

Raising Consciousness on Gender Equality and Women' Rights: Did It Make a Difference?

Rhodora Masilang Bucoy and Flora Generalao

THIS PAPER presents the findings of a study I conducted to ascertain the impact of teaching Gender in the General Education (GE) Program. I wanted to answer the question: Did the teaching of gender equality principles and substantive provisions of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women make a difference in the knowledge and attitudes of the students taking a course on "Understanding Gender" in the Undergraduate Curriculum of the University of the Philippines, Cebu (UP Cebu). Did it promote gendered awareness in the students; instill in them an awareness of international covenant on women's rights as human rights and a recognition of the need to advance gender equality and women empowerment? Did the course enable them to see the unequal relations between men and women and the need for an affirmative action towards gender equality?

The Teaching of Gender and Development and CEDAW in UP Cebu¹

UP Cebu has started offering Social Science 5 (Understanding Gender) in 2005. Before the introduction of gender in the GE Program, there were already initiatives to incorporate feminist theories and gender and development concepts in courses in Political Science and Development Studies, Philippine History, Social and Economic Thought, Philosophy among others by Gender and Development (GAD) advocates and feminist faculty members. The offering of the Cebu campus was part of the entire UP Visayas² (UPV) Gender and Development Program's thrust to mainstream gender and development in the curriculum. I was one of the members of the UPV-wide Committee that crafted the course and pushed for its adoption as one of the options in the Social Sciences of the GE Program. All students of the University take a total of 45 GE courses, 15 units of which are in the Social Sciences. Together with GAD Advocates from UP Tacloban which included

Merlie Alunan and Nanette Pelino, UP Iloilo's Rosario Asong, Tita Torio and Ma. Luisa Mabunay, among others, we enhanced the draft prepared by UP Tacloban and produced a course which was a product of our collective effort. This course is still offered in the UP Visayas campuses. In other campuses of the constituent units of UP such as Diliman, Manila, Los Baños and Mindanao, gender courses are likewise taught. This in line with the UP's commitment to promote gender equality and women empowerment in all tri-functions of the University: teaching, research and extension or public service.

The adoption of the course in the UPV curriculum was aimed at broadening student's intellectual and cultural horizon through their exploration of the various theoretical frameworks in the analysis of key gender concepts, and root causes, forms and dimensions of gender inequalities and their manifestations in selected societies. The approved proposal to teach a gender course also prescribed that it be taught by faculty with expertise on gender and women studies and track record in gender advocacy. Every semester two to three sections of Social Science 5 are offered. I was among those who taught this course. In the beginning, we tried to team teach the subject. In the succeeding years, the course was taught solely by one teacher.

Sharpening of the Women's Rights Discourse in the Course

Starting 2004, the teaching of GAD was anchored on the rights-based perspective. In our initial Gender Sensitivity Trainings, we focused on the concepts of sex and gender and did exercises on the differences between male and female. Although clarification of the meaning of sex and gender is important in gender orientations, in order to drive home the point that sex is biological while gender is a social construction that varies through time and cultures, the discourse has moved to a higher plane where the subordination and marginalization of women are viewed as human rights violations and are obstacles to personhood and dignity of women.

The Rights-based Perspective

The rights-based perspective in teaching gender recognizes women's rights as human rights. It is anchored on the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) which was adopted by

the United Nations General Assembly on 18 December 1979 and ratified by the Philippines on 5 August 1981. This is considered as the definitive legal instrument regarding respect for and observance of human rights of women (Feliciano 2008, page 188). Filipino women played vital role in the crafting of this International Bill of Rights of Women. Noteworthy contributions were made by Filipinas in the United Nations like former Philippine Senator Leticia Ramos-Shahani and Ambassador Rosario Manalo.

To eliminate gender-based discrimination, CEDAW emphasizes that State Parties recognize the important economic and social contributions of women to the family and society. It stresses the need for a change in attitude, through education of both men and women, to accept equality of rights and responsibilities and to overcome prejudices and practices based on stereotyped roles (Feliciano, 2008, page 183; Sobritchea, 2008, page 21). CEDAW explicitly acknowledges the broad ranging discrimination against women which is defined under Article 1 as: any distinction, exclusion or restriction made on the basis of sex which has the effect or purpose of impairing or nullifying the recognition, enjoyment or exercise by women, irrespective of their marital status, on a basis of equality of men and women, of human rights and fundamental freedoms in the political, economic, social, cultural, civil or any other field.

CEDAW is based on the core principles of equality and non-discrimination. It distinguishes between *de jure* equality and *de facto* equality. It recognizes the impact of social, customary and cultural practices which are based on the idea of inferiority or superiority of either sex of stereotyped roles of women and men (De Dios 2008, page 78). It looks at the connection between public and private spheres and contends that human rights violations occur in the private sphere as well (De Dios 2008).

The Integration of CEDAW in the Teaching of Gender Course

The University of the Philippines, a national university, is one of the leading universities in the countries of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) that has mainstreamed gender in the curriculum and in the University organization and practices. As part of its commitment to advance gender equality and women empowerment the UP Center for Women Studies (UCWS) was established in 1988. UCWS played a pivotal role in mainstreaming gender and human rights in the curriculum (Lopez-Rodriguez,

2008, Foreword). In collaboration with United Nations Fund for Women (UNIFEM) under its CEDAW Southeast Asia Program and the Canadian International Development Agency, UCWS spearheaded the mainstreaming of CEDAW in the curriculums. The project included a training workshop on "Integrating CEDAW in the Teaching, Research, and Extension Programs of Regional Gender Resource Centers" in May 2006. The seminar which I attended provided the participants understanding of CEDAW and its salient provisions and the strategies and methods of incorporating CEDAW in teaching, research and extension work in the University. The participation of GAD focal persons in UP in this training has led to a conscious effort to include CEDAW in the relevant parts of the course syllabus. In the case of UP Visayas CEDAW was incorporated in the discussion on women's rights as human rights in relation to the concepts on marginalization, subordination and violence against women. It is part of the discussion on the international and national mandates on GAD and GAD mainstreaming. In my particular experience, my students analyzed the provisions of CEDAW and produced their advocacy materials and posters on the different provisions of CEDAW which they displayed during the Human Rights Week Celebration. The teaching of CEDAW remains to be integrated in Social Science 5 in UP Cebu, which is now an autonomous unit of the UP system.

Impact of Integrating CEDAW

UCWS led by Ma. Theresa Ujano-Batangan, PhD, has conducted an assessment of the teaching intervention of Integrating CEDAW in 2006. The findings of the study were included in the *Compendium of Teacher's Guidelines on Teaching CEDAW* (De Guzman, editor, 2008). The assessment included students enrolled in History 1, History 2, Rizal³ and Natural Sciences. The evaluation noted significant shifts in the knowledge, attitudes and behaviors of the students after going through a course that integrated CEDAW. Results showed that there has been significant change in the perceptions of students. There was an increased disagreement by students to the statement "no matter how accomplished she is, the woman is not truly complete as a person unless she has the love of a man" (Ujano-Batangan, 2008, page 157). Dis-agreement here suggests that students do not accept the stereotyped view about women.

With regard to the issue on substantive equality, UP Diliman students enrolled in History 1, History 2, Sociology and Science, except those taking Rizal, included in the assessment in 2006 showed their non-compliance with the traditional roles of women and men. Non-compliance with traditional roles was measured by the following statements for males: "When I get married, I will ask my wife to stay home and take care of children" and for females: "When I get married, I will stay home and take care of my children." Increased in disagreement to the statement "it is important that husbands continue to provide consent in decisions concerning their wives' fertility" was likewise reported by the UCWS assessment. Positive assertion of women claiming their rights was also confirmed by the study (Ujano-Batangan, 2008, page 158).

This same UCWS study reported that students recognized that the state has obligation to protect women's rights even in the post-test, with a high rate of agreement to the statement.

The UCWS study concluded that there were positive outcomes in the integration of CEDAW in the different tertiary courses included in the evaluation but also raised remaining challenges on the need for the students to further deconstruct stereotypes on gender and their implications to the discourse on human rights (Ujano-Batangan, 2008, page 164).

Positive Impact of Integrating Gender and CEDAW in UP Cebu

Using the instrument developed by the UCWS team headed by Ma. Theresa Ujano-Batangan, PhD, I conducted an evaluation of the outcomes of the teaching of gender using a rights-based perspective. At the start of the semester in 2012-13 a pre-test was conducted before the start of the semester. After taking the course Social Science 5 (Understanding Gender) a post-test was made to find out if there were significant changes in the attitudes, knowledge and behaviors on students on various domains of CEDAW particularly on the issues of Non-Discrimination, Substantive Equality, State Obligation, Human Rights, Women's Rights and the civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights and CEDAW integration in the curriculum (Ujano-Batangan, 2008, page 156). The non-discrimination domain developed by the UCWS team looked into the attitudes embodied in stereotypes and beliefs regarding males and females that shape discriminatory practices against women in the Philippine culture (Ujano-Batangan, 2008, page 157).

Objectives of the Study

This study aims to assess the impact of teaching gender equality and women's rights in Social Science 5 (Understanding Gender) on students' knowledge of, beliefs on, and attitudes toward women's attributes, roles, concerns, and rights. This study used the UCWS Team instrument developed by the group of Ujano-Batangan which looked at whether there existed shifts in the knowledge of the students after taking the course that integrated women's rights as embodied in the CEDAW (Ujano-Batangan, page 157). Its assessment indices included the five dimensions of CEDAW, namely, non-discrimination, substantive equality, human and women's rights, state obligation, and gender integration in the curriculum. The item pool was comprised of negatively and positively constructed statements, which students had to rate using the following scale: Strongly Agree, Agree, Don't Know, Disagree and Strongly Disagree (Ujano-Batangan, page 156). The study further aimed to determine if there were differences along these dimensions according to gender.

Participants of the Study

Eighty students enrolled in Social Science 5 classes in the first semester of School Year 2012-2013 participated in the study. Their average age was 17.65 ($SD = 1.74$) with 16 as the youngest and 24 as the oldest. Most (78.8 percent) were females while males comprised only 21.2 percent of the sample. Fine arts (30 percent) was the most frequent program of the respondents followed by Management (27.5 percent) and Political Science (25 percent). Only 10 percent came from the Computer Science program while the rest were from Psychology (3.8 percent), Math (2.5 percent), and Mass Communication (1.3 percent).

Instrument

The instrument used in the study was a 46-item 5-point Likert scale constructed by the UCWS team. It contained 13 items for non-discrimination, 15 items for substantive equality, 29 items for human rights, women's rights and CEDAW, 8 items for state obligation, and 3 items for gender integration in the curriculum. It was administered twice – in the beginning and at the end of the semester. Students indicated whether they strongly agree, agree, are undecided, disagree or strongly disagree with each item.

Data Analyses

Each item in the instrument was evaluated for its positivity or negativity. A positive item cohered with the teachings of Social Science 5 while a negative item reflected the opposite. For a positive item, the coding was from 0 for strongly disagree to 4 for strongly agree. For a negative item on the other hand, the coding was from 0 for strongly agree to 4 for strongly disagree. Summated scores for the five dimensions were calculated. High summated scores connote greater agreement with the teachings of Social Science 5 particularly on women's rights as human rights. Unlike the UCWS Study, where responses were presented in percentages, the statistical analysis used paired sample t-tests.

Paired samples t-tests were conducted to determine differences between pre-test and post-test for each dimension. When differences were significant, eta squared values⁴ were solved to determine size effects. Independent samples t-tests were conducted to determine differences between males and females across the five dimensions in both pre-tests and post-tests. When differences were found to be significant, size effect values were determined. The level of significance was pegged at .05.

Results and Discussion

Non-Discrimination

Eleven items comprised the non-discrimination domain. The domain looked into the attitudes embodied in stereotypes and beliefs regarding males and females that shape discriminatory practices against the latter in our culture (Ujano-Batangan, page 157). (See Annex A for the eleven items on non-discrimination dimension). Eight of the items were negatively stated and as such, a strongly disagree response was coded 4 and a strongly agree response was coded 0. A strongly agree response to the positively stated item was coded 4. There was a statistically significant increase in summated mean scores from pre-test (*Mean* = 25.68, *SD* = 3.74) to post-test (*Mean* = 27.86, *SD* = 3.90, $t(79) = 4.323$, $p = .000$). The eta squared statistic was .19, considered a large effect size based on Cohen's 1988 guidelines. This significant shift reflects substantial changes in gender beliefs and stereotypes among the students. A closer look at these changes though at the scaled score levels (summated scores were reduced into a 0 to 4 scale by dividing the summated scores with the number of items) revealed that the shift was

from undecided at 2.33 to slightly positive at 2.53. This means that more still needs to be done in deconstructing gender stereotypes and gender discrimination.

Of the eleven items under this domain, six resulted to significant differences between pre-test and post-test. These included the following:

1. An accomplished woman is already complete as a person even without the love of a man (from $Mean = 2.37, SD = 1.22$ to $Mean = 2.88, SD = 1.20, t(79) = 3.25, p = .002$). There is an observed change in the perception of the students on the statement "No matter how accomplished she is, a woman is not truly complete as a person unless she has the love of the man". Students disagreed to this stereotype that a woman becomes complete only if loved by a man;
2. Green jokes about women are not funny nor entertaining as shown in the mean scores (from $Mean = 2.54, SD = 1.16$ to $Mean = 2.89, SD = .98, t(79) = 2.84, p = .006$);
3. On the need to celebrate women's month, statistical analysis showed significant shifts of mean scores (from $Mean = 2.76, SD = .88$ to $Mean = 3.118, SD = .90, t(79) = 3.23, p = .002$);
4. The students' view about women should not stop complaining about the way they are being treated indicated their support for women's standing up against discrimination with mean from $Mean = 2.65, SD = .96$ to $Mean = 3.06, SD = .97, t(79) = 3.165, p = .002$.

Significant shifts were noted from disagreeing with the statement that women do not use their gender to obtain special privileges, to being undecided (from $Mean = 1.68, SD = 1.09$ to $Mean = 2.19, SD = 1.08, t(79) = 3.5, p = .0001$).

There was a shift from being undecided to disagreeing with the statement that men and women enjoy the same rights in our laws (from $Mean = 2.11, SD = 1.2$ to $Mean = 1.7, SD = 1.2, t(79) = 2.88, p = .005$). These respondents still perceive women as not enjoying the same rights as men in our laws.

In both pre-test and post-test, responses were relatively neutral with the statements that women are better than men in nurturing jobs and that women have a quality of purity that few men possess. This may imply that the students who took the course did not essentialize the character of men and women. This may further mean they did not ascribe solely to women the capacity of nurturance and purity of character.

Independent samples *t*- tests were conducted to determine if gender was a significant variable in the pre-test and post-test in the non-discrimination domain. Results revealed that in the pretest, the summated mean score of females was significantly higher than the summated mean score of males ($Mean_{female} = 26.11, SD = 3.43, Mean_{male} = 24.06, SD = 4.46, t(78) = 2.04, p = .044$). This significant difference was gone in the post-test, $t(78) = .19, p = .19$. This change among males is reflective of the success of Social Science 5 in deconstructing gender stereotypes, with male students expressing positive view about women and their struggle for gender equality.

Substantive Equality

Twelve items comprised the substantive equality domain. This part of the instrument looked into the knowledge, attitudes and behaviors that promote or hinder substantive equality among females and males (Ujano-Batangan, page 158). Eight items were negatively stated and four were positively stated. (See Annex B for the twelve items on the substantive equality domain) A high summated score in this dimension evinced recognition of factors that facilitate or thwart efforts to achieve equality between men and women. Results revealed a statistically significant increase in summated means from pre-test to post-test (from $Mean = 24.14, SD = 3.74$ to $Mean = 27.16, SD = 4.1, t(79) = 5.62, p = .000$). The eta squared statistic was .29, indicating a large size effect. The corresponding scaled scores showed that the change was from 2.01 to 2.26. These scores are actually within the undecided point of a 0 to 4 continuum. Although significant shifts are noted between the pre-test and the post-test, a lot still needs to be done in this dimension. It is highly recommended that the instrument be enhanced to capture the nuances of students "knowledge and attitude" about discrimination and women's rights.

There was a significant shift from disagreement to more disagreement with the statement that women do not seek to gain power by getting control over men (from 1.85 to 1.28, $t(79) = 3.5, p = .001$). There was also a significant shift from disagreement to undecided with the statement that many women are not really seeking special favors such as having policies that favor them over men under the guise of asking for equality (from 1.45 to 2.34, $t(79) = 4.85, p = .000$). These results apparently reflect students' beliefs that the women are not fighting for dominance over men and they have a positive view of women's struggle for their rights. This item has to be rethought in

future evaluation in order to clarify meanings of empowerment of women. It is noted here that there exists differences among feminist groups as to the specific goals of the feminist movement. Some groups are calling for women's autonomy and ending of male domination or patriarchy. Other groups seek mainly equality and legal reforms. And there are groups that clamor to end capitalist domination, among other issues. Students' responses showed some ambivalence on—whether the women's movement struggle is for equality or for dominance over men. The unclear perspective of the students on this ideological divide could be possibly traceable to the limits of the scope of Social Science 5 as a General Education course. There are also limits to students' recall of these concerns. Deeper issues on feminisms and the variations in feminist ideologies are not given much time in the course content. This aspect could be given future consideration by the faculty in both the substantive aspect of the course as well as its pedagogy.

On students' responses to other items on advocacies for pro-women policies, both pretest and post-test, respondents expressed agreement with the statements about the reasonable demands of pro-women policies. They likewise expressed agreement on women not just staying at home when they get married. In both pre-test and post-test, though, respondents agreed with the statement that husbands should provide consent in decisions concerning the fertility of their wives. This response could be interpreted to mean students' adherence to a couple's shared decision-making even on matters of fertility. This may reflect students' non-adherence to the view of feminist groups advocating for women sexual and reproductive health rights and women's autonomy over their bodies.

In terms of gender, females significantly scored higher than males on the substantive equality dimension in the pretest ($Mean_{female} = 24.81, SD = 3.58, Mean_{male} = 21.65, SD = 3.33, t(78) = 3.28, p = .002$). The size effect was moderate at .12. In the post-test, there was also a significant difference but the size effect at .06 was small ($Mean_{female} = 27.67, SD = 4.13, Mean_{male} = 25.29, SD = 3.45, t(78) = 2.17, p = .033$).

Human rights, Women's Rights and CEDAW

Nineteen items comprised the domain of human rights, women's rights, and CEDAW. Nine of these items were negatively stated. (See Annex C for the nineteen items on human rights, women's rights, and CEDAW domain) High

summated scores reflect awareness of the universality of human rights and women's rights as well as the role of CEDAW in promoting these rights.

A significant increase in pre-test and post-test summated means was found (from 53.39, $SD = 5.07$ to 56.4, $SD = 5.94$, $t(79) = 4.72$, $p = .0000$). The eta squared valued was .22, a relatively large size effect. The corresponding scaled scores reflect an increase in agreement from 2.81 to 2.97 with the rights of women as human rights and the role of CEDAW in promoting these rights. This was reflected in the student's recognition of equal pay for men and women, women's role in governance and women pursuing career choices even in field dominated by men.

These positive views on rights of women were reflected in the views of the male and female respondents. While women were significantly more positive in their views in the pre-test ($Mean_{female} = 54.17$, $Mean_{male} = 50.48$, $t(78) = 2.79$, $p = .007$), the post-test showed that gender gap is erased with male students expressing support for women's rights. ($Mean_{female} = 56.89$, $Mean_{male} = 54.59$, $t(78) = 1.42$, $p = .16$).

State Obligation and CEDAW integration in the Curriculum

Seven items comprised the domain of state obligation while three items tapped the domain of gender integration in the curriculum. (See Annex D for the seven items on the domain of state obligation and CEDAW integration in the curriculum). A significant shift was found in the summated mean scores of the state obligation domain between the pre-test and the post-test (from 19.21, $SD = 2.61$ to 20.88, $SD = 2.95$, $t(79) = 4.31$, $p = .000$). The size effect was large at .19. The corresponding scaled scores showed that initial views were relatively positive and became more positive in the post-test (from 2.74 to 2.98). Similarly, both males and females were positive in their views on the obligation of the state to promote women's rights.

On the other hand, respondents' views on the integration of women's issues in the curriculum did not differ significantly between pre-test and post-test. Their views were positive in both instances. Similarly, male and female respondents shared the same positive views with regards to the integration.

Summary, Conclusion and Recommendation

Paired samples t-tests evinced significant changes in the views on, attitudes toward, and beliefs on women's attributes, roles, rights, and issues among

Social Science 5 students from the start of the semester to the end of the semester in four of the five dimensions measured by CEDAW's instrument. Size effects were generally large, which indicate substantial differences between the two time frames. Greater positivity was found in both dimensions of human and gender rights as well as state obligation. The shift in the non-discriminatory dimension was from undecided to slightly positive while the shift in the substantive equality dimension was within the undecided point of the 0 to 4 continuum. There was no significant change in the views of the students with regards to the integration of gender in the curriculum. Their views were already positive even in the beginning.

Gender as a variable was found to be significant in the pretest on the dimensions of non-discrimination, substantive equality and women's rights. Female respondents had more positive views on these dimensions. The post-test results revealed the absence of gender differences on the dimensions of non-discrimination and rights. A significant difference remained in the substantive equality dimension but size effect became smaller. These results mean that men's views can be changed when their existing views are challenged in classes like Social Science 5.

Social Science 5 indeed contributed to the shift in students' views, beliefs and attitudes. The researcher recognizes that these changes are not solely attributable to the impact of Social Science 5. The study's design is not experimental and as such, there are a number of variables that can confound the results and can serve as alternative explanations. There is also a need to incorporate findings of the qualitative assessment that used students' journals and focused group discussions probing on the students' meanings of discrimination and issues that could not be captured by a structured questionnaire. Lastly, there is a need to enhance the instrument and assess its internal consistency. Face validity is not an adequate measure of its psychometric property. But despite this limitation, the study found out the positive impact of integrating women's rights principles on the students who took the course on gender. Integrating CEDAW indeed made a difference in the knowledge and attitudes of students.

References

- Cohen, J. 1988. *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*. Hillside, New Jersey: Erlbaum.

- De Dios, Aurora. 2008. "Claiming Women's Human Rights through CEDAW." In De Guzman, Odine, editor, *Teaching CEDAW*. Quezon City: UP Center for Women Studies.
- De Guzman, Odine. Editor. 2008. *Teaching CEDAW*. Quezon City: UP Center for Women Studies.
- Feliciano, Myrna. 2008. "An Overview of Women's Human Rights and CEDAW." In De Guzman, Odine, editor, *Teaching CEDAW*. Quezon City: UP Center for Women Studies.
- Sobritchea, Carolyn. 2008. "Guidelines for Integrating CEDAW in Academic Programs." In De Guzman, Odine, editor, *Teaching CEDAW*. Quezon City: UP Center for Women Studies.
- Ujano-Batangan, Ma. Theresa. 2008. "Assessment of Teaching Interventions: Pre – and Post Test Administered to Students." In De Guzman, Odine, editor, *Teaching CEDAW*. Quezon City: UP Center for Women Studies.

Endnotes

- 1 Flora Generalao, PhD, of UP Cebu Social Sciences Cluster provided technical assistance by doing the crucial statistical analysis for this study. The researcher gratefully acknowledges her substantial role in providing meaning to statistical data and applying appropriate statistical tests beyond the usual presentations in percentages.
- 2 The University of the Philippines Visayas has campuses in Cebu, Iloilo and Tacloban.
- 3 Rizal is a university course on the life and writings of Jose Rizal, a 19th century Philippine hero.
- 4 Eta square or the size effect is the degree of departure from null hypothesis (no difference) of the alternative hypothesis (there is a difference).

Annex A

Survey Items

Domain: Non-discrimination

Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. No matter how accomplished she is, a woman is not truly complete as a person unless she has the love of a man.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
8. Many women have a quality of purity that few men possess.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
13. Men are complete with woman.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
14. Women are better than men in professions or jobs that entail care giving and teaching.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
15. It is important that men and women get the same compensation for the same job or work.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
23. Many women use their gender to obtain special privileges.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
27. I find green jokes about women funny and entertaining.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
28. Men and women enjoy the same rights in our laws.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
30. Celebrations such as "Women's Month" are not necessary because women enjoy the same rights as men.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
33. Women should be allowed to pursue career choices even in fields dominated by men.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
37. Women should stop complaining about the way they are treated, and simply get on with their lives.	SA	A	DK	D	SD

Annex B
Survey Items

Domain: Substantive Equality

Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
2. Many women are seeking special favors, such as hiring policies that favor them over men, under the guise of asking for "equality."	SA	A	DK	D	SD
3. In a disaster, women ought not necessarily to be rescued before men.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
9. Women should be cherished and safeguarded by men.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
10. Most women fail to appreciate fully all that men do for them.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
11. Women seek to gain power by getting control over men.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
17. A good woman should be set on a pedestal by her man.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
21. Individuals pushing for policies that are pro-women are making entirely reasonable demands.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
34. People should stop describing women as depressed and exploited.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
37. Women should stop complaining about the way they are treated, and simply get on with their lives.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
38. For males: When I get married, I will ask my wife to stay home and take care of our children. For females: When I get married, I will stay home and take care of my children if that is what my husband wants.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
40. For Females: I expect men to shield me from harm. For Males: I think that is my role to insure that women are shielded from any harm.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
51. Do you know of any policies in your school/university that discriminates against women? [] YES [] NO 52. What are these policies? _____ _____ _____	SA	A	DK	D	SD

Annex C

Survey Items

Domain: Human Rights, Women's Rights and CEDAW integration in the curriculum

Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
4. It is not for men to be sued for sexual harassment just because a woman feels violated by the former's sexual jokes and remarks.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
6. Women should leave the field of governance to men.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
7. Women should not be allowed to work in the night shift, so they could be shielded from sexual assault.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
12. Human rights belong to each individual from birth.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
14. Women are better than men in professions or jobs that entail care giving and teaching.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
15. It is important that men and women get the same compensation for the same job or work.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
16. CEDAW protects men and women from all forms of discrimination	SA	A	DK	D	SD
18. Human rights are universal.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
19. The Philippines is a signatory of CEDAW and its optional protocol.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
20. Women should be willing to sacrifice their own well-being in order to provide financially for their families.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
22. Rape can occur even in intimate relationships (e.g. husband and wife, boyfriend-girlfriend, partners)	SA	A	DK	D	SD
25. Policies that promote more active participation of women in the everyday life of the community are not necessary.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
26. Given the chance I want to be actively involved in the promotion of women's rights.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
28. Men and women enjoy the same rights in our laws.	SA	A	DK	D	SD

30. Celebrations such as "Women's Month" are not necessary because women enjoy the same rights as men.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
31. Rape should have remained as a crime against chastity.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
35. Despite the gains in making the issues of women heard, it is still important for government to push for affirmative actions on women.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
36. Our laws allow for married men and women individually own properties.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
38. For males: When I get married, I will ask my wife to stay home and take care of our children. For females: When I get married, I will stay home and take care of my children if that is what my husband wants.	SA	A	DK	D	SD

Annex D Survey Items

Domain: State Obligation and CEDAW Integration in the Curriculum

Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
5. The state has the obligation to protect women's rights.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
18. Human rights are universal.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
24. Having the women's desk in police precincts is a laudable attempt of the government to promote women's rights.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
25. Policies that promote more active participation of women in the everyday life of the community are not necessary.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
31. Rape should have remained as a crime against chastity.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
34. People should stop describing women as depressed and exploited.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
39. In today's tough economic times Filipinos' tax money shouldn't be used to support the implementation of courses on women's rights in government-run universities and schools.	SA	A	DK	D	SD