still needs to be done for better female professionals’ inclusion in leadership and administrative roles. The current study suggests that future studies should be dedicated to finding the current challenges facing women academics.
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1. Introduction

Despite the widespread exploration of women’s representation and roles in leadership, little is known about the role of women in leadership and academia in Iraq. According to Alsubaie and Jones (2017), most of the literature that covers academic imperialism and the relegation of women to secondary roles in higher education are mostly set in the Western context. When Arabic women are in the center of attention, the source is authored to present a biased and incomplete representation of Arabic women as exotic and erotic (Alsubaie & Jones, 2017). Although a number of studies conducted by western scholars fail to depict an accurate image of Arabic women in leadership and academia, it is irrefutable that Muslim majority countries post the highest discrepancies when it comes to education. Lomazzi (2020) asserts that the lack of gender equity in Arab societies stems from religious roots, cultural heritage and legislation.

Equality and fair treatment of people of all social groupings, gender, sexual orientation, political affiliation, or religious subscription is a fundamental human right. Arafa and El-Ashry (2017) posit that despite the widespread recognition for the need for equality, legislations and societal practices that undermine equality are still prevalent in today’s society. In the case of Egypt, which is a Muslim-dominated society, the recognition of gender equality as a fundamental human right has been ongoing since the emergence of the feminist movement in 1919 (Arafa & El-Ashry, 2017). The lack of gender equality, be it in the Islamic context or in Western civilizations, has been the major precursor for women revolts throughout history.
Lomazzi (2020) asserts that gender culture guides people in how they assign gender roles and behaviour about genders. Gender culture can be defined as the uniform normative view that exists within a society on the proper form of gender relations and the roles assigned to each gender. Gender cultures, although ingrained in a society’s traditions, can be changed over time; therefore, it can be seen that even in the Islamic world, the treatment of women and their assigned roles differ significantly (Lomazzi, 2020). In this regard, it is not intellectually responsible for assuming that women are still denied positions of influence in the contemporary Arab setting without conducting an in-depth interrogation of the issue.

In the academic spheres, gender inequality is witnessed in both women’s involvement in academia and leadership in institutions of higher learning and the literacy levels. A study by Roudi-Fahimi and Mohghadan (2003) reported that the proportion of illiterate people aged between 15 and 25 years was significantly higher among females than their male counterparts. Although this study is almost 20 years old, and an array of interventions intended to bridge the gap between women and men have been undertaken in Iraq over the years, a study done by UNESCO (2014) found that 18–20% of the Iraqi population is illiterate, and 26.4% of women are illiterate while only 11.6% of men are illiterate. The illiteracy level among women was higher in rural areas, where it was as high as 50%. Assessing illiteracy level is equally important for the exploration of the current study subject as it can explain gender inequality in academia, more men than women in higher education leadership and teaching roles because men could be more qualified.

The second facet of gender inequality in academic stems is from teaching roles. The current study will focus on the proportion of higher education teaching roles held by women, but on their attitude and experience on working in this academic context. A study by Rehani (2015) found that 77% of students reported that female lecturers were better at delivering content than their male counterparts. Female lecturers were also perceived by students as the most disciplined and the best in providing clarification. Nevertheless, the study conducted by Rehani (2015) was limited as it predominantly focused on teaching competence and did little to elucidate the attitude of the student towards their lecturers, in terms of respect, among other behavioural attributes.

Moreover, the current study will attempt to debunk how academicians working in higher institutions perceive the state of gender equity, equality in promotion, and the overall working conditions. In addition, it will strive to evaluate the opinions of students on a lecturer’s competence and quality of student-instructor interaction based on gender differences. The study is set in Iraq, which is a country predominantly constituted by Muslims and people of Arabic descent. Rather than focusing on the opinions of female lecturers alone, this study includes students and male lecturers too to gain a wholesome perception of gender equity.

1.1 Research Problem
Gender stereotypes and empirical studies conducted by western researchers have a long time shaped how people perceive the treatment of women in the Arabic context (Asbah et al., 2014). Although a number of initiatives have been launched to bridge the gender gap in leadership, economic, and academic spheres by governments in the gulf, the degree to which gender equality is exhibited in these learning institutions is still a subject devoid of research findings. Eleraqi and Slahuddin (2018) assert that women earn the majority of undergraduate degrees in Arab countries today and largely constitute the teaching fraternity in most primary and secondary schools but are underrepresented at institutions of higher learning. Oman leads the Arab world with the highest number of the female university president, 13.3%, while only 2.9% of university leaders in Iraq are women. The situation is even worse in some Arab countries such as Bahrain, Comoros, Qatar, Somalia, and Yemen, where there are no women presidents in the realm of higher education (Harb, 2008). The low number of female university presidents triggers an inquiry into whether women enjoy equal career progression chances as their female counterparts in academic spheres in Arabic societies. Complementarily, a number of studies have been conducted in the Arabic context to debunk the attitude and perceptions of students towards their female lecturers (Rehani, 2013; Tili et al., 2021). Although the studies offer in-depth insight into the situation in the Arabic world, no such studies have been conducted on Iraq. Therefore, the current study is integral because it facilitates the generation of invaluable information on students’ behavioural patterns. Therefore, the current study strives to answer the following research questions:

1. To what extent do female and male academicians’ perceptions of the prospect of career progression differ?
2. How does lecturer-student interaction differ based on gender?
3. How different was the quality of lecturer-student interaction during online classes for female and male lecturers?
4. To what extent was equity upheld in departmental administration?

1.2 Objectives and Significance of the Study
The objective of the current study is to elucidate the perception of gender equity in higher education in Iraq for both male and female lecturers. The study aims to determine if women in higher education are at a disadvantage in terms of career progression, interaction with students, and inclusion in administrative roles and decision-making. The study will contribute to the available body of research by determining the root cause of gender inequity in academia in the context of Iraq and advance recommendations.
that can be adopted by the Iraqi Ministry of Higher Education to remedy the situation. The study will also deduce students’ attitudes and perception of gender among their lecturers and whether there is a statistically significant difference in how students perceive their lecturers’ qualifications and competence based on gender.

2. Literature Review
This section of the dissertation presents research findings relevant to the study’s topic presented in the introduction section. Various themes and sub-themes span from the definition of key concepts and frameworks to the presentation of statistics showing the degree of gender inequality in academia in the context of the Arabic world and Iraq in particular. This section will be based on reliable peer-reviewed journals to ensure the information conveyed is reliable and relevant, and scholarly.

2.1 Gender Equity in Academia
A study by Alsubaie and Jones (2017) on the state of women's involvement in leadership roles in higher education in Saudi Arabia found that although female leaders are as effective as their male counterparts, the salience and far-reaching ramifications of gender stereotypes and masculinization of institutions of higher learning limit women's opportunities for career advancement. Despite women constituting the majority of primary and secondary school teachers, they often fail to ascend to positions of leadership (Eleraqi and Slahuddin, 2018). Nonetheless, in their study, Alsubaie and Jones (2017) found that the challenges facing women in academia in the Middle East are congruent to factors hampering women's career progression in the Western world. Women's chances of clinching leadership positions in the Middle East or the Western world, specifically in academia, are limited by the masculinization of organizations and institutions cultures and the misrecognition of women's leadership capabilities. Therefore, throughout the world, both in academia and outside the academic realm, women experience devaluation of their leadership competencies and marginalization. Smith and Abouammoh (2013) established that despite the fact that women in the Arab world face ubiquitous problems in their pursuit of career progression as their western counterparts, the situation in the Arab world is profoundly complex because their career prospects are shaped by both religious and cultural conformity.

Moreover, in today's progressive world, gender norms are increasingly changing. Women are no longer perceived as just childbearers but also as professionals with tremendous potential that can be leveraged to foster the success of companies. Nonetheless, Probert (2005) affirmed that women chances of career advancement are curbed by the double burden of family obligation, and this phenomenon affected both women with and without children. The combined effect of the masculinization of the educational institutions and gender discrimination in academia explains the low number of female professors and female leaders of higher education institutions. In a study by Morley (2013) exploring the gender dynamics in the United Kingdom’s higher education setting, women constituted 44% of the academics, but men made up 72.1% of academic staff in senior management roles. The discrepancies stemmed from the misrecognition of women’s leadership abilities and gender bias in the promotion process (Morley, 2013).

Gender equality and feasible adoption of policies that give all people equal chances in academia are crucial to Iraq’s economic success. According to Harb (2008), Iraq’s higher education can potentially play a pivotal role in helping the country overcome the widening sectarian and gender divide fostering long term stability and peace. Despite the eminence of Iraq’s higher education success, the pervasiveness of bias and misrepresentation of women’s leadership abilities could demotivate women to work in the university as only 2.9% of Iraqi university presidents are women (Eleraqi % Slahuddin, 2018). According to Al-Ali et al. (2012), the problems of academics in Iraq go beyond gender discrimination as there were numerous reported cases of the assassinations of academics in the post-war Iraqi society. Other elements that impede the progression of Iraqi higher education are the high number of academics that fled Iraq during the war, the destruction of infrastructure, sectarianisms exhibited by both lecturers and students, and the high rate of corruption within academic institutions (Al-Ali et al., 2012).

According to Al-Ali et al. (2012), the crisis in Iraqi higher education and the erosion of women’s rights did not begin with the invasion and occupation of the republic in 2003. The enactment and implementation of legislations that disenfranchise women and propagate gender inequality in higher education can be traced to Iraq’s history. The economic sanctions imposed on Iraq resulted in an economic and humanitarian crisis in the war. The sanction resulted in heightened conservatism in Iraq, which resulted in a scenario where academics were denied access to journal articles, stopped from collaborating with academics from the rest of the world, and banned from travelling to other parts of the world (Al-Ali et al., 2012). The economic sanction severely affected women in academics as the Iraqi society became even stricter and segregated in its treatment of its women. Al-Ali et al. (2012) reported that owing to the economic decline, class and gender inequality has escalated as professional women were pushed back into traditional roles of housewifery and maternity.

The tide for the deteriorating status of a professional Iraqi woman turned following the decree issued by the Iraqi Ministry of Higher Education in 2005, offering employment to all PhD and master’s degree holders (Al-Ali et al., 2012). Most women that had attained this qualification were employed as researchers and lecturers, with very few clinching university leadership positions. Al-
Ali et al. (2012) assert that male dominance in university leadership roles can be attributed to the looming risk of assassination and the academic drain that had occurred in Iraq when most senior university leaders had to flee the country.

Although the progression of Iraqi higher education and gender equality were significantly paralyzed by the economic sanctions imposed on the nation and stringent religious and cultural provisions, an array of policies are increasingly being adopted to bridge the gender gap in Iraq’s academic realm.

### 2.2 Students' and Professors' Attitude towards Gender Equity

Even though little is known about the attitude of university students towards their lectures and whether this perception is shaped by the lecturer’s gender, an array of studies has been conducted in the gulf region. According to a study by Lafta et al. (2018) on Iraqi medical students’ attitude, 59% of the students rated their learning experience as either poor or fair, and about 57% of the participants admitted to thinking about leaving Iraq upon their graduation. The inclination to leave stems from the adverse living conditions as an aftermath of the invasion, as 18% of the participants reported having lost at least one family member to intentional violence, and 15% reported that they have witnessed or heard about the death of a medical school classmate (Lafta et al., 2018). Nonetheless, Lafta et al.’s (2018) study is limited as it failed to explore students’ perceptions of their teachers and lecturers.

Another study by Rehani (2015) on students' perception of their lecturers in the Arabic Language department set in Saudi Arabia elucidates that female lecturers were more competent than their male counterparts. According to Rehani (2015), 77 percent of students believe female lecturers are better at delivering content than male lecturers, and female lecturers are also seen as the most disciplined and best at providing clarification. The fact that students perceive female lecturers as more competent and experienced, the progression of gender stereotypes and inequality cannot be justified in terms of the performance of female professors. However, Rehani’s (2015) study was limited in that it primarily focused on teaching competence and did little to explicate students’ attitudes toward their lecturers in terms of respect and other behavioural qualities.

A study by Bayes et al. (2020) exploring student’s perceptions of their professors in the gulf found that more than 80% of the participants, which were engineering students, would not choose courses based on the professor's gender and about 80% states that they were comfortable approaching a professor of the opposite sex (Bayes et al., 2020). When it comes to the prompt on the impact of gender on a professor’s teaching style, 50% of male and 30% of female participants agreed. In addition to the subject, 61% of the participants emphasized that more female professors should be included in STEM subjects (Bayes et al., 2020).

Lecturers also have varied perceptions of gender equity in the Arabic context. According to Asbah et al. (2014), students studying in education colleges tend to maintain normative perceptions of gender that influence their training process. To effectively understand the gender attitudes of lecturers and teachers, it is imperative that the role of social norms practices in the Arab world and their implications on one’s perception of gender is understood (Asbah et al., 2014). Although the account of Arab women’s status is exaggerated by secular researchers, the situation is still far from ideal. Asbah et al. (2014), in their study of Israel, determined that the treatment of women in the Arab world is significantly shaped by the patriarchal hegemony that reinforces men’s dominance over women. The dominance and the control traverse social contexts and infiltrate how women are perceived in professional contexts. The interplay between the traditions and customs on the one hand and the religious culture, on the other hand has entirely or at least in part affected or limited Arab women’s movement, work, education, lifestyle, and career prospects (Asbah et al., 2014).

Although it can be argued that gender discrimination is slowly being addressed in the Arab world, it is still a principal impediment to women’s career progression. A study by K (2020) elucidates that gender segregation policy conditions organizations and reshapes the corporate culture to depict women in leadership as an absurdity. The segregation policy poses a structural challenge to the involvement of women in a leadership role, and the few that make it into leadership face fierce scrutiny and are less involved in the decision-making process (K, 2020). Also, women’s career progression in academia depends on their level of education. Most governments in the Arabic context, especially Saudi Arabia, have recognized that many women leaders can be attained by according women an opportunity to further their studies. Nevertheless, women still need their husbands’ ‘parents’ or male siblings’ permission to study abroad (Ensour et al., 2016). Therefore, unless this culture of male guardianship is addressed, the attainment of gender equality in leadership shall remain an unattainable goal.

Another study seeking to demonstrate how social norms hamper women’s chances for career advancement was conducted in Israel by Arar and Abramovitz (2013). The study explored the dynamics of principal appointments and how their fellow teachers perceived their appointment. The study revealed that women principals were more effective in creating a pleasant atmosphere than their male counterparts. On the downside, women were perceived as inferior leaders and incapable of effectively relating with outside administrators as opposed to their male counterparts (Arar & Abramovitz, 2013). Male teachers demonstrated more patriarchal attitudes than their female counterparts, and astonishingly teachers that held a university degree were more opposed
to the idea of a female principal than those without a higher education degree (Arar & Abramovitz, 2013). Observably, the opposition towards women’s engagement in leadership, be it in lower or higher educational settings, comes from the societal context and discriminatory attitudes held by faculty members.

2.3 Women’s Leadership Capability

A broad body of research has demonstrated that female lecturers are as good as their male counterparts, if not better, at content delivery, and their leadership fosters a better and more comfortable work environment (Bayes et al., 2020; Rehani (2015). Nonetheless, women still constitute a small percentage of university leaders in the Middle East, while they constitute 2.9% of university presidents in Iraq (Elraçi & Slahuddin, 2018). The extremely low number of female university leaders is a reflection of how women have been overlooked for a leadership positions in the Arab world and the Middle East alike. In this accord, it is integral that whether preferring men for positions of leadership and the masculinization of organizational cultures is justified or practice entirely anchored on gender stereotypes.

A study by Gipson et al. (2017) found that while men and women exhibit different leadership styles and men are predominantly preferred for positions of leadership, there is no statistically significant difference in the performance of women and men in leadership. Female leaders tend to impact the general organization than their male counterparts because they have a higher propensity to adopt the transformational leadership style, allowing them to mentor and attend to their followers more than their male counterparts (Hopkins et al., 2008). Another complementary study by Offermann and Foley (2020) exploring whether there is a female leadership advantage found that female leaders can bring a constellation of distinct attributes and traits that will give the organization a competitive advantage. Nonetheless, most companies adopting equity and giving women a chance to clinch leadership positions may fail to harness the benefits conferred by a female leader because of an organizational culture that inhibits female leadership advantage.

The disadvantages facing women in leadership both in academia and outside this realm are not exclusively orchestrated by men. According to Kreidy and Vernon (2018), women in leadership positions that adopt a somewhat different leadership approach tend to be perceived as “unlikable” by their colleagues. Moreover, the style of leadership employed by female leaders can influence the subordinate staff’s perception of female leadership and, in extreme circumstances, perpetuate gender bias in leadership. In some instances, the limitations to women’s participation in leadership stem from them yielding to masculine corporate culture and choosing to step down (Alqhtani, 2020). Also, the tenacity of the gender gap in leadership can be traced to the segregation-based employment and promotion patterns that are woven into the organizational fabric (Alqhtani, 2020).

A study by Nash et al. (2017) stated that women are underrepresented in leadership positions in STEMM fields; science, technology, engineering, mathematics, and medicine. Nash et al. (2017) refute the perception that women tend to lean towards a specific type of leadership style as opposed to their male counterparts. The researcher states that the notion that women and men lead differently and have a different style of leadership does not explain where there is gender discrepancy in leadership but is used to perpetuate promotion biases. For instance, if there is a widespread idea that women cannot be assertive leaders, then administrators and the HR department can use such a notion to justify discriminatory tendencies in the hiring process. There is no consistency on how effective leadership is defined; as a result, it is prudent that every individual that merits leadership positions should be given a chance regardless of their gender (Nash et al., 2017).

In the Arab world, the gender disparity in leadership is far more far-reaching than in western societies. A study by Hodges (2017) found that women occupy limited positions of leadership in the Mena region because there are subject to social, cultural, religious, and organizational principles that perpetuate bias. The study revealed that leadership should be redefined in an attempt to overcome the existing stereotypes pertaining to leadership and give women equal chances in academia. Leadership should be defined as an action rather than a position of power and authority. By changing the definition of leadership in the Mena regions, men will not perceive a woman in authority as a threat to their masculinity, but they will perceive her as someone that merits to serve them in some capacity (Hodges, 2017).

2.4 Summary

A broad body of research is available on women representation leadership in both academia and other spheres in the West and the Middle East. The study posits that women’s underrepresentation in leadership stems from masculinized organizational cultures and social, cultural, and religious stereotypes that Arabic women face in and outside the workplace. Although academics are perceived as enlightening and people that are guided by intellect, gender disparities still exist in academia, not just in the Arab world but also in the Western world. Even though women all over the world face the same hurdles in their professional undertaking, the limiting gender stereotypes and biases are more intense in the Arab world than in the Western context.
3. Methodology
This section details the research design, data collection method, and other empirical research considerations that will be invoked in ensuring the collection of accurate, credible, and reliable data. Moreover, the study will outline the method used to analyze the collected data.

3.1 Research Method
The primary purpose of the current study is to elucidate gender discrepancies in Academia, particularly in the context of Iraqi Universities. The degree of gender bias is evaluated from the lens of university professors, assistant lecturers, and students. Although many studies have been conducted on gender inequality in the Arabic world, the current study seeks to evaluate the role that the masculinization of the university’s perceptions plays in gender inequality in Iraq’s academic spheres. To effectively achieve the objective of the current study, it is imperative that the most appropriate research method is used. According to Apuke (2017), the quantitative research approach is appropriate for exploratory research into phenomena, shedding more insight into the phenomena. A descriptive research design was employed to further strengthen the understanding of the phenomenon, in this case, perceptions of gender inequality in academia. A qualitative research approach was not selected for the current study because the research seeks to determine the perception of gender equity rather than address the question of why such perceptions exist.

3.2 Research Philosophy
Saunders et al. (2009) define a research philosophy as a set of assumptions and beliefs underpinning the development of knowledge. The research philosophy used in the current study is interpretivism. The philosophy of interpretivism is significantly different from positivism because positivists view reality as something as separable or independent of human beings; therefore, the reality under research can be observed objectively. Conversely, interpretivism is anchored in the premise that reality is highly subjective and is shaped by people perceptions. The interpretivism school of thought is ideal for the current study because while some researchers may presume that bias and masculinization of organizational culture are disenfranchising women and propagating gender inequality, some participants may view the phenomenon from a whole different lens. Although a researcher may try to collect results devoid of personal biases and imposition of personal perceptions, designing the question for the selection of the participants may subconsciously propagate these biases. Therefore, an interpretivist approach is more logical as it acknowledges that the manner in which the data came to be may not be devoid of personal biases.

3.3 Research Approach and Design
The research approach adopted for this study is quantitative and deductive. This means that the research is descriptive in the sense that it sought to ensure the subject of the study has been well understood in breadth while beginning with a hypothesis and generalizing the findings. The deductive approach is effective in the context of the current study because it allows for the measurement of the study phenomena quantitatively. Therefore, the study starts from theory and narrows down to the participants’ perception of gender equity in Academia in Iraq. According to Apuke (2017), quantitative research is a statistical method that entails quantification and analysis of variables to deduce results that can be used to answer the research question.

Akhtar (2016) defines a research design as an overall strategy adopted by a researcher to integrate the different components and aspects of a study in a logical and coherent manner. A descriptive research design was deployed in the current study. A descriptive research design is a design employed by a researcher to obtain information for systematically describing a population or a phenomenon. The descriptive research design focuses on describing the nature of a particular group or demographic, in this case, students and lecturers, without focusing on why the phenomena occur. In the case of this study, a descriptive design is effective in determining the perceptions of lecturers and students on gender equity rather than why the inequality persists in academia despite the numerous efforts to scrap discriminatory practices in the hiring and promotion processes.

3.4 Population and Sampling
The congruence between the characteristics of the sample populations and the requirements of the researcher are integral in warrant exhaustive exploration of the study subject. The current study has two sample populations that include university students and lecturers.

The other integral approach that can be adopted to warrant the accuracy of a study is the employed sampling technique. Efil and Negida (2017) define sampling as the model deployed in the selection of members of the sample population to be recruited for the research. In this study, non-probabilistic sampling was employed because the researcher’s access to the sample population was limited by factors such as geographical access, limited budget, and stringent COVID-19 regulation. In this accord, convenience sampling was employed. Etikan (2016) defines convenience sampling as a purposive sampling approach that a researcher uses to choose a sample from a population-based on availability, access, and convenience. The method was adopted because the number
of lecturers and administrators that could be accessed for the study was limited. Principally, 59 lecturers and administrators were recruited as well as 114 students of both genders and across the department.

3.5 Data Collection and Analysis
Data required to effectively address the research questions were collected using self-administered questionnaires. Given that the current study is quantitative research, data could be collected using questionnaires. Most questions were close-ended, and responses were measured on a 5-point Likert scale, 5 being strongly agree and 1 strongly disagreeing. The questionnaires were distributed to the recruited participant via Gmail. The participants filled out the questionnaires and returned them. After the data was collected, the data was entered on an SPSS spreadsheet and an analysis was conducted. The core statistical analysis methods that were performed to ensure the research question is exhaustively addressed include descriptive analysis, correlation, regression analysis, and an independent sample t-test. Descriptive analysis, particularly frequencies when the incidence of phenomena was to be established, for example, the number of male participants in a sample population (Wetcher-Hendricks, 2011). A correlational analysis was used when there was a need to elucidate a statistical correlation between two or more variables, and the regression analysis was used to elucidate the degree to which the dependent variable changes due to the interference of the independent variable (Wetcher-Hendricks, 2011). Lastly, an independent sample t-test was used to compare the mean distributions between two or more groups.

3.6 Ethics
The research was conducted in accordance with ethical provisions governing research. The aim of the research was communicated. Participants were given the liberty to discontinue their participation at any time without suffering any ramifications. Anonymity was exercised as each participant was assigned a code rather than using their name to prevent any possible backlash that their answers might elicit. Also, the institutional affiliation that the lecturers work at and the students go to was concealed for privacy reasons. The collected data was stored in a safe and was only accessible to the researcher to foster confidentiality.

4. Findings
This section presents the findings of the research. It is divided into subsections that extensively explore several research questions. Most of the tables are put in the Appendices.

4.1 Demographic Findings
On the basis of gender, the analysis revealed that 55.9% of participants were male and 44.1% of participants were female, as shown in Table A1 (see Appendix A). All professional participants declared their gender, and there were no missing data points. In regard to student participants, 51.8% and 48.2% were male and female respectively, as shown in Table A5, and a majority of them, 65.8%, were above the age of 25 years, as presented in table A5 in the appendix. Moreover, 61.4% of the student participants were pursuing a masters’ degree, as presented in Table A7 in the appendix.

The analysis also showed that 30.5% of the professional participants were aged between 33 and 39, and only 3.4% were older than 60 years of age (Table A2 in the appendix). Also, most of the professional participants recruited for the study worked in the English, History, and Geography departments (Table A3). According to table A8, the frequencies of departmental affiliation shows that students from 27 departments were recruited, fostering a wholesome analysis of the professionals’ attitude towards gender equity in academic spheres.

4.2 Prospect of Career Development
In terms of career progression, 42.3% of female participants agreed that family duties negatively impact their career progression, and only 27.3% of male participants agreed that family duties hampered their career progression (Table B14 in the appendix). Also, 93.9% of male participants agreed that their families support their careers and 94.4% percent of women affirmed that their families support their careers (Table B15). The data analysis revealed that 96.2% of female participants at the very least agree that their chances of attaining career progression are high, and 90.9% of male respondents at least agreed that they are more likely to experience career progression, as shown in table B16 and figure 1.
The analysis also revealed that at least 33.4% of males disagree that men and women are given equal promotion opportunities, and only 19.2% disagreed with this prompt, insinuating that the promotion process adopted in academia in Iraq is fair and free from biases, as shown in table B7. When it comes to intradepartmental dynamics, the analysis revealed that 19.2% of women disagree with the prompt that they are appreciated and respected by their deans, while only 9.1% of male professional participants disagreed with this statement. The degree of agreement with this prompt is presented in Table B13 in the Appendix and Figure 2 below.

A correlative analysis was conducted to determine the correlation between the perceived feeling of respect from the dean and the prospect of career development.

The correlation analysis showed that there is a statistically significant but negative correlation between the perception that household duties hinder career progressions and the participant’s perception of their chances of attaining career progression $r = -0.264$, $p > 0.05$, as shown in table B18. Although the correlation was not statistically significant for the effect of the perceived respect from the dean and career progression, it was negative, which means an inverse relationship. Therefore, an increase in the perceived disrespects from the dean propagated a decrease in the perceived chances of career progression.
An independent sample t-test was also conducted to deduce whether the degree to which the participants perceived household duties as a deterrent of their career progressions, the prospect of career progression, and equal promotion chances in the workplace were based on gender differences. The group means are as depicted in table B19, and the independent sample t-test is presented in table B20.

From table B19, it is evident that the means for career prospect progression is higher for female than male professional participants, where \[ M = 1.54 \] and \[ M = 1.52 \], respectively. When it comes to the equality in the promotion and household duties as an impediment to career progression, female participants agreed more than their male counterparts. The t-test results showed that there was a statistically significant difference in the two groups’ (genders) perception of household duties, equality in the process of promotion, and the prospect of career progression.

Table B20 showed that for the prospect of career progression, there was no statistically significant difference in how female and male professional participants perceived their prospects \( t(57) = -0.141, p = 0.888, \) given that \( p > 0.05 \), it can be inferred that the difference in how male and female participants answered this question is not statistically significant. Similar, the difference between the perception of the female and male professional participants on equal promotion chances and the impact of household duties on career progression was not statistically significant. They both posted \( p \) values greater than 0.05, as shown in table B20.

### 4.3 Interaction with Students

The analysis found that 84.7% of female participants agreed that they felt respected by their students, and 93.9% of male professionals felt respected, as shown in table C1. Also, the other dynamic to understanding workplace inequality in academia stems from how an individual is perceived by students. The analysis revealed that 79.7% of male professional participants felt that they were treated differently by students in comparison to their female counterparts. On the other hand, 67.4% of female participants asserted that they felt their students treated them differently, as shown in table C3. Nevertheless, the current study did not elucidate whether the participants felt being treated differently was a positive or a negative aspect. In terms of whether the professionals perceived different attitudes from their students, 76.9% of female professionals agreed that their students exhibited preferential behaviour, and 78.8% of male professional participants agreed that their students exhibited preferential tendencies (table C4). Noticeably, the professional’s perceptions of students’ attitudes were not significantly different.

Conversely, 88.6% of student participants agreed that the gender of an instructor does not affect how much they learn, 98.2% agreed that they respect all teachers equally, as shown in table C8. Therefore, notions of gender stereotypes held and perpetuated by students in the Arabic world were refuted.

### 4.4 Online Interaction

The COVID-19 pandemic normalized online learning, and this redefined the process of instruction dispensation and the nature of lecture–student interaction. The perception of the participants on the degree to which students understood core concepts in the context of online learning, as depicted in table D3, is that 78.8% of the professional participants disagreed that online learning is better than traditional learning methods in fostering students’ comprehension. Female participants echoed this perception as 84.6% of them disagreed that online learning is better than traditional instructional models. Also, 30% and 27% of female and male participants, respectively, strongly disagreed that they felt a high level of engagement with their learners through online learning than traditional teaching approaches (Table D5 in the appendix). Both male and female professors predominantly agreed that they received the utmost respect from their learners in zoom classes. Moreover, female professionals felt that female students were freer to interact with them than male learners as 38.5% disagree that male students interact with them freely, and only 11.5% disagree that female students are free with them (table D6 and D7).

In regards to student participants’ online learning experience, 48.2% agree that it is better than the traditional learning approach. Although 50.9% agreed that they learned better online, 39.5% asserted that they grasped concepts better in a traditional learning environment, as shown in table D8.
4.5 Equity in Administration

Equity in administration is an integral aspect of consideration in a bid to understand women’s chances of clinching leadership positions in academia in Iraq. A descriptive analysis of prompts designed to determine the equity in administrative practices at Iraq’s higher education institutions showed that 34.6% of female academics felt excluded from the departmental decision-making process as opposed to 18.2% of male academics that disagreed with this prompt, as shown in table E2. Moreover, 80.7% of female academics agreed to receive adequate support from female colleagues, while only 63.6% acknowledged that they receive adequate support from male colleagues, denoting a lack of collaboration across gender differences (Table E6 and E7 in the appendix). A regression analysis was also undertaken to establish the degree to which inclusion in decision making, meetings, team-building exercises, and the information loop impacted academic’s perception of their value to the department. The regression output is as presented in tables E8, E9, and E10. The regression output as presented in the tables showed that there is a strong and statistically significant correlation between inclusion in decision making, meetings, team-building exercises, and the information loop and academic’s perception of their value to the department.

5. Discussion and Conclusion

5.1 Discussion

A broad body of research on the treatment of professional women in the Arab world exists (Reddy, 2005; Al-Ali et al., 2012). Nonetheless, most studies are about Saudi Arabia or other fairly developed Middle Eastern countries (Alsubaie & Jones, 2017; Rehani; 2015; K, 2020); therefore, there is a need to explore the context and treatment of professional women in Iraq. To effectively debunk whether traditional gender stereotypes still exist and are preventing women from attaining success in their respective professions, the current study used a quantitative approach to elucidate professionals’ and students’ perceptions of gender equity in academia.

5.1.1 Career Prospects

The analysis revealed that there was a negative but statistically significant correlation between professional women’s perception on whether they are being respected or not by the dean and household duties and career progression, \( r = -0.264 \) and \( r = -0.019 \), respectively. According to a study by Reddy (2005), the economic decline that resulted from the invasion of Iraq significantly increased class and gender inequality, which later escalated and propagated the relegation of professional women into traditional roles of housewifery and maternity. Reddy’s study (2005), although it was conducted more than 16 years ago, still reflects the situation faced by women academics today. The current study also revealed that men reported a higher prospect of career progression than their female counterparts; 57.6% of male professional participants strongly agreed that their prospect of career progression is high, while 50% strongly agreed to this prompt. Therefore, the findings show that the difference in the prospect of career progression between female and male academics is not very broad, and the gender inequality is not as big as some literature sources suggest (Roudi-Fahimi & Moghadan, 2003; Rehani, 2015; Alsubaie & Jones, 2017; Elias, 2018). Also, only 32.2% of the participants agreed that women occupy core leadership positions in academia, and this denotes that a lot of work still has to be done to bridge the leadership inequality.
5.1.2 Effect of Gender on Lecturer – Student Interaction
The findings of this study are largely congruent with available research on this subject. The analysis revealed that 88.6% of student participants agreed that the gender of a lecturer has none to minimal impact on how much they learn. 98.2% agreed that they respect all lecturers equally, and this is not based on the gender of the instructor, as shown in table C8. Therefore, notions of gender stereotypes held and perpetuated by students in the Arabic world were refuted. Rehani (2015) found that 77% of students reported that female lecturers were better at delivering course content than their male colleagues. Female lecturers were also perceived by students as the most disciplined and the best in providing clarification. Just like in available literature, the current study shows that students do not discriminate against their professors based on gender (motasher Alqabi, 2019). Nevertheless, female academics felt that female students were more to consult them than male counterparts, but the discrepancy was relatively small.

5.1.3 Online Interaction during COVID-19
The study revealed that there was a discrepancy between students’ and lecturers’ perceptions of online learning. While 78.8% of males and 84.6% of female academic disagreed that online learning was better than traditional learning methods in fostering student comprehension of concepts, 50.9% of students agreed that online learning allows them to learn better. Nonetheless, students’ responses remained fairly neutral when it came to if they learned better from male or female lecturers, and they also held a neutral position on the if they consider the gender of an instructor an integral determinant of their performance in courses. The current study’s findings are significantly consistent with the results reported by Rehani (2015), which shows that students do not portray preferential habits when choosing their courses as they fairly hold a neutral position on the lecturers’ gender.

5.1.4 Equity in Departmental Administration
The success of a woman in academia is not only dependent on students’ attitudes but also on the values, attitudes, and perceptions held by their colleagues (Eleraqi & Slahuddin, 2018). In this accord, it is imperative that departmental conditions are explored. The current study elucidates that there is a significant women inclusion problem in administrative duties in institutions of higher learning in Iraq, and this finding is congruent to the what (Eleraqi and Slahuddin, 2018; Zenger & Folkman, 2019) found in their research; only 2.9% of university leaders in Iraq are women. As shown in table E2, a descriptive analysis of prompts designed to determine the equity in administrative practices at Iraq’s higher education institutions revealed that 34.6% of female academics felt excluded from the departmental decision-making process, while 18.2% of male academics disagreed. Furthermore, 80.7 percent of female academics felt that they receive appropriate assistance from female colleagues, whereas only 63.6 percent said they receive adequate help from male colleagues, indicating a lack of collaboration across gender lines (Table E6 and E7 in the appendix). In this regard, it is notable that there is a significant gap here that should be filled to promote collaboration and eradicate gender inequity.

6. Conclusion
The inclusion of women in leadership in academia is a topic that is attracting the interest of researchers across the world. A broad body of research has established that although problems facing women in academia and even outside the academic realm are largely the same, the conditions of professional women in terms of career progress and inclusion in administrative roles are far much worse in the Arabic world than in the West. Nevertheless, the current study denotes that reports in the west are far much exaggerated as the gap in gender equity is shrinking. The current study revealed that the prospect of career progression was higher in men than women, and although students did not demonstrate gender stereotypes and preferences both on online learning platforms and in the traditional learning context, women’s dwarfed progression in academia stems from the limited inclusion in departmental decision making, household duties, and the low respect received from the dean.

6.1 Recommendations and Future Studies
The current study recommends that a significant degree of disadvantages that women face in academics come from their superiors and colleagues who relegate them to a lower position. Therefore, there is a need to create an organizational culture within higher institutions of learning that create a workspace where promotions and collaboration are based on merit rather than gender.

Future studies on the subject should adopt a mixed research method and focus exclusively on the problems facing women in academia. Such a study would ensure that the problem is better understood a solution is sought.

6.2 Limitations
The core limitation of this study is the hesitance of professional participants to take part in the study. Also, the study findings could be subject to desirability bias, affecting the validity of the results.
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Appendices
### Appendix A: Demographic Findings

#### Table A1: Gender Distribution of Professional Participants

| Gender    | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Male      | 33        | 55.9    | 55.9          | 55.9               |
| Valid     | Female    | 26      | 44.1          | 100.0              |
| Total     | 59        | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

#### Table A2: Age Distribution of Professional Participants

| Age Group | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| 26-32     | 13        | 22.0    | 22.0          | 22.0               |
| 33-39     | 18        | 30.5    | 30.5          | 52.5               |
| 40-49     | 17        | 28.8    | 28.8          | 81.4               |
| Valid     | 50-59     | 9       | 15.3          | 15.3               |
|           | 60 and above | 2     | 3.4           | 3.4               |
| Total     | 59        | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

#### Table A3: Departmental Affiliation of the Professionals

| Department            | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Accounting            | 1         | 1.7     | 1.7           | 1.7                |
| Ancient History       | 1         | 1.7     | 1.7           | 3.4                |
| Arabic Language       | 7         | 11.9    | 11.9          | 15.3               |
| Arabic Literature     | 3         | 5.1     | 5.1           | 20.3               |
| Arabic/ Linguistics   | 1         | 1.7     | 1.7           | 22.0               |
| Biology               | 1         | 1.7     | 1.7           | 23.7               |
| Civil Engineering     | 2         | 3.4     | 3.4           | 27.1               |
| Computer Sciences     | 2         | 3.4     | 3.4           | 30.5               |
| Contemporary History  | 1         | 1.7     | 1.7           | 32.2               |
| Economic Sciences     | 2         | 3.4     | 3.4           | 35.6               |
| English               | 6         | 10.2    | 10.2          | 45.8               |
| English / Pragmatics  | 1         | 1.7     | 1.7           | 47.5               |
| English department    | 1         | 1.7     | 1.7           | 49.2               |
| French                | 1         | 1.7     | 1.7           | 50.8               |
| Geography             | 5         | 8.5     | 8.5           | 59.3               |
| Geography/ GIS        | 1         | 1.7     | 1.7           | 61.0               |
### Table A4: Role of the Professional in the Department

| Role in Dept | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|--------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Teaching Staff | 51        | 86.4    | 86.4          | 86.4               |
| Administrative | 5         | 8.5     | 8.5           | 94.9               |
| Support Staff  | 3         | 5.1     | 5.1           | 100.0              |
| Total          | 59        | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

### Table A5: Gender Description of Student Participant

| Gender | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|--------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Male   | 59        | 51.8    | 51.8          | 51.8               |
| Female | 55        | 48.2    | 48.2          | 100.0              |
| Total  | 114       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

### Table A6: Age of Student Participants

| Age        | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| 18-20      | 5         | 4.4     | 4.4           | 4.4                |
| 21-24      | 34        | 29.8    | 29.8          | 34.2               |
| 25-28      | 34        | 29.8    | 29.8          | 64.0               |
| 31 and above | 41    | 36.0    | 36.0          | 100.0              |
| Total      | 114       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |
### Table A7: Education Level of Student Participants

| Stage      | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| 1-2        | 9         | 7.9     | 7.9           | 7.9                |
| 3-4        | 35        | 30.7    | 30.7          | 38.6               |
| Valid      |           |         |               |                    |
| Masters    | 70        | 61.4    | 61.4          | 100.0              |
| Total      | 114       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

### Table A8: Departmental affiliation of students

| Department                  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Arabic Language             | 9         | 7.9     | 7.9           | 7.9                |
| Biology                     | 1         | .9      | .9            | 8.8                |
| biomedical engineering      | 1         | .9      | .9            | 9.6                |
| Chemistry                   | 1         | .9      | .9            | 10.5               |
| Civil Engineering           | 2         | 1.8     | 1.8           | 12.3               |
| Computer science            | 1         | .9      | .9            | 13.2               |
| Dentistry                   | 14        | 12.3    | 12.3          | 25.4               |
| Education                   | 1         | .9      | .9            | 26.3               |
| English                     | 17        | 14.9    | 14.9          | 41.2               |
| English literature          | 1         | .9      | .9            | 42.1               |
| Geography                   | 7         | 6.1     | 6.1           | 48.2               |
| History                     | 3         | 2.6     | 2.6           | 50.9               |
| Islamic History             | 2         | 1.8     | 1.8           | 52.6               |
| Management                  | 44        | 38.6    | 38.6          | 91.2               |
| Medicine                    | 5         | 4.4     | 4.4           | 95.6               |
| Nursing                     | 1         | .9      | .9            | 96.5               |
| Pharmacy                    | 1         | .9      | .9            | 97.4               |
| Political Sciences          | 1         | .9      | .9            | 98.2               |
| Sociology                   | 1         | .9      | .9            | 99.1               |
| Technical Medicine          | 1         | .9      | .9            | 100.0              |
| Total                       | 114       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

Appendix B: Career Progression
Table B1: Prospect of Career Development

1. The prospect of career progression is high

|                | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|-------------------|
| Strongly Agree | 32        | 54.2    | 54.2          | 54.2              |
| Agree          | 23        | 39.0    | 39.0          | 93.2              |
| Neutral        | 4         | 6.8     | 6.8           | 100.0             |
| Total          | 59        | 100.0   | 100.0         |                   |

Table B2: My role challenges me

2. My role challenges me to improve myself

|                | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|-------------------|
| Strongly Agree | 13        | 22.0    | 22.0          | 22.0              |
| Agree          | 29        | 49.2    | 49.2          | 71.2              |
| Neutral        | 10        | 16.9    | 16.9          | 88.1              |
| Disagree       | 4         | 6.8     | 6.8           | 94.9              |
| Strongly Disagree | 3  | 5.1     | 5.1           | 100.0             |
| Total          | 59        | 100.0   | 100.0         |                   |

Table B3: Overwhelming

3. I feel overwhelmed by the requirements of my job

|                | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|-------------------|
| Strongly Agree | 12        | 20.3    | 20.3          | 20.3              |
| Agree          | 30        | 50.8    | 50.8          | 71.2              |
| Neutral        | 8         | 13.6    | 13.6          | 84.7              |
| Disagree       | 9         | 15.3    | 15.3          | 100.0             |
| Total          | 59        | 100.0   | 100.0         |                   |

Table B4: Comfortable with the Requirements

4. I am comfortable with the requirements of my job

|                | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|-------------------|
| Strongly Agree | 10        | 16.9    | 16.9          | 16.9              |
| Agree          | 26        | 44.1    | 44.1          | 61.0              |
| Neutral        | 16        | 27.1    | 27.1          | 88.1              |
| Disagree       | 6         | 10.2    | 10.2          | 98.3              |
| Strongly Disagree | 1  | 1.7     | 1.7           | 100.0             |
| Total          | 59        | 100.0   | 100.0         |                   |
Table B5: Receive a Promotion within the Next 5 years

5. I am confident that I will receive a promotion in the next five years

| Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Strongly Agree | 30 | 50.8 | 50.8 | 50.8 |
| Agree | 23 | 39.0 | 39.0 | 89.8 |
| Neutral | 6 | 10.2 | 10.2 | 100.0 |
| Total | 59 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Table B6: Prospect of Salary Increase

6. I am confident that I will receive a salary raise in the next 2 years

| Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Strongly Agree | 19 | 32.2 | 32.2 | 32.2 |
| Agree | 27 | 45.8 | 45.8 | 78.0 |
| Neutral | 10 | 16.9 | 16.9 | 94.9 |
| Disagree | 2 | 3.4 | 3.4 | 98.3 |
| Strongly Disagree | 1 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 100.0 |
| Total | 59 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Table B7: Equal Promotion Chances

7. Both men and women are given equal promotion chances at my institution

| Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Strongly Agree | 11 | 18.6 | 18.6 | 18.6 |
| Agree | 17 | 28.8 | 28.8 | 47.5 |
| Neutral | 15 | 25.4 | 25.4 | 72.9 |
| Disagree | 11 | 18.6 | 18.6 | 91.5 |
| Strongly Disagree | 5 | 8.5 | 8.5 | 100.0 |
| Total | 59 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Table B8: Women in Senior Positions

8. Women occupy senior positions at my institution

| Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Strong Agree | 2 | 3.4 | 3.4 | 3.4 |
| Agree | 17 | 28.8 | 28.8 | 32.2 |
| Neutral | 19 | 32.2 | 32.2 | 64.4 |
| Disagree | 16 | 27.1 | 27.1 | 91.5 |
| Strongly Disagree | 5 | 8.5 | 8.5 | 100.0 |
### Table B9: Equality

9. Both men and women are subjected to the same treatment at work

|               | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Strongly Agree| 4         | 6.8     | 6.8           | 6.8                |
| Agree         | 16        | 27.1    | 27.1          | 33.9               |
| Neutral       | 21        | 35.6    | 35.6          | 69.5               |
| Disagree      | 10        | 16.9    | 16.9          | 86.4               |
| Strongly Disagree | 8   | 13.6 | 13.6          | 100.0              |
| Total         | 59        | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

### Table B10: Equal Salary

10. Both men and women in the same position receive equal salary

|               | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Strongly Agree| 18        | 30.5    | 30.5          | 30.5               |
| Agree         | 23        | 39.0    | 39.0          | 69.5               |
| Neutral       | 9         | 15.3    | 15.3          | 84.7               |
| Disagree      | 9         | 15.3    | 15.3          | 100.0              |
| Total         | 59        | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

### Table B11: Looked Down Upon

11. I feel looked down upon by my colleagues

|               | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Agree         | 5         | 8.5     | 8.5           | 8.5                |
| Neutral       | 13        | 22.0    | 22.0          | 30.5               |
| Disagree      | 24        | 40.7    | 40.7          | 71.2               |
| Strongly Disagree | 17 | 28.8 | 28.8          | 100.0              |
| Total         | 59        | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

### Table B12: Appreciated by the Dean

12. I feel respected and appreciated by my dean

|               | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Strongly Agree| 18        | 30.5    | 30.5          | 30.5               |
| Valid         | Agree     | 24      | 40.7          | 71.2               |
|               | Neutral   | 9       | 15.3          | 86.4               |
Table B13: Good Relationship with the Dean

|                | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|-------------------|
| Strongly Agree | 26        | 44.1    | 44.1          | 44.1              |
| Agree          | 23        | 39.0    | 39.0          | 83.1              |
| Neutral        | 5         | 8.5     | 8.5           | 91.5              |
| Disagree       | 3         | 5.1     | 5.1           | 96.6              |
| Strongly Disagree | 2   | 3.4     | 3.4           | 100.0             |
| Total          | 59        | 100.0   | 100.0         |                   |

Table B14: Household and Career Progression

|                | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|-------------------|
| Strongly Agree | 6         | 10.2    | 10.2          | 10.2              |
| Agree          | 15        | 25.4    | 25.4          | 35.6              |
| Neutral        | 17        | 28.8    | 28.8          | 64.4              |
| Disagree       | 18        | 30.5    | 30.5          | 94.9              |
| Strongly Disagree | 3   | 5.1     | 5.1           | 100.0             |
| Total          | 59        | 100.0   | 100.0         |                   |

Table B15: Family Support

|                | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|-------------------|
| Strongly Agree | 24        | 40.7    | 40.7          | 40.7              |
| Agree          | 31        | 52.5    | 52.5          | 93.2              |
| Neutral        | 1         | 1.7     | 1.7           | 94.9              |
| Disagree       | 3         | 5.1     | 5.1           | 100.0             |
| Total          | 59        | 100.0   | 100.0         |                   |
## Table B16: Comparing Prospect of Career Development between Genders

| Gender | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|--------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Male   |           |         |               |                    |
| Agree  | 11        | 33.3    | 33.3          | 33.3               |
| Neutral| 3         | 9.1     | 9.1           | 42.4               |
| Strongly Agree | 19 | 57.6    | 57.6          | 100.0              |
| Total  | 33        | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |
| Female |           |         |               |                    |
| Agree  | 12        | 46.2    | 46.2          | 46.2               |
| Neutral| 1         | 3.8     | 3.8           | 50.0               |
| Strongly Agree | 13 | 50.0    | 50.0          | 100.0              |
| Total  | 26        | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

## Table B17: Respect by the Dean

| Gender | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|--------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Male   |           |         |               |                    |
| Agree  | 15        | 45.5    | 45.5          | 45.5               |
| Disagree | 2       | 6.1     | 6.1           | 51.5               |
| Neutral| 6         | 18.2    | 18.2          | 69.7               |
| Strongly Agree | 9 | 27.3    | 27.3          | 97.0               |
| Strongly Disagree | 3  | 9.1     | 9.1           | 100.0              |
| Total  | 33        | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |
| Female |           |         |               |                    |
| Agree  | 9         | 34.6    | 34.6          | 34.6               |
| Disagree | 1       | 3.8     | 3.8           | 38.5               |
| Neutral| 3         | 11.5    | 11.5          | 50.0               |
| Strongly Agree | 9 | 34.6    | 34.6          | 84.6               |
| Strongly Disagree | 4  | 15.4    | 15.4          | 100.0              |
| Total  | 26        | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

## Table B18: Correlation of Household Duties, Respected by the Dean, and the Prospect of Career Progression

| Correlations | 12. I feel respected and appreciated by my dean | 14. I feel my household duties hinder my career progression | 1. The prospect of career progression is high |
|--------------|-----------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| 12. I feel respected and appreciated by my dean | Pearson Correlation | 1 | -0.19 | -0.030 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | | 889 | 820 |
| | N | 59 | 59 |
| 14. I feel my household duties hinder my career progression | Pearson Correlation | -0.019 | 1 | -0.264* |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | | 889 | 044 |
1. The prospect of career progression is high

Pearson Correlation

\[ r = \begin{array}{c}
-0.30 \\
-0.26^* \\
\end{array} \]

Sig. (2-tailed)

\[ p = \begin{array}{c}
.820 \\
.044 \\
\end{array} \]

N

\[ N = \begin{array}{c}
59 \\
59 \\
59 \\
\end{array} \]

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table B19: Group Means

| Group Statistics | 1. Gender | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|------------------|-----------|---|------|----------------|-----------------|
| The prospect of career progression is high | Male | 33 | 1.52 | .667 | .116 |
| | Female | 26 | 1.54 | .582 | .114 |
| Both men and women are given equal promotion chances at my institution | Male | 33 | 2.79 | 1.386 | .241 |
| | Female | 26 | 2.58 | .987 | .194 |
| I feel my household duties hinder my career progression | Male | 33 | 3.06 | 1.029 | .179 |
| | Female | 26 | 2.81 | 1.167 | .229 |

Table B20: Independent Samples Test

| Independent Samples Test | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | t-test for Equality of Means |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
|                          | F | Sig. | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference |
| The prospect of career progression is high | Equal variances assumed | .699 | .407 | -1.141 | 57 | .888 | -.023 | .165 | -.355 | .308 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | -.143 | 56.368 | .887 | -.023 | .163 | -.349 | .303 |
| Both men and women are given equal promotion chances at my institution | Equal variances assumed | 4.801 | .033 | .655 | 57 | .515 | .211 | .322 | -.434 | .855 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | .682 | 56.488 | .498 | .211 | .309 | -.409 | .831 |
| I feel my household duties hinder my career progression | Equal variances assumed | 1.163 | .285 | .884 | 57 | .381 | .253 | .286 | -.320 | .826 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | .870 | 50.274 | .388 | .253 | .291 | -.331 | .837 |

Appendix C: Professional's Interaction with Students

Table C1: Respected by Students

| Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Strongly Agree | 32 | 54.2 | 54.2 |
| Agree | 21 | 35.6 | 35.6 |
| Neutral | 6 | 10.2 | 10.2 |
| Total | 59 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

Table C2: Appreciated
2. I feel appreciated by my students

| Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Strongly Agree | 23 | 39.0 | 39.0 | 39.0 |
| Agree | 28 | 47.5 | 47.5 | 86.4 |
| Neutral | 8 | 13.6 | 13.6 | 100.0 |
| Total | 59 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

Table C3: Perception of Treatment from Students

I feel my students treat me differently in comparison to my male/female counterparts

| Gender | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|--------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Male | Valid | | | |
| Agree | 14 | 42.4 | 42.4 | 42.4 |
| Disagree | 1 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 45.5 |
| Neutral | 9 | 27.3 | 27.3 | 72.7 |
| Strongly Agree | 9 | 27.3 | 27.3 | 100.0 |
| Total | 33 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Female | Valid | | | |
| Agree | 12 | 46.2 | 46.2 | 46.2 |
| Disagree | 1 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 50.0 |
| Neutral | 8 | 30.8 | 30.8 | 80.8 |
| Strongly Agree | 4 | 15.4 | 15.4 | 96.2 |
| Strongly Disagree | 1 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 100.0 |
| Total | 26 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

Table C4: Preferential Behavior

4. My students exhibit preferential behavior

| Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Strongly Agree | 25 | 42.4 | 42.4 | 42.4 |
| Agree | 21 | 35.6 | 35.6 | 78.0 |
| Neutral | 10 | 16.9 | 16.9 | 94.9 |
| Disagree | 2 | 3.4 | 3.4 | 98.3 |
| Strongly Disagree | 1 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 100.0 |
| Total | 59 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
Table C5: Cooperation from Female Students

5. Female students adhere to my instructions and deadlines

|                | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Strongly Agree | 19        | 32.2    | 32.2          | 32.2               |
| Agree          | 30        | 50.8    | 50.8          | 83.1               |
| Neutral        | 8         | 13.6    | 13.6          | 96.6               |
| Disagree       | 2         | 3.4     | 3.4           | 100.0              |
| Total          | 59        | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

Table C6: Cooperation from Male Students

6. Male students adhere to my instructions and deadlines

|                | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Strongly Agree | 11        | 18.6    | 18.6          | 18.6               |
| Agree          | 20        | 33.9    | 33.9          | 52.5               |
| Neutral        | 12        | 20.3    | 20.3          | 72.9               |
| Disagree       | 12        | 20.3    | 20.3          | 93.2               |
| Strongly Disagree | 4       | 6.8     | 6.8           | 100.0              |
| Total          | 59        | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

Table C7: Comfortable Learning Environment

7. I feel comfortable around my students

|                | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Strongly Agree | 23        | 39.0    | 39.0          | 39.0               |
| Agree          | 26        | 44.1    | 44.1          | 83.1               |
| Neutral        | 10        | 16.9    | 16.9          | 100.0              |
| Total          | 59        | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

Table C8: Perception towards teachers

The gender of my instructor does not affect how much I learn

|                | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Strongly Agree | 64        | 56.1    | 56.1          | 56.1               |
| Agree          | 37        | 32.5    | 32.5          | 88.6               |
| Neutral        | 10        | 8.8     | 8.8           | 97.4               |
| Disagree       | 1         | .9      | .9            | 98.2               |
| Strongly Disagree | 2   | 1.8     | 1.8           | 100.0              |
| Total          | 114       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |
### Table D1: Learning style

1. I enjoyed online learning more than the traditional learning style, especially during the COVID-19 pandemic

|                | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Strongly Agree | 4         | 6.8     | 6.8           | 6.8                |
| Agree          | 7         | 11.9    | 11.9          | 18.6               |
| Neutral        | 10        | 16.9    | 16.9          | 35.6               |
| Disagree       | 22        | 37.3    | 37.3          | 72.9               |
| Strongly Disagree | 16   | 27.1    | 27.1          | 100.0              |
| Total          | 59        | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

### Table D2: Online Teaching is more convenient

2. It is more convenient to teach online than via traditional teaching methods

|                | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Strongly Agree | 3         | 5.1     | 5.1           | 5.1                |
| Agree          | 8         | 13.6    | 13.6          | 18.6               |
| Neutral        | 7         | 11.9    | 11.9          | 30.5               |
| Disagree       | 18        | 30.5    | 30.5          | 61.0               |
| Strongly Disagree | 23   | 39.0    | 39.0          | 100.0              |
| Total          | 59        | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

### Table D3: Online Learning and Understanding of Concepts

Students understood concepts better through online platforms than through traditional learning.

| Gender | Valid | Agree | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|--------|-------|-------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Male   |       |       | 3         | 9.1     | 9.1           | 9.1                |
|        |       |       | 9         | 27.3    | 27.3          | 36.4               |
|        |       |       | 3         | 9.1     | 9.1           | 45.5               |
|        |       |       | 1         | 3.0     | 3.0           | 48.5               |
|        |       |       | 17        | 51.5    | 51.5          | 100.0              |
| Total  | 33     |       | 100.0     | 100.0   |               |                    |

| Gender | Valid | Disagree | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|--------|-------|-----------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Male   |       | 7         | 26.9      | 26.9    | 26.9          |                    |
|        |       | 3         | 11.5      | 11.5    | 38.5          |                    |
|        |       | 1         | 3.8       | 3.8     | 42.3          |                    |
|        |       | 15        | 57.7      | 57.7    | 100.0         |                    |
| Total  | 26     |           | 100.0     | 100.0   |               |                    |

| Gender | Valid | Strongly Agree | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|--------|-------|----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Female |       |                | 1         | 3.8     | 3.8           | 42.3               |
|        |       |                | 15        | 57.7    | 57.7          | 100.0              |
| Total  | 26     |                |           | 100.0   |               |                    |

### Table D4: Grades

4. Student’s scored better grades in online school than traditional learning methods.

|                | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Strongly Agree | 31        | 52.5    | 52.5          | 52.5               |
| Valid          |           |         |               |                    |
| Agree          | 15        | 25.4    | 25.4          | 78.0               |
| Neutral        | 7         | 11.9    | 11.9          | 89.8               |
Table D5: Engagement

5. I felt a high level of engagement with learners through emails and online discussion in online learning than when I used traditional models

|                  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Strongly Agree   | 4         | 6.8     | 6.8           | 6.8                |
| Agree            | 10        | 16.9    | 16.9          | 23.7               |
| Neutral          | 10        | 16.9    | 16.9          | 40.7               |
| Disagree         | 18        | 30.5    | 30.5          | 71.2               |
| Strongly Disagree| 17        | 28.8    | 28.8          | 100.0              |
| Total            | 59        | 100.0   | 100.0        |                    |

Table D6: Male Student Free to Interact

6. Male students were free to interact with me

|                  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Strongly Agree   | 14        | 23.7    | 23.7          | 23.7               |
| Agree            | 22        | 37.3    | 37.3          | 61.0               |
| Neutral          | 8         | 13.6    | 13.6          | 74.6               |
| Disagree         | 13        | 22.0    | 22.0          | 96.6               |
| Strongly Disagree| 2         | 3.4     | 3.4           | 100.0              |
| Total            | 59        | 100.0   | 100.0        |                    |

Table D7: Female Students free to Interact

7. Female students were free to interact with me

|                  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Strongly Agree   | 16        | 27.1    | 27.1          | 27.1               |
| Agree            | 24        | 40.7    | 40.7          | 67.8               |
| Neutral          | 14        | 23.7    | 23.7          | 91.5               |
| Disagree         | 5         | 8.5     | 8.5           | 100.0              |
| Total            | 59        | 100.0   | 100.0        |                    |
Table D8: Respected by Students on Zoom

|                | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Strongly Agree | 17        | 28.8    | 28.8          | 28.8               |
| Agree          | 27        | 45.8    | 45.8          | 74.6               |
| Neutral        | 14        | 23.7    | 23.7          | 98.3               |
| Disagree       | 1         | 1.7     | 1.7           | 100.0              |
| Total          | 59        | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

Table D9: Student's perception of Online Learning

I learn better from male instructors than female instructors

|                | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Strongly Agree | 3         | 2.6     | 2.6           | 2.6                |
| Agree          | 25        | 21.9    | 21.9          | 24.6               |
| Neutral        | 73        | 64.0    | 64.0          | 88.6               |
| Disagree       | 9         | 7.9     | 7.9           | 96.5               |
| Strongly Disagree | 4    | 3.5     | 3.5           | 100.0              |
| Total          | 114       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

Table D10: Online Learning

I understood concepts better through online learning during the lockdown period that I did through traditional learning methods.

|                | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Strongly Agree | 32        | 28.1    | 28.1          | 28.1               |
| Agree          | 26        | 22.8    | 22.8          | 50.9               |
| Neutral        | 11        | 9.6     | 9.6           | 60.5               |
| Disagree       | 30        | 26.3    | 26.3          | 86.8               |
| Strongly Disagree | 15    | 13.2    | 13.2          | 100.0              |
| Total          | 114       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

Appendix E: Administrative Role

Table E1: Inclusion in Team Building
### Table E2: Inclusion in Decision Making

I am included in the decision-making process in my department

| Gender | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|--------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
|        |           |         |               |                    |
|        | Valid     | 1       | 100.0         | 100.0              |
|        | Agree     | 12      | 36.4          | 36.4               |
|        | Disagree  | 4       | 12.1          | 48.5               |
| Male   | Neutral   | 11      | 33.3          | 81.8               |
|        | Strongly Agree | 4 | 12.1 | 93.9 |
|        | Strongly Disagree | 2 | 6.1 | 100.0 |
|        | Total     | 33      | 100.0         | 100.0              |
|        | Agree     | 10      | 38.5          | 38.5               |
|        | Disagree  | 6       | 23.1          | 61.5               |
| Female | Neutral   | 4       | 15.4          | 76.9               |
|        | Strongly Agree | 3 | 11.5 | 88.5 |
|        | Strongly Disagree | 3 | 11.5 | 100.0 |
|        | Total     | 26      | 100.0         | 100.0              |

### Table E3: Attendance in group Meetings

My presence is requested in all departmental meetings

| Gender | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|--------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
|        |           |         |               |                    |
|        | Valid     | 1       | 100.0         | 100.0              |
|        | Agree     | 15      | 45.5          | 45.5               |
|        | Disagree  | 2       | 6.1           | 51.5               |
| Male   | Neutral   | 8       | 24.2          | 75.8               |
|        | Strongly Agree | 7 | 21.2 | 97.0 |
|        | Strongly Disagree | 1 | 3.0 | 100.0 |
|        | Total     | 33      | 100.0         | 100.0              |
|        | Agree     | 7       | 26.9          | 26.9               |
|        | Disagree  | 4       | 15.4          | 42.3               |
| Female | Neutral   | 12      | 46.2          | 88.5               |
|        | Strongly Agree | 3 | 11.5 | 100.0 |
|        | Total     | 26      | 100.0         | 100.0              |
Table E4: Reception of Information

4. I receive news and information at the exact same time as my counterparts

| Agreement Level   | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Strongly Agree    | 15        | 25.4    | 25.4          | 25.4               |
| Agree             | 36        | 61.0    | 61.0          | 86.4               |
| Neutral           | 8         | 13.6    | 13.6          | 100.0              |
| **Total**         | **59**    | **100.0**| **100.0**     |                     |

Table E5: Valuable Member of the Department

I feel like a valuable member of the department

| Gender  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Male    | Valid     | 1       | 100.0         | 100.0              |
|         | Agree     | 15      | 45.5          | 45.5               |
|         | Disagree  | 3       | 9.1           | 54.5               |
|         | Neutral   | 5       | 15.2          | 69.7               |
|         | Strongly Agree | 9   | 27.3          | 97.0               |
|         | Strongly Disagree | 1 | 3.0           | 100.0              |
|         | **Total** | **33**  | **100.0**     | **100.0**          |
| Female  | Valid     | 10      | 38.5          | 38.5               |
|         | Disagree  | 3       | 11.5          | 50.0               |
|         | Neutral   | 8       | 30.8          | 80.8               |
|         | Strongly Agree | 5 | 19.2          | 100.0              |
|         | **Total** | **26**  | **100.0**     | **100.0**          |

Table E6: Received Support from Male Colleagues

6. I receive adequate support from my male colleagues

| Agreement Level   | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Strongly Agree    | 12        | 20.3    | 20.3          | 20.3               |
| Agree             | 24        | 40.7    | 40.7          | 61.0               |
| Neutral           | 14        | 23.7    | 23.7          | 84.7               |
| Disagree          | 8         | 13.6    | 13.6          | 98.3               |
| Strongly Disagree | 1         | 1.7     | 1.7           | 100.0              |
| **Total**         | **59**    | **100.0**| **100.0**     |                     |
Table E7: Received Support from Male Colleagues

| Gender | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|--------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Male   |           |         |               |                    |
| Valid  |           |         |               |                    |
| Agree  | 14        | 42.4%   | 42.4%         | 42.4%              |
| Neutral| 12        | 36.4%   | 36.4%         | 78.8%              |
| Strongly Agree | 7  | 21.2%   | 21.2%         | 100.0%             |
| Total  | 33        | 100.0%  | 100.0%        | 100.0%             |
| Agree  | 16        | 61.5%   | 61.5%         | 61.5%              |
| Disagree | 1  | 3.8%    | 3.8%          | 65.4%              |
| Neutral| 3         | 11.5%   | 11.5%         | 76.9%              |
| Strongly Agree | 5  | 19.2%   | 19.2%         | 96.2%              |
| Strongly Disagree | 1 | 3.8%    | 3.8%          | 100.0%             |
| Total  | 26        | 100.0%  | 100.0%        |                    |

Female Valid

| Gender | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|--------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid  |           |         |               |                    |
| Agree  | 14        | 42.4%   | 42.4%         | 42.4%              |
| Disagree | 1  | 3.8%    | 3.8%          | 65.4%              |
| Neutral| 3         | 11.5%   | 11.5%         | 76.9%              |
| Strongly Agree | 5  | 19.2%   | 19.2%         | 96.2%              |
| Strongly Disagree | 1 | 3.8%    | 3.8%          | 100.0%             |
| Total  | 26        | 100.0%  | 100.0%        |                    |

Table E8: Model Summary

| Model | R       | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|-------|---------|----------|-------------------|---------------------------|
| 1     | .709*   | .503     | .446              | .736                      |

Table E9: ANOVA

| Model | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F     | Sig.  |
|-------|----------------|----|-------------|-------|-------|
| 1     | Regression     | 6  | 4.754       | 8.779 | .000* |
|       | Residual       | 52 | .541        |       |       |
|       | Total          | 58 |             |       |       |

Table E10: Coefficients from the Regression Analysis

| Coefficients* | Model | Unstandardized Coefficients | Standardized Coefficients | t     | Sig.  |
|---------------|-------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|-------|-------|
|               | 1     | (Constant)                  | -0.032                    | Std. Error | Beta | -0.083 | .935 |
| 1. I am included in departmental team-building exercises | .023 | .123 | .024 | -1.88 | .852 |
| 2. I am included in the decision-making process in my department | .218 | .113 | .252 | 1.926 | .060 |
| 3. My presence is requested in all departmental meetings | -.021 | .123 | -.021 | -1.174 | .863 |
| 4. I receive news and information at the exact same time as my counterparts | .478 | .186 | .299 | 2.572 | .013 |
| 5. I receive adequate support from my male colleagues | .346 | .131 | .355 | 2.636 | .011 |
| 6. I receive adequate support from my female colleagues | .030 | .143 | .025 | .211 | .834 |

a. Dependent Variable: 5. I feel like a valuable member of the department