

# **UKRAINE AND THE MILLENNIUM DEVELOPMENT GOALS: THE QUESTION OF GENDER (IN)EQUALITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION**

By  
Iryna Kushnir

*Submitted to  
Central European University  
Department of Gender Studies*

*In partial fulfillment for the degree of Master of Arts in Gender Studies.*

Supervisor: Professor Sophie Howlett

Budapest, Hungary  
2012

## Abstract

This thesis deals with the way the question of gender equality in higher education is addressed on the university level in Ukraine. I argue in my thesis that the question of gender equality as part of the UN MDG “Gender equality and empowerment of women” is probably not addressed effectively on the university level in Ukraine. This is so because there were misunderstandings about the concept of gender equality and therefore how to implement a gender equality policy at the international, national and university levels. Indeed, I argue that the inconsistencies in policy transfer – created by such misunderstandings but also by other difficulties – from the top down, level by level, even increased the problem. Misunderstandings were passed on, inconsistencies multiplied, resistances to the issue of gender equality were not overcome, and the problems grew. The end result is two-fold. On the one hand, my case study suggests that the issues of gender equality does seem to have been addressed, at least technically, in some universities – there has been apparent progress. But, at the same time, my research also suggests that we should question even this progress towards the fulfillment of the MDG “Gender equality.” The problem of policy transfer and of defining gender equality in this instance not only has resulted in only partial compliance to date, but also in a potential disparity between technical compliance and ‘real’ change at the level of Ukrainian higher education. I offer directions for building change.

## **Acknowledgements**

I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisor, Professor Sophie Howlett, for her careful guidance through my research and writing process, for her valuable advice, support, patience, and encouragement.

I would like also to thank my family, and my friends Vitaliy Shmidel and Viktoriya Zhukova for their support.

# Table of Contents

Abstract .....	ii
Acknowledgements .....	iii
Introduction .....	1
Chapter I. Theoretical Framework and Methodology.....	6
1.1. Theoretical Framework.....	6
1.1.1. Policy transfer: from the international to the national to the local .....	6
1.1.2. Policy Transferring related to the Millennium Development Goals .....	9
1.1.3. Gender Equality in Education .....	12
1.2. Methodology .....	14
1.2.1. The Case of Higher Education in Ternopil .....	15
1.2.2. Research Design of the Case Study .....	16
1.2.3. Problems Occurred During the Case Study .....	17
1.2.4. Solutions to the Problems.....	18
1.2.5. Data Analysis .....	19
Chapter II. Inconsistencies in Adoption and Transferring of the Millennium Development Goals .....	21
2.1. International Framework of the Millennium Development Goals .....	21
2.1.1. Implementation at the UN level .....	21
2.1.2. Millennium Development Goal 3 “Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women” .....	25
2.2. Ukrainian Framework of the Millennium Development Goals .....	28
2.2.1. Transferring of the International Framework to Ukraine.....	28
2.2.2. Ukrainian Millennium Development Goal “Gender Equality” .....	31
2.2.3. Gender Equality in Higher Education in Ukrainian Policy Implementation before the Millennium Development Goals .....	33
2.3. Gender Equality in Higher Education and National Policy Implementation after the Adoption of the Millennium Development Goals.....	34
2.4. Act №839 “About the Implementation of the Principles of Gender Equality in Education” .....	38
Chapter III. Implementation of Act №839 "About the Implementation of the Principles of Gender Equality in Education" on the University Level.....	43
3.1. Fact of Implementation.....	44
3.2. People’s Awareness .....	47
3.3. Promotion of Gender Equality .....	49
3.3.1. Confusion of the Meaning of the Concept Gender Equality.....	53
3.3.2. Failure to Recognize Gender Inequality .....	55
Conclusions .....	59
Appendices .....	66
Appendix 1. Act №839 from 10/09/2009 “About the Implementation of the Principles of Gender Equality in Education” (extracts).....	66
Appendix 2. List of Interviewees .....	67
Appendix 3. Interview Scenario .....	68
Appendix 4. Report from Pedagogical University Human Resources Offices .....	71
Appendix 5. Table 1 .....	72
Appendix 6. Table 2 .....	73
Appendix 7. Table 3 .....	74
Bibliography .....	75

## Introduction

The issue of gender equality in higher education has gained political visibility in independent Ukraine after 2003 when the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) were adopted by the Ukrainian government. The series of eight MDGs have been introduced by UN secretary-general Kofi Annan in 2001 as concrete objectives to improve life globally by 2015. Since 2001, the member-states of the UN were supposed to work at the implementation of the goals.

I argue in my thesis that the question of gender equality as part of the UN MDG “Gender equality and empowerment of women” is probably not addressed effectively on the university level in Ukraine. This is so because there were misunderstandings about the concept of gender equality and therefore how to implement a gender equality policy at the international, national and university levels. Indeed, I argue that the inconsistencies in policy transfer – created by such misunderstandings but also by other difficulties – from the top down, level by level, even increased the problem. Misunderstandings were passed on, inconsistencies multiplied, resistances to the issue of gender equality were not overcome, and the problems grew. The end result is two-fold. On the one hand, my case study suggests that the issues of gender equality does seem to have been addressed, at least technically, in some universities – there has been apparent progress. But, at the same time, my research also suggests that we should question even this progress towards the fulfillment of the MDG “Gender equality.” The problem of policy transfer and of defining gender equality in this instance not only has resulted in only partial compliance to date, but also in a potential disparity between technical compliance and ‘real’ change at the level of Ukrainian higher education.

In this thesis, I look at whether the question of gender equality as part of the UN MDG 3 “Gender equality and empowerment of women” is addressed effectively on the

university level of Ukraine; if not – why, and what could have been done differently to address it effectively.

My specific research questions are the following:

- What is the meaning of effective addressing of the question of gender equality in higher education of Ukraine?
- How was the question of gender equality in higher education adapted from the UN MDGs context to Ukrainian MDGs context, and how has this questions been implemented on the national level?
- What aspects of the Ukrainian act *About the Implementation of the Principles of Gender Equality in Education*,<sup>1</sup> that relate to higher education, have been implemented on the university level?
- What is the effect of addressing the question of gender equality in higher education on international and national levels on the way gender equality is addressed on the university level of Ukraine?

Ukraine is particularly interesting for the examination of the MDGs goal to promote gender equality in higher education. On the one hand Ukraine is a representative of the post-Soviet heritage. This implies that Ukraine should already have some background in addressing gender issues, which partially originated in Lenin's politics during the Bolshevik times (Si-eun, 2008). In addition to this, current Ukrainian politics aim to improve the position of Ukraine in the international environment by ensuring the access of the country to a number of international organizations, which tend to promote democratic human rights, including gender equality (Sumylo-Tapiola, 2012). Thus the ideas of gender equality on the current stage of the development of Ukraine should be familiar to the country, and it should be a fertile territory for the implementation of the MDG on gender equality. However, on the

---

<sup>1</sup> Act №839 About the Implementation of the Principles of Gender Equality in Education (2009). Retrieved from <http://osvita.ua/legislation/other/4849/> (accessed May 12, 2012), (herefrom the act)

other hand, I noticed from my personal experience in obtaining higher education in Ukraine that the achievement of gender equality was failing in higher education. I came to this idea on the basis of judging the message of a gender equality course that I took. This message was the promotion of unequal opportunities for men and women veiled under the idea of gender equality. Therefore, I chose to devote my MA research to studying the question of gender equality in higher education in detail utilizing the MDG project to find out and begin to analyze if my personal experience was correct, and if so, to consider what and where the project may have failed, and consequently what could be done to build change.

To prove my argument, I organize my thesis in the following structure. In chapter I, I situate my argument in the existing scholarship that deals with policy transfer and inconsistencies that might originate in this process. I deal with the three levels: international, which is the UN in my case, national, which is the level of Ukrainian government, and local level of Ukrainian universities. In addition to this, I review the definitions of gender equality provided in the literature in order to have a background for the analysis of the definition of gender equality implied in the UN MDG “Gender equality and empowerment of women” and definitions of gender equality implied in Ukrainian documentation related to the implementation of the UN MDG. I chose such scholarship for my theoretical framework because I believe that the problems with addressing gender equality on the university level of Ukraine are connected to misunderstanding gender equality on each of the three levels, and inconsistencies in policy transfer from level to level. I then go on to explain my methodology which is the following. I chose to do document analysis related to the adoption of the MDGs on the UN level and implementation of these goals on the level of Ukrainian government because these documents serve as evidence for how the policies related to the MDGs were implemented, transferred to the lower levels and controlled. I decided to do a case study of the university level in the Ukrainian city of Ternopil, where I conducted interviews,

examined official websites and searched literature in the libraries of the pedagogical, economic and medical universities. I also analyzed a report from a human resources office of the pedagogical university. Although this case study did not provide me with statistically significant data, it was sufficient to begin to suggest tendencies of how the question of gender equality and the implementation of the MDG is being addressed at the university level.

In chapter II, I discuss inconsistencies in the process of the implementation of the MDGs by the UN. In addition to this, I pay specific attention to the analysis of the UN MDG 3 “Gender equality and empowerment of women” to show that the question of gender equality was inadequately addressed by the UN in the process of adoption of the goals. I explain how inconsistencies in the adoption of the goals on the UN level transferred to the national level of Ukraine and increased there. I analyze in detail how the question of gender equality in higher education was downgraded in Ukraine, as can be seen for instance, in the changes that were made to the UN goal “Gender equality and empowerment of women.” In order to prove that this question was downgraded without any valid reasons, I review the history of the Ukrainian documentation before the adoption of the MDGs and show that there was no prior large scale initiative to tackle the problem or upon which to build with the MDG project. Indeed, I then show that gender equality in education was ignored to a large extent after the MDGs were transferred to Ukraine until 2009 when an act specifically targeting the subject was issued. However, it was not effective in terms of addressing gender equality because of poor definitions of the idea of gender equality and failure to deal with the issues that could build change in perceptions of gender equality at the university level.

In chapter III, I analyze the results of my case study. I discuss the shortfalls of the implementation of the eight aspects of the act *About the Implementation of the Principles of Gender Equality in Education* at the three chosen universities for my study. I have found out that the issue of gender equality has been addressed, at least technically. However, at the



same time, I have identified three levels of implementation of the act and use them to analyze why gender equality is not promoted at the universities. I demonstrate that the major obstacle for this is resistance against the idea of the achievement of gender equality on the university level which is reinforced by people's confusion over the meaning of gender equality and their subsequent failure to recognize instances of the existent gender inequality.

The goal on gender equality in higher education Ukraine in the context of the MDG project is probably failing for a number of misunderstandings of definitions and inconsistencies in policy transfers. This calls for the need to find the directions for building change in addressing the question of gender equality, which I address in more detail in my conclusions.

## **Chapter I. Theoretical Framework and Methodology**

In this chapter, I will situate my argument in the existing literature that deals with policy transfer and inconsistencies that might originate in this process. I chose such literature because I believe that the problems with addressing gender equality in higher education in Ukraine are connected to policy transfer. Furthermore, I will review how gender equality is defined in literature. I will analyze the definitions of gender equality provided in the scholarship in order to have a background for the analysis of the definition of gender equality implied in the UN MDG “Gender equality and empowerment of women.” But further, definitions of gender equality are important for my argument as I need to explain what gender equality is before I prove if it is addressed inadequately in higher education in Ukraine. I will then go on to explain the overall methodology used for my research.

### ***1.1. Theoretical Framework***

#### **1.1.1. Policy transfer: from the international to the national to the local**

I was originally inspired to pay attention to policy transfer by Lapovsky Kennedy and Beins’s (2005) discussion of the three levels, among which ideas transfer: international, national and household. These scholars refer to transferring ideas rather than policies. However, I would like to elaborate on the approach of Lapovsky Kennedy and Beins before I review arguments of the authors that deal specifically with policy transfer.

The area of emphasis of Lapovsky Kennedy and Beins differs from mine, as they do not speak about the effect of policy transfer on the way gender equality is addressed. They are focused on the ideas of globalization and feminist internationalism. However, I find their general approach valid for my discussion, too. The scholars argue that the spread of feminist internationalism is part of globalization, which means that it originates at the international level, and then, there is a top-down influence of these ideas at the national and then the household levels. Similarly, the idea to promote gender equality has originated at the level of

the UN (international level), is taken up and reworked by the Ukrainian government (the national level) and then influences the university level. It is not a bottom-up process because gender inequality on the university levels was not recognized as a problem, as I will show, and did not influence policymaking within university administrators or elsewhere. For instance, as I will show in chapter 2, gender equality in education was not addressed as a separate policy area until Ukraine adopted the MDGs.

However, my purpose of using the three levels for my analysis is different from that of Lapovsky Kennedy and Beins. They use these levels in order to analyze shortcomings of viewing international development of feminist ideas as a homogeneous process worldwide. The authors criticize homogenization of international feminism because they recognize specificities of different national, and thus, household levels that alter feminist ideas as they came to these levels from the international level. Rather than critiquing the manner in which globalization has attempted to homogenize feminist ideas worldwide, I am interested in looking at how and why such a homogenization failed. I will use the framework of the three levels to show how the inconsistencies in setting-up the MDGs on the international level for use at the national level, and then similar inconsistencies at the national level caused a growing number of inconsistencies in the implementation of these goals at each level, when the goals have been transferred downwards.

It is worth explaining how exactly Lapovsky Kennedy and Beins's three levels of transferring of the ideas of international feminism correspond to the levels of policy implementation in the area of gender equality. The authors state that the spread of international feminism as part of globalization originated at the highest among the three levels, which is the international level (2005: 210). They show the impact of the ideas on the international level on the lower levels, i.e., the national and household. In my analysis, I will refer to the UN as the international level because the MDGs were initiated there.

The national level is distinct from the international, according to the scholars, because of the specific economic and cultural politics of each individual country, which are being influenced by the ideas of the dominant international level (2005: 212). I will discuss the Ukrainian government as the national level of policy implementation. I see the adoption of the MDGs by the Ukrainian government as a representation of the subordinated position of the Ukrainian government to the UN policy transfer related to the MDGs.

The household level is recognized by the authors as a multiple formation dependent on the national level. Households are influenced by the globalization processes that are initiated at the international level and go through the national level, which, in turn, impacts the household level (2005: 213). I am not interested in discussing kinship, marriage and parenting, which are the essence of the household level. I will be focused on gender equality issues at universities, which, similarly to households, can be considered to be a multiple formation subordinated to policy implementation on the national level. Therefore, I will substitute households for universities in the system of the three levels, offered by Lapovsky Kennedy and Beins.

As I have mentioned earlier, Lapovsky Kennedy and Beins do not use the term *policy* when they explain why the ideas of feminism are not homogeneous internationally. In my analysis, I will specifically look at how the ideas of gender equality in higher education were reconfigured at each of the three levels because of certain peculiarities in policy implementation at each level which were then transferred to the next. Deacon (2005), True and Mintrom (2001) and Grunberg (2001) all examine policy transfer but focus only on two of the Lapovsky Kennedy and Beins' three levels. All of the authors consider both top-down and bottom-up influences among the described levels of policy transfer and implementation. As I have argued earlier, I only want to examine top-down effects here.

Deacon, and True and Mintrom all argue for the existence of a two-way relationship between the influences of international and national levels of policy implementation – providing both a policy transfer downwards and also back up. Deacon argues that the mutual effect of policy implementation on the two levels becomes the basis for the globalized social policies (2005: 443). In my study, rather than showing the mutual impact of policy formation on the international and national levels, I will analyze how the translated from the international level inconsistencies in the adoption of the MDGs were enlarged on the national level, and then downwards to the third level.

Grunberg also speaks about the mutual influence of the levels of policy implementation under the concept of policy transfer. However, unlike Deacon, True and Mintrom, he does not consider the international level and describes how policies start working when they get to the national ministerial level of a country. Grunberg dwells instead on the national, local and regional levels. Grunberg's ideas about national and regional levels are concordant with my national and university levels, respectively. The scholar describes top-down and bottom-up effects of the policies that are reconfigured at each level because of the peculiarities of each level. I will also look at the reconfiguration of policies related to the MDGs at each level as a reason of the peculiarities of the levels that caused inconsistencies in policy formation.

### **1.1.2. Policy Transferring related to the Millennium Development Goals**

I will deal in my analysis with the inconsistencies of transfer of the policies concerning gender equality in higher education from the international level to the university level in Ukraine. But why does policy transfer allow inconsistencies to emerge? In this section I review literature on the assessment of the success and failures of the progress towards the MDGs that is relevant to the emergence of inconsistencies in MDG transfer. One group of scholars, represented by Hulme (2009), Haines and Cassels (2004), and Alston

(2005), positively assesses the results and future outcomes of the progress towards the achievement of the goals by the countries. Another group of scholars, represented by Johnson (2005), Aikman et al. (2005), Warren (2006) and Heyzer (2005), critiques the whole idea of the implementation of the MDGs and anticipation of positive results afterwards.

Hulme (2009), Haines and Cassels (2004), and Alston (2005) all consider the MDGs to be a beneficial plan for the UN and the countries. Inconsistencies in the implementation of the MDGs are not considered because they are mostly focused on the adoption of the MDG agenda rather than the process of transfer from the UN to individual countries. Hulme's emphasis on the adoption of the MDGs is important for my argument because I argue that inconsistencies in addressing gender equality in Ukraine were partially caused by the problems in the process of adoption of the goals. UN funding, control and deadline for the implementation of the goals are treated by Hulme as facilitating the success of countries in achieving the goals. Hulme's emphasis on UN control is particularly important for my argument. However, my analysis, that will follow in chapter 2 and 3, will exemplify the impossibility of sufficient UN control over transferring the goals to the countries. I will discuss the problems associated with the implementation of the series of the MDGs on the UN level that later transferred down to the lower levels.

Similarly to Hulme, Haines and Cassels focus on the crucial role of the control of the UN. However, Haines and Cassels specify that the annual reports from the countries were the most important in their success to achieve the goals because they were a means of accountability (2004: 394). Information in chapter 2 will disprove Haines and Cassels's optimistic idea. I will claim that the change of the targets and indicators of the goals by Ukraine exemplifies the devaluing of the annual reporting as a form of top-down control. These changes did not just occur in Ukraine, the role of national reporting is devalued

because there is a general lack of comparability among the results of individual countries as a variety of countries changed targets and indicators of the goals.

Alston mentions another aspect of UN control as an important factor in the progress of the countries towards the achievement of the MDGs. The author emphasizes that the plan of the MDGs is promising for success because the fulfillment of the goals are limited to certain targets. Such a prioritization of certain objectives makes it plausible for these objectives to be achieved (2005: 756). Alston's idea is useful for my analysis of the UN MDG "Gender equality and empowerment of women." It is so because I aim to show that the assigned target for this goal related to reaching gender equality in education was partially sufficient for the achievement of the goal because I believe that the achievement of gender equality in education can potentially lead to gender equality in other spheres.

The positive attitude of the three above mentioned scholars to the results and potentials of the implementation of the MDGs is, however, counterbalanced by Johnson (2005), Aikman et al. (2005), Warren (2006) and Heyzer (2005) who offer a critique of the MDGs. Both Johnson and Aikman et al. emphasize that the targets chosen for the goals are too limited to specific areas. Targets do not reflect the whole idea of a goal. Therefore, the achievement of the targets cannot lead to the achievement of the goals. I cannot express my agreement or disagreement with this statement, as the analysis of the targets for all of the goals is not my expertise. In my thesis, I aim to analyze in detail only the goal "Gender equality and empowerment of women" and its target. I will argue in chapter 2, contrary to Johnson and Aikman et al., that the target assigned to this goal by the UN had a potential to assist in reaching gender equality in general in Ukraine.

Warren argues that one of the biggest problems with the implementation of the goals is the widely practiced attempt to get so called visible results to show progress (2006: 9). In this case, he argues, the core of the problems, associated with the goals, remains unchanged.

This happens when the causes of the problems are not addressed, and only the effects are masked and represented as if the problems have been solved. I will use Warren's claim to support some of my finding related to addressing gender equality on the university level in chapter 3.

Heyzer claims that the goals could be achieved if awareness raising took pace in the countries that chose to implement the goals (2005: 9). He argues that raising awareness about the problems implied by the goals is needed to persuade citizens of a country of the importance of the achievement of the goals. According to the author, understanding the importance is crucial in the adequate implementation of the goals. I find Heyzer's claim useful for my argumentation. I will suggest that the lack of awareness of people on the university level about the essence and importance of gender equality was one of the reasons for the inadequate addressing of the question of gender equality on this level.

### **1.1.3. Gender Equality in Education**

But in discussing why a gender equality goal has not been implemented appropriately at the local level in Ukraine, I also need to define what *gender equality* is or what it is considered to be – in terms of the theoretical debate, and also at each of the three levels I will study. I need a definition of gender equality against which I can judge the way gender equality in higher education is addressed on each of the three levels of policy implementation. First and foremost, the distinction between gender equality and gender parity in education, made by Avalos (2003), is particularly useful when considering the UN concept as presented in “Gender equality and empowerment of women.” Avalos, focusing on schooling, argues that gender equality is a broader term than gender parity. The main limitation of gender parity, defined by the scholar as enrollment rates of boys and girls, is that it does not always reflect equal opportunities that are at the heart of reaching gender equality. This is because parity can be reached by decreasing enrollment of boys, while the obstacles



for girls' education remain unchanged. I agree with Avalos' argument, which will be used to support my critique of the limitation of the UN goal "Gender equality and empowerment of women." I see the limitation of the UN goal on gender equality in viewing the achievement of gender parity as a means for reaching gender equality.

My critique of the UN conceptualization of gender equality as gender parity can also be supported by Arnot and Fennel (2008) and Unterhalter's (Arnot and Fennel, 2008) discussion of gender equality in education in terms of equal opportunities of men and women. Arnot and Fennel state that going beyond the problem of access and considering providing opportunities for women to be able to access education and facilitating women's agency in choosing to obtain education can help attain gender equality in education. Unterhalter expresses a similar idea claiming that breaking down the barriers that hinder women's opportunities to study helps to reach gender equality in education.

Arnot and Fennel also argue that the achievement of gender equality in education is connected to achieving gender equality in civil society. This claim is useful for justifying the focus of the UN MDG concerning gender equality on the achievement of gender equality specifically in education. It is also valid for proving the appearance of inconsistencies on the national level when this goal was transferred, and the focus of the goal was shifted for not valid reasons from gender equality in education to gender equality in legislature. The achievement of gender equality in education was not seen in Ukraine as a starting point for the achievement of gender equality in other spheres.

Gender equality is also mentioned by Arnot and Fennel as a "Western version of modernization" (2008: 3) when the authors explain one of the contemporary perspectives on international interference in nations. I will confirm the existence of such an idea of viewing gender equality when I will explain resistances against gender equality at the university level.

## **1.2. Methodology**

I want to show a top-down influence of the inconsistencies in MDG policy transferring and its impact on the definitions of gender equality at each of the three levels: international, national and university, because the goal related to gender equality originated at the UN level and was transferred down to the local level of universities. To show this influence, I have conducted document search and analysis and a case study of gender equality in higher education.

I chose to do document analysis related to the adoption of the MDGs on the UN level and implementation of these goals on the level of the Ukrainian government because these documents serve as evidence for how the policies related to the MDGs were implemented, transferred and controlled. I decided to do an instrumental case study of gender equality in higher education to find out how the local level experiences top-down policy transfer, why it is not successful, and what attitudes to gender equality are on this level. The instrumental case study is the examination of a particular case with a goal to use the conclusions from the research for the understanding of broader issues (Stake, 2003: 137). I need to briefly mention the essence of my case study before I state the reasons for choosing a different research method on the university level. My case study included interviews with people involved with universities, examination of the official websites of the universities, searching literature for gender equality courses at university libraries, and making petitions to human resources offices of the universities to get information about university workers. I chose to do such a case study for three reasons. First, I do not have access to reliable documentation of the Ukrainian universities. Second, even if I had such access, I would not be able to look at each university in Ukraine. Third, an instrumental case study allows me to extrapolate conclusions from it for understanding a general tendency of the effects of inconsistencies of policy transfer on the way the question of gender equality is addressed on the university level.

### 1.2.1. The Case of Higher Education in Ternopil

The city of Ternopil was chosen as a case study for the following reasons. I intended to conduct my research in a regional center, rather than in the capital city which is the most populated in Ukraine. There is a tendency of highly populated regions to be “the most conducive to innovative activity” and offer its inhabitants “greater opportunities to learn from one another” (Orlando and Verba, 2005: 31). Consequently, capital cities are likely to represent the rarity more than the norm. It is more indicative to see what is going on the university level by examining a regional center, such as Ternopil. Ternopil is particularly interesting because, despite being a regional center, it provides a thriving higher education environment allowing cross comparison from within the city.

In choosing higher educational institutions (HEIs), the study aimed to find state institutions, since such institutions should be directly influenced by national level policy transfer. In addition to this, the study was focused on the institutions that had some degree of implementation of the aspects of the act *About the Implementation of the Principles of Gender Equality in Education* (see appendix 1). As I have mentioned in the introduction, this act aimed at the achievement of the UN MDG “Gender equality and empowerment of women.” As the Ukrainian government understood it to be, at the local level I assume there might be HEIs in Ternopil where the act has not been implemented at all. But I am interested to see how policy was reconfigured when transferred down to the university level. According to this logic, the following universities were chosen. First, Ternopil Volodymyr Hnatyuk National Pedagogical University (herefrom, the pedagogical university) was selected because it has a Center of Gender Studies and Department of Pedagogy and Gender Equality, as I discovered from the official website of the university.<sup>2</sup> The center and department are relevant to the implementation of the act because the aspects of the act presuppose the

---

<sup>2</sup> Official website of the pedagogical university  
<http://old.tnpu.edu.ua/english/index.php?page=faculties> (accessed May 12, 2012)

existence of such centers and departments. Secondly, Ternopil National Economic University (herefrom, the economic university) was chosen as it offers the course *Basics of Gender Equality*, as described in a collected volume of the best Ukrainian courses related to gender issues (2009: 173-176). This course is relevant to the implementation of the act because one of the aspects presupposes the existence of such courses at universities. Thirdly, Ternopil State Medical University (herefrom, the medical university) was chosen because professors of this university created a program for the course *Gender Problems in the Sphere of Health Protection*, also found in the above mentioned volume (2009: 333-336).

### **1.2.2. Research Design of the Case Study**

The study utilized a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods, which, respectively, were data from university websites and interviews, and data from the university human resources offices. The following four groups of people were chosen by a snowball sampling method for interviews: senior administrators, professors who teach courses specifically related to gender issues, professors of other subject areas, students including those who are involved with student council. These groups of people were targeted because the answers of these groups of people were needed in order to assess the three levels of implementation found within the act. I will name the three levels later in this chapter and explain them in detail in chapter 3. 2-4 interviews with each of the groups of respondents at each university were made for a total of 27 interviews (see appendix 2). Interviews were audio recorded.

Semi-structured interviews with close-ended and open-ended questions were used for the study, because this type of interviews is optimal if comparable and, at the same time, rich data is needed (Pawson, 1996: 299). I needed comparable data because I wanted to compare the results at the three universities. Moreover, I needed rich data because it provides a wide scope for analysis, and most importantly, reveals attitudes and understandings of the ideas

such as gender equality itself. Interviews were recorded in Mp3 format and manually transcribed using edited transcript type. An edited transcript was chosen, rather than verbatim transcript, because the correction of misspoken errors helps “to make sense of the spoken word when put down in writing” (Ritchie, 1995: 44).

The interview questions (see appendix 3) were created in reference to aspects of the Ukrainian act to look specifically at the transfer element, and then to understanding gender equality and attitudes to it. There were two types of divisions of the interview questions. First set of questions focused on interviewees’ awareness of the implementation of the act. There was then a second set of questions that focused on interviewee’s conceptualization and evaluation of the issues related to gender equality raised by the apparent need to implement the act.

I also intended to use the assistance of the university human resources offices in receiving quantitative data about the workers of HEIs by gender. Since official websites of Ukrainian HEIs have limited information about their workers, it was not possible for me to do a quantitative analysis of university workers by gender myself. I was expecting human resources offices of each university to assist me in this. I planned to get the following information: number of male and female professors, the amount of male and female professors by degree, and the amount of male and female senior administrators (pro-rectors, deans, and heads of departments). This information was needed in order to see if there is gender disparity among faculty members and administration.

### **1.2.3. Problems Occurred During the Case Study**

Three problems were encountered in my empirical research process. The first problem was related to the quantitative part of my research. I made written petitions to rectors of each of the three universities asking to be provided with personnel information. My petition was accepted and satisfied at the pedagogical university. However, it was rejected at the economic

university by a written letter stating that this information cannot be provided because it is confidential to the university. My petition was also rejected at the medical university with an oral explanation that the requested information is a commercial secret and cannot go abroad. Such an explanation was provided for me after procrastinating, losing my petition, suggesting writing it again and denying even to give written explanations on the reasons of rejection. The second problem that I encountered in my research was related to my sampling method in choosing interviewees. I planned to select a sample, in which professors of other, than gender related, subject areas, and students would have been from different departments or institutes. In addition to this, I planned to choose randomly administrators and professors who teach gender related courses. However, first attempts of arranging interviews this way were not successful because of interviewees' reluctance to be interviewed. The most frequently mentioned reason was that respondents work in subject areas other than gender equality, and thus, the topic of gender equality is foreign to them. The third problem that I encountered in my research was caused by four people, three of whom were professors of gender equality courses. They agreed to participate in the interview but refused to answer my planned questions and told me some information in a didactic manner instead.

#### **1.2.4. Solutions to the Problems**

The following solutions were found to the above mentioned problems. I will solve the problem of the absence of quantitative data about workers by analyzing why my petitions were rejected. I solved my problem with sampling by using snowball sampling. Professors and students from the following subject areas were interviewed: Institute of Pedagogy and Psychology, Institute of Foreign Languages, Institute of Chemistry and Biology, Institute of Geography, Institute of History (the pedagogical university); Department of Sociology, Department of Foreign Languages, Institute of Computer Engineering, Institute of Accounting and Auditing, Institute of International Business and Management (the economic

university); Department of Social Medicine, Health Protection with Medical Statistics, Department of Pharmaceutical Chemistry, Department of Normal Physiology, Institute of Medico-Biological Problems, Institute of Medicine (the medical university). In the case of the problem caused by interviewees' refusals to follow my interview scenario, a decision was made not only to focus the analysis on what was found out during the research, but also on what they refused to answer and possible reasons for those refusals.

### 1.2.5. Data Analysis

Four sources of information were used for my analysis of addressing gender equality in higher education: documents related to the implementation of the national MDG "Gender equality," official websites of the three universities in Ternopil, a report from the pedagogical university human resources office about the amount of the university workers by gender, and interview transcripts. Different approaches were used for the analysis of the information needed for answering each of my specific research questions. I used document analysis for answering research questions 1 and 2<sup>3</sup> because these questions relate to the international and national levels of policy implementation. I used interview analysis and data from university human resources offices and university official websites to answer my research questions 3 and 4<sup>4</sup> because these methods allowed me to assess not only whether there was implementation at the local level, but the meaning of this implementation or lack of people's awareness of implementation and assess more closely the reasons for potential non-compliance at the local level. The answers to these two questions were searched in two steps. First, three levels of the implementation of the aspects of the act were identified on the basis

---

<sup>3</sup> Research question 1: What is the meaning of effective addressing of the question of gender equality in higher education of Ukraine?

Research question 2: How was the question of gender equality in higher education adapted from the UN MDGs context to Ukrainian MDGs context, and how has this questions been implemented on the national level?

<sup>4</sup> Research question 3: What aspects of the Ukrainian act About the Implementation of the Principles of Gender Equality in Education, that relate to higher education, have been implemented on the university level?

Research question 4: What is the effect of addressing of gender equality in higher education on the international and national levels on the way gender equality is addressed on the university level of Ukraine?

of interview results, university websites and data from human resources offices analysis. I have identified the following levels: first, the actual fact of implementation, second, people's awareness of the implementation and the content of what is being done, third, preservation of the original purpose of the aspects to promote gender equality. Second, I conducted comparative analysis of the levels of implementation of the act, which were supposed to be implemented at the three universities.

In this chapter, I have situated my argument in the existent scholarship that deals with policy transferring and definitions of gender equality. The scholarship proves that inconsistencies can emerge in the transfer of the MDGs from the UN level to the lower levels. Inconsistencies are caused by the following issues: lack of UN control over ensuring comparability of the results of individual countries, the tendency of the countries to implement the goals by presenting visible results without solving actual problems, absence of awareness raising of the importance of the progress towards the MDGs. I have also presented in this chapter the definitions of gender equality provided in the scholarship. Gender equality is distinct from gender parity as the former definition encompasses equality of opportunities, whereas the latter one deals only with equality of numbers. Finally, I have explained my methodology, which is document search, that I used to study the policy transfer from international level to the national level, and a case study, which I utilized to study the effect of policy transfers and people's attitudes to gender equality at the local level.



## **Chapter II. Inconsistencies in Adoption and Transferring of the Millennium Development Goals**

By reviewing literature on policy transfer, I have shown that the problems with addressing gender equality in higher education in Ukraine could have originated from this process. My central argument of the thesis suggests that the question of gender equality as part of the UN Millennium Development Goal “Gender equality and empowerment of women” is not addressed effectively in higher education of Ukraine. In this chapter, I first address one of the origins of this problem – the inconsistencies that were present in the implementation of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and misinterpretation of the definition of gender equality by these goals on the UN level, which is the international level here. I then go on to the analysis of how these inconsistencies and misinterpretations of the definition of gender equality were increased as they transferred to the national level of Ukraine.

### ***2.1. International Framework of the Millennium Development Goals***

In this section I discuss inconsistencies in the process of the implementation of the MDGs at the UN level in order to understand a reason for the distortion of the UN policies related to the MDGs when they were transferred to the national level of Ukraine. In addition to this, I will pay specific attention to the analysis of the UN MDG 3 “Gender equality and empowerment of women” to show that the question of gender equality was inadequately addressed by the UN in the process of adoption of the goals.

#### **2.1.1. Implementation at the UN level**

The idea of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) has its roots in the UN Millennium Declaration.<sup>5</sup> This document was written by the General Assembly of the UN, and adopted at the first Millennium Summit (New York, 2000) by 189 member states of the

---

<sup>5</sup> UN Millennium Declaration (2000). Retrieved from <http://www.un.org/millennium/declaration/ares552e.pdf> (accessed May 12, 2012), (herefrom the declaration)

UN. 147 heads of states, including the Ukrainian president, signed the Declaration, committing their countries to fulfill the declaration by 2015.

Although many scholars (e.g. Antrobus, 2006; Bhalla, 2003; Heyzer, 2005; Aikman et al., 2005) refer to this declaration as the place in which the MDGs have been defined, I argue it is not so. The declaration included the identification of key values for the efficient international relations and improvement of life globally. The countries that signed the declaration became committed to achieve these values by 2015. The following values have been identified in the declaration: Freedom, Equality, Solidarity, Tolerance, Respect for nature and Shared responsibility. However, these values were too abstract and broad to be achieved in any comparable manner transnationally.

The MDGs were written by the secretary-general Kofi Annan a year later as the plan for the fulfillment of these values – the translation of the identified values into concrete objectives, again all to be achieved by 2015. The goals were spelled out in the follow-up document of the Millennium Declaration, which is known as *Road Map Towards the Implementation of the United Nations Millennium Declaration* (2001).<sup>6</sup> Eight MDGs were written: first, eradication of extreme poverty and hunger; second, achievement of universal primary education; third, promotion of gender equality and empowerment of women; forth, reduction of child mortality; fifth, improvement of maternal health; sixth, combat of HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases; seventh, ensuring environmental sustainability; and eighth, development of a global partnership for development. Each goal was assigned one or more targets, and indicators were defined for the assessment of the implementation of the targets. No references were made in the Road Map document as to whether individual countries can change targets and indicators assigned by the UN.

---

<sup>6</sup> Road Map Towards the Implementation of the United Nations Millennium Declaration. Retrieved from <http://www.un.org/documents/ga/docs/56/a56326.pdf> (accessed May 12, 2012), (herefrom the Road Map)

The Road Map document was not signed by the heads of the states. This fact means that the MDGs could be considered to be non-binding. Indeed, states are cajoled to commit to the implementation of this Road Map, but on the understanding that the Road Map can only be a suggestion (however strong). “States need to demonstrate the political *will* to carry out commitments already given” (p.7). This document just “outlines potential strategies for action that are designed to meet the goals and commitments made by the 147 heads of State and Government” (p.2). It looks like the UN was not comfortable offering the MDGs as some sort of non-binding amendment to the binding declaration.

An attempt to improve such an uncomfortable position was made by Kofi Annan and UNDP administrator Mark Malloch Brown by organizing the UN Millennium Project (2002).<sup>7</sup> The UN Millennium Project was a three-year action plan, the purpose of which was to accelerate progress towards the achievement of MDGs by UN countries. The action plan was to conduct research in the areas related to the values identified in the Millennium Declaration and identify the most effective strategies for meeting the MDGs. The project report (2005)<sup>8</sup> states that the MDGs, regardless of their global status, are country goals, and thus, countries are responsible for designing national strategies to reach the MDGs. These strategies came to be referred to as activities for the implementation of the goals. Declaring the responsibility of the countries for the definition of the activities for the implementation of the goals means shifting the responsibility for the implementation of the MDGs from the UN to the countries.

The second and third Millennium Summits (New York, 2005 and 2010) followed the already mentioned Millennium Project report. The purpose of these summits was to reaffirm the Millennium Declaration. In addition to this, determination was expressed at the two

---

<sup>7</sup> Official website of the Millennium Project  
<http://www.unmillenniumproject.org/index.htm> (accessed May 12, 2012)

<sup>8</sup> Millennium Project Report “Investing in the Development: A Practical Plan to Achieve the Millennium Development Goals” (2005). Retrieved from  
<http://www.unmillenniumproject.org/documents/MainReportComplete-lowres.pdf> (accessed May 12, 2012)

summits to ensure the timely realization of the MDGs. This determination is reflected in the summits outcome documents.<sup>9</sup> On the one hand, the purpose of the summits stated reviewing the progress of the countries towards the fulfillment of the declaration, and thus, the values outlined in it. On the other hand, notes that the countries' determination to achieve the MDGs implies that the focus has shifted from the reaching of binding values to the achievement of the unbinding MDGs. The idea of this shift is specifically demonstrated in the World Summit Outcome Document (2010), where the progress of the countries towards the MDGs, rather than values, is evaluated.

However, the fulfillment of the MDGs by the countries remained unbinding. The implied flexibility of the countries in achieving the MDGs partially explains a great number of inconsistencies in the attempts of the countries to implement the goals, which were transferred to them from the UN level. Missing data in the MDG progress reports from some countries, the reconfiguration of the amount and names of the goals, changes of the essence of goals by altering the UN's assigned targets and indicators can all be found in the annual country reports that have been published by the UN. These reports are also further evidence, in addition to the outcome documents of the summits, of the shift in the emphasis from the fulfillment of the values defined in the declaration to the fulfillment of the MDGs, and these goals were not necessarily defined in accordance with the values that were outlined in the declaration. In the next section I will exemplify the lack of such accordance by discussing goal 3 "Gender equality and empowerment of women," from which derives the specific issue of gender equality in higher education.

---

<sup>9</sup> World Summit Outcome document (2005)  
<http://www.who.int/hiv/universalaccess2010/worldsummit.pdf> (accessed May 12, 2012)  
 and World Summit Outcome document (2010)  
<http://www.un.org/en/mdg/summit2010/pdf/mdg%20outcome%20document.pdf> (accessed May 12, 2012)

### 2.1.2. Millennium Development Goal 3 “Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women”

Goal 3 “Gender equality and empowerment of women” evolved from the value Equality from the Millennium Declaration. Equality was defined in the declaration as “equal rights and opportunities of women and men” (Declaration, 2000: 2). I think the idea of viewing gender equality in terms of opportunities, rather than solely rights, is productive for the achievement of gender equality. The term *opportunities* has a broader meaning than *rights* because the term *rights*, in this sense, means access. As I have shown in my chapter 1, such a distinction between opportunities and access is also mentioned by Arnot and Fennel (2008: 7). These rights for access, if any, might be devalued, if opportunities to exercise these rights are deprived, for instance, by women then receiving the extra burden of housework. Apart from this issue of the definition of gender equality in the declaration, there is a limitation. It can be noticed that *equality* only addresses the identities of men and women, rather than other identities, such as, for example, transsexual, transgender, and intersex people.

According to the explanation of the meaning of the value Equality in the declaration, the source of ensuring equality between men and women is seen in “Equal access [of both genders] to all levels of education” (Declaration, 2000: 5). Achievement of gender equality in education, including higher education, is viewed in the declaration as a facilitator of gender equality in other areas because education can give equal rights and opportunities for men and women in work.

The essence of the value Equality was altered when it was adapted to MDG 3 “Gender equality and empowerment of women” by Kofi Annan in the Road Map document (2001). I think that the meaning of this goal and other goals is best understood through the targets and indicators that accompany the goals. Targets and indicators reveal the areas on which the efforts to achieve the goals should be focused. The following target has been assigned for MDG 3, “Eliminate gender disparity in primary and secondary education,

preferably by 2005, and in all levels of education no later than 2015” (Road Map, 2001: 56). Four indicators have been assigned for this target: first, “Ratio of girls to boys in primary, secondary and tertiary education,” second, “Ratio of literate females to males of 15-to-24-year-olds,” third, “Share of women in wage employment in the non-agricultural sector,” and forth, “Proportion of seats held by women in national parliament” (Road Map, 2001: 56). I might seem that the last three indicators do not relate to education; however, I think they are quite relevant in terms of implying that gender equality in education has an effect on the achievement of gender equality in other areas. And if there is gender equality in those other areas, it means that the target of the goal has been achieved. This idea is concordant with the idea of the value Equality in the Millennium Declaration. Viewing achievement of gender equality as a source for the achievement of gender equality in other areas is productive. I think so because equal education for men and women gives equal rights for equal work and salaries. In addition to this, equal education provides awareness of the opportunity to have equal living conditions, and thus, awareness of the possibility to exercise this opportunity.

I think the idea of gender equality contained in the essence of MDG 3 also has negative sides. Understanding equality in terms of providing rights and opportunities, that was part of the value Equality in the declaration, was not reflected in the goal. Equality became viewed as parity in the numbers of males and females involved in education. Such an understanding of equality implies that it became a matter of representation of rights of access to education, rather than providing equal rights and opportunities. Equality can be evaluated as parity only if the deprivation of rights of access to education is a cause of the disproportion of males and females in education. However, lack of opportunities, mentioned earlier, is likely to remain even if rights are granted to those who were deprived of them. Therefore, I disagree that the achievement of gender equality is a matter of parity of numbers between

males and females. Such a disagreement is also explicit in Avalos' argument to separate the concepts of gender parity and gender equality (2003).

The idea of gender equality was described in a more complex way in the Millennium Project report (2005) and World Summit Outcome documents (2005; 2010), than in the Road Map document. I claim that this more complex description of gender equality is also more effective for the achievement of gender equality in other spheres. In the Millennium Project report, apart from the explanation of this phenomenon in terms of parity, the idea of improving women's opportunities to obtain education is recognized as important in achieving gender equality (Millennium Project report, 2005: 64). This improvement in women's opportunities is described as being dependent upon awareness raising in society aiming to overcome gender biases and violence against women (p.87; 88). The same ideas are reaffirmed in the outcome documents of the Millennium Summits (2005: 17; 2010: 18).

I think the way gender equality was addressed in the Millennium Project report and the two World Summit Outcome documents is effective for the achievement of gender equality. First, the idea that achievement of gender equality in education is productive for triggering further achievement of gender equality in other spheres. Equal education for men and women gives equal rights for equal work and salaries. This idea is also expressed by Arnot and Fennel (2008: 10). In addition to this, equal education provides awareness of the opportunity to have equal living conditions, and thus, and the awareness that it is possible to exercise this opportunity. Second, addressing the causes of women's lack of opportunities to gain education is effective because the elimination of these causes opens up opportunities to obtain education. However, the idea of judging the implementation of gender equality in terms of parity is ineffective. As I have already mentioned, parity does not reflect if rights and opportunities to access education are equal.

I have discussed in this section inconsistencies in the implementation of the MDGs on the UN level. I have noticed that unbinding status of the goals could be a potential reason for chaos in further transfer and implementation of the goals on the national level of Ukraine. I have also analyzed advantages of the focus of the goal related to gender equality on the achievement of gender equality specifically in education. However, I have suggested that the definition of gender equality in terms of parity might not be productive.

## **2.2. *Ukrainian Framework of the Millennium Development Goals***

In this section I explain how the inconsistencies in the implementation of the goals in general on the UN level transferred further to Ukraine and increased there. I also analyze in detail how the question of gender equality in higher education was downgraded in Ukraine, as we can see in the changes that were made in Ukraine to the UN goal “Gender equality and empowerment of women.” In order to argue that this question was downgraded without any valid policy reasons, I review the history of Ukrainian policy implementation on gender equality in higher education before the adoption of the MDGs. Finally, I show that this question was also ignored to some extent after the MDGs were transferred to Ukraine until 2009 when an act that specifically targeted the achievement of gender equality in education was issued. However, the act was not effective in terms of addressing gender equality.

### **2.2.1. Transferring of the International Framework to Ukraine**

According to the National Report of the MDGs (2010),<sup>10</sup> although the president of Ukraine signed the Millennium Declaration in 2000, the MDGs were adapted to national setting of Ukraine only in 2003 (p.32). This three-year delay in adopting the MDGs by Ukraine is evidently because of the delay in the adoption of the MDGs by Kofi Annan and the unbinding nature of the MDGs for the member-states of the UN.

---

<sup>10</sup> National Report of the MDGs (2010). Retrieved from [http://undp.org.ua/files/en\\_52412MDGS\\_UKRAINE2010\\_REP\\_eng.pdf](http://undp.org.ua/files/en_52412MDGS_UKRAINE2010_REP_eng.pdf) (accessed May 12, 2012)



When they were adopted and adapted in Ukraine, inconsistencies between the international and Ukrainian set of MDGs can be immediately seen. Only six goals out of the international eight goals were adopted (National report, 2003: 2).<sup>11</sup> Goal 8 “Development of a global partnership for development” was left out. Ironically, Ukraine did not recognize the assistance of the UN as important for Ukraine’s progress towards the achievement of the MDGs or, at least, the values. Goal 4 “Reduction of child mortality” and goal 5 “Improvement of maternal health” were merged into one Ukrainian goal “Improvement of maternal health and reduction of child mortality.” It is obvious from this merging of the two goals related to women’s issues that the issue of gender has already been downgraded. Moreover, goal 3 “Gender equality and empowerment of women” in the international set of the goals was moved to the last position in the list of Ukrainian MDGs. The words “empowerment of women” were not included in the name of this Goal in Ukraine, which was worded as following “Gender Equality.”

Further inconsistencies between the international and Ukrainian set of the MDGs can be traced in an analysis of the differences between the targets and indicators at the international and national levels. Targets and indicators were changed for the following goals: “Achieve universal primary education,” “Promote gender equality and empower women” and “Combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases.” The only two goals that remained unchanged were “Ensure environmental sustainability” and “Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger.”

It is hard to judge if Ukraine was authorized to make changes to the list of the goals and to amend targets and indicators for the goals. On the one hand, none of the UN documents prohibits such changes, which is obvious due to the nonbinding status of the goals to the countries. On the other hand, I see two reasons why such changes are not beneficial for

---

<sup>11</sup> National Report of the MDGs (2003). Retrieved from [http://www.forumpartnerships.zsi.at/attach/UA\\_03\\_NS\\_MoEEI\\_Millenniumgoals.pdf](http://www.forumpartnerships.zsi.at/attach/UA_03_NS_MoEEI_Millenniumgoals.pdf) (accessed May 12, 2012)

the countries and the UN. First, targets, and thus, indicators should ideally reflect the essence of the goal. Changing the targets and indicators would change the direction of the goal. In addition to this, the agency of the countries is explicitly recognized only in the statement from the Millennium Project report (2005) about the necessity for the design of national strategies by the countries (p.23). These strategies were also referred to as activities, rather than targets and indicators, for the implementation of the goals. The second reason why changes in the agenda of the goals are not beneficial for the countries and the UN is that measuring the successful achievement of the MDGs internationally requires transnational comparability. Annual reports of the UN on the progress of the countries towards the achievement of the goals and consequent advice of how to improve it requires comparability in the aspects of progress of the countries towards the achievement of these goals. Comparability can only be provided by preserving the same targets and indicators for the goals.

Ukraine followed its own MDGs agenda until 2009. Meanwhile, Ukraine published reports (2003; 2005; 2007; 2008) about its progress that reflect its achievements for all of the six goals. In 2009 the Ministry of Economy of Ukraine initiated a review of the MDGs and their respective targets and indicators in relation to the current trends of development in the country. As a result of this review, the Ministry recognized that improvements to the process for achieving the goals had to be made, and changed the 2003 agenda of the national MDGs. These changes were reflected in the National Report (2010), which is the last accessible Ukrainian report at the present time on progress towards the achievement of the MDGs.

The most significant changes in the 2009 Ukrainian agenda for the MDGs were related to gender questions. 2009 was the year when the state started to pay more attention to gender questions. I infer this from two changes. First, Ukrainian goal “Improvement of maternal health and reduction of child mortality” was split back into two goals: “Reduction of

child mortality” and “Improvement of maternal health.” This was done apparently in order to pay more attention to the issues targeted by the goals. Consequently, a list of seven MDGs, rather than six, was introduced in Ukraine. Second, Ukrainian goal “Gender equality” was moved from the last position in the list of the goals to the third position, as it is in the list of the goals offered by Kofi Annan.

### **2.2.2. Ukrainian Millennium Development Goal “Gender Equality”**

The Ukrainian targets and indicators for the goal “Gender Equality,” have not changed since 2009. They show that despite the changes made to upgrade the issue of gender equality at that time, the essence of this goal is different from the international goal. The Ukrainian goal does not recognize that the achievement of gender equality in education would help achieve gender equality in other areas of life. I state this because the achievement of gender equality in education, which is the target of the international goal, was downgraded to one of the required activities to reach certain indicators of the two targets for this Ukrainian goal.<sup>12</sup>

It is worth emphasizing how the UN target “Eliminate gender disparity in primary and secondary education, preferably by 2005, and in all levels of education no later than 2015” was changed when it was interpreted as a required activity to reach the goal. The Ukrainian required activity to reach gender equality was worded in the following way, “Combat of gender stereotypes on all levels of educational system (from the primary), elaboration of gender friendly educational programs and textbooks.” On the one hand, this change implied stepping aside from the earlier explained ineffectiveness of the idea of parity in education for achieving equality in other areas. On the other hand, no explanation was provided for what gender stereotypes mean, so that they can be combated by new educational programs and

---

<sup>12</sup> Goals are structured in the following way by the UN: goal is sectioned into targets, targets – into indicators. In addition to this, countries are responsible to decide on the required activities (that are at the lowest position of the hierarchized structure of the goals).

textbooks. Furthermore, gender equality was not defined in the first national report, nor is gender equality defined in any further national reports that were published afterwards. This means that there is no working definition in Ukraine to move towards the achievement of gender equality, and suggests that if there is a lack of understanding on what constitutes gender equality then it has persisted. Further progress is unlikely to occur towards a poorly or not understood goal.

Ukrainian targets were formed on the basis of two indicators for the international goal. I argue this because the same ideas of parity in the government and equal salaries that are found in the Ukrainian targets of the goal “Gender equality” are present in two indicators of the corresponding international goal. Ukrainian targets are the following: “By 2015 in legislative and executive bodies of power achieve the gender ratio of at least 30 to 70 of each sex,” and “halve the gap in incomes between men and women till 2015” (National report, 2003) According to these targets, the idea of parity, ineffectiveness of which for reaching gender equality was explained earlier, was preserved in the essence of Ukrainian goal. Moreover, it reinforced the maintenance of the underprivileged position of women by aiming to increase the percentage of women in executive bodies of power, but still to keep this percentage lower than that of men. Striving to reach unequal representation of men and women in executive bodies of power does not reflect the idea of equality in any way.

As I have tried to show earlier, targets represent the area which is chosen as a focal point, the improvement of which would facilitate the achievement of the whole goal. Equal wages and legislature were chosen to be two targets of Ukrainian goal on gender equality. However, I have discovered that these areas were not specifically chosen as the areas, the achievement of gender equality in which, would help to reach gender equality in other areas of life. Ironically, these two areas seem to have been chosen for a simple bureaucratic reason. The national report (2003) that was a result of the evaluation of the situation related to the

MDGs in Ukraine and adoption of the goals in the country states, “Unfortunately, the present Ukrainian gender statistics carries out the monitoring of gender representation only at leading posts only among state officials” (p.21). So the issue of gender equality in education was downgraded (shifted down in the hierarchy of the structure of the goal) without any valid reasons.

### **2.2.3. Gender Equality in Higher Education in Ukrainian Policy Implementation before the Millennium Development Goals**

In order to be sure in stating that downgrading the importance of the question of gender equality in higher education in Ukrainian agenda of MDGs was not reasonable, I explored the history of the question of gender equality in higher education in Ukrainian policy implementation before the adoption of the MDGs. I have found that the idea of gender equality in higher education in Ukraine was addressed in the following three documents. First, *The International Pact about Economic, Social and Cultural Rights*<sup>13</sup> from 19/10/1973, that recognized the right of each person for education, including higher education, in its article 13. Second, *The UN Convention about Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women*<sup>14</sup> from 06/10/1999 was the first document which showed the connection between forbidding discrimination against women and the opportunity of achieving equality in the society. This document legalized in article 10 of part III “equal rights of women and men in the sphere of education” that guaranteed equal access of both genders to higher education and promoted the elimination of stereotypical ideas of the roles of men and women in education. Stereotypical ideas are not defined in the document. Third, *The Constitution of Ukraine*<sup>15</sup> from 28/06/1996 included the idea of gender equality in higher education in two of its articles. Article 24 “Citizens shall have equal constitutional rights and freedoms and shall

<sup>13</sup> International Pact about Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (1973). Retrieved from [http://zakon3.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/995\\_042](http://zakon3.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/995_042) (accessed May 12, 2012)

<sup>14</sup> UN Convention about Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (1999). Retrieved from [http://zakon1.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/995\\_207](http://zakon1.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/995_207) (accessed May 12, 2012)

<sup>15</sup> The Constitution of Ukraine (1996). Retrieved from <http://www.president.gov.ua/en/content/chapter02.html> (accessed May 12, 2012)

be equal before the law” was followed by the explanation that concerned the elimination of privileges or restrictions based on sex in education and professional training. Article 53 “Everyone shall have the right to education” stated that people should have equal opportunities in obtaining free higher education at state and communal educational establishments on a competitive basis. Equality of men and women was not referred to as gender equality in these documents, thus suggesting that the term gender is new in Ukraine and was apparently introduced to Ukrainian policy language with the adoption of the MDGs.

Although equality of men and women in higher education was mentioned in these documents, there was no specific plan of how to implement equality. The absence of such a plan implies the absence or insufficiency of the attempts, if any, to implement gender equality in higher education. Natalia Kutova’s 2001 evaluation of gender equality in Ukraine suggested that the gender equality in higher education advocated in these three documents was not implemented in practice at that time. The author claims that “in reality, equality is much more proclaimed than observed” (p. 130). So there were no reasons for the problem of gender equality in higher education to be underestimated and downgraded in the process of transferring of the international MDGs to the national level of policy implementation in Ukraine.

### ***2.3. Gender Equality in Higher Education and National Policy Implementation after the Adoption of the Millennium Development Goals***

I argue that the confusion in the interpretation of the international Millennium Development Goal 3 “Gender Equality” as a Ukrainian MDG resulted in lack of attention to the problem of gender equality in higher education at the national level of policy implementation. I argue this because until 2009 the status of gender equality in higher education in Ukrainian policies was basically the same as prior to the adoption of the MDGs. It was merely mentioned along with other areas where human rights were supposed to be

protected without any plans for actions on how to organize this protection or definitions of what the concept might mean in theory and practice. I have distinguished two periods in the history of gender equality in higher education in Ukraine after the adoption of the MDGs. These two periods were distinguished according to the degree of attention in addressing the problem of gender equality specifically in higher education.

The first period lasted from 2003 until 2009. In this period, education, higher education in particular, was not addressed separately from other areas where gender equality had to be achieved. In addition to this, it was mainly focused on the problem of the access of students to higher education and the problem of textbook's use of stereotypical gender roles. The first time equality of men and women in higher education is mentioned after the adoption of the MDGs in Ukraine is in the ratified *Facultative Protocol to the UN Convention about Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women* (2003),<sup>16</sup> which was originally issued in 06/10/1999. This protocol aimed to guarantee gender equality in all spheres of life, implying in higher education as well. I would like to emphasize that this protocol was the first document in which the term *gender equality*, rather than equality of men and women, was mentioned in Ukraine. This fact supports my earlier suggestion that the term gender equality came to the Ukrainian language from the context of the MDGs. However, no explanation of the term *gender* was provided either in this protocol, or in any other document issued in Ukraine. This fact again suggests that *gender equality* was misinterpreted or simply poorly understood as it was introduced into the Ukrainian policy language.

An important attempt to raise people's awareness of the questions of gender equality in different spheres of life, including the area of higher education, was the 05/09/2005 of *Program of Equal Opportunities and Rights of Women in Ukraine*<sup>17</sup> for 2008-2011. It is clear

<sup>16</sup> Facultative Protocol to the UN Convention about Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (2003). Retrieved from

[http://zakon2.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/995\\_794](http://zakon2.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/995_794) (accessed May 12, 2012)

<sup>17</sup> Program of Equal Opportunities and Rights of Women in Ukraine (2005). Retrieved from

that two of the assigned three years for the work of this program fall after 2009, which is already the second period I recognize here. However, I assign this document to the first period because the work of this program started before 2009, and it addressed higher education as one of many areas where gender equality had to be achieved, which is a characteristic feature of the first period.

This program was sponsored by the European Union and the United Nations Development Program in Ukraine organized by the European Union in different countries to facilitate the progress towards the achievement of the MDGs. *Program of Equal Opportunities and Rights of Women in Ukraine* was supposed to financially assist the implementation of training programs for “national and regional State officials responsible for gender policy implementation” (official website of the UNDP in Ukraine).<sup>18</sup> Specifically in higher education, this program was supposed to sponsor the creation of Centers of Gender Equality and university Departments of Gender Equality, and the organization of conferences and contests in Ukraine on gender related topics. According to the official document of the program, the following understanding of gender equality was to be promoted. Gender equality was viewed as “an innovative international project” that aimed at combating gender prejudices and providing equal opportunities and rights for women and men (p.2-3). Although the meaning of gender prejudices was not explained, the plan of the work of this program seemed to be a great promise to improve understanding of gender equality issues in Ukraine, and in higher education as specifically.

According to the official website of this program, the program assisted in the creation of three education centers of gender studies and five academic departments in the whole Ukraine. In addition to this, it assisted in conducting 2500 trainings for 50000 different

---

[http://www.undp.org.ua/images/stories/ua\\_11592EOWR\\_prodoc\\_ukr.pdf](http://www.undp.org.ua/images/stories/ua_11592EOWR_prodoc_ukr.pdf) (accessed May 12, 2012)

<sup>18</sup> Official website of the UNDP in Ukraine

<http://www.undp.org.ua/en/media/41-democratic-governance/1241-the-largest-in-eastern-europe-gender-project-comes-to-an-end-analyzes-results> (accessed May 12, 2012)



workers and officials. However, the results of my research that will follow in chapter 3 will demonstrate that there is great confusion in understanding gender equality even at the university in which such a center and department exist. Those findings prove that the quality of the work of the program has not been successful.

The adoption of this program in 2005 became a basis for the adoption of a new Ukrainian Law *About Providing Equal Rights and Opportunities for Women and Men*<sup>19</sup> from 08/09/2005. Article 21 of the Law “Providing equal rights and opportunities for women and men in the sphere of education” states the creation of equal access of both genders to education, reinforcement of culture free from gender stereotypes in terms of family roles, and compilation of textbooks free from gender stereotypes. This Law was supplemented by the act №1834 *About Adoption of State Program of Implementation of Gender Equality in Ukrainian Society until 2010*<sup>20</sup> from 27/12/2006, which also included a notice that gender equality in higher education should be supported. Obviously, gender equality was not paid a lot of attention to in this law and act. There are simple notices about the importance of gender equality in education as well as in other spheres, without explanations of how to achieve it and what actually is meant by gender equality. This again suggests that the issue of gender equality in general and in higher education specifically was downgraded from the international MDG level.

The second period in addressing gender equality in higher education started in 2009 and has lasted until the present time. It is characterized by addressing the problem of gender equality in higher education separately from the problems of gender equality in all spheres of life, and offers a plan of its implementation. As I have already discussed, this awakening of attention to gender equality in higher education in Ukrainian policies was accompanied by a

<sup>19</sup> Law About Providing Equal Rights and Opportunities for Women and Men (2005). Retrieved from <http://zakon2.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2866-15> (accessed May 12, 2012)

<sup>20</sup> Act №1834 About Adoption of State Program of Implementation of Gender Equality in Ukrainian Society until 2010 (2006). Retrieved from <http://zakon2.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/1834-2006-n> (accessed May 12, 2012)

rise of attention to gender issues in the Ukrainian agenda of the MDGs in general in 2009. In addition, this period is characterized by taking into consideration different components of higher education as the area for the achievement of gender equality. Only one document was supposed to start facilitating such a change. This document is known as act №839 *About the Implementation of the Principles of Gender Equality in Education*. I will analyze this document in the next section.

#### **2.4. Act №839 “About the Implementation of the Principles of Gender Equality in Education”**

Act №839 *About the Implementation of the Principles of Gender Equality in Education* from 10/09/2009 was issued by the Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine. This is the only act that targets the acquisition of gender equality specifically in education, and higher education in particular, by focusing on various areas which might contribute to the acquisition of gender equality in education. It is important to emphasize the relevance of the Act to the Ukrainian goal on gender equality. This act seems to be the outcome of the necessity to address the goal for the following reasons. First, obviously, it targets the achievement of gender equality which is also the aim of the earlier discussed required activity. Second, the achievement of all of the aspects of the act is required before 2015, which is the deadline for the achievement of the MDGs. Third, the act uses *gender equality* in its policy language, rather than equality of men and women. As I have argued earlier, such a change appeared in policy language in Ukraine after the implementation of the MDGs on the national level. Further analysis of eight out of twenty one aspects of the act, that are related specifically to promoting gender equality in higher education, suggests that the Ukrainian government had only a vague idea of what gender equality means and how it can be achieved.

The first aspect of the act which related specifically to higher education is aspect 7 “Continuing the implementation of courses of gender equality at higher educational

establishments of I-IV levels of accreditation.” The way this aspect is worded suggests that courses of gender equality started to be implemented before the act was issued. As I will argue in my chapter 3, it is true that discussions about gender were included in some courses even before the act was issued. However, as I will show, gender was not viewed from the perspective of gender equality within those courses. Therefore, stating the necessity to “continue” implementation of such courses either presupposed letting the idea of gender equality be further overlooked in the courses related to gender, or that the Ukrainian Ministry was unaware of the existing inadequate discussion of the question of gender equality on the university level. Moreover, no references are made in the act as to who is supposed to teach such courses. Implementation of the courses in Ukraine, no matter how they represent gender equality, is a decision that impacts all students, because the Ukrainian curriculum is fixed, and thus, does not allow students to select many of their courses. There are four levels of accreditation, which stand for the level of recognition of the activities at universities, funding they have for those activities, requirements for teaching and learning processes, etc.

Another aspect of the act related to higher education is aspect 8 “Broadening the chain and activate the work of educational and research gender centers, laboratories, which work in cooperation with higher education.” According to this aspect, some educational and research gender centers were supposed to already exist before the act was issued. According to Kutova (2001), there had been such centers in Kyiv, Harkiv and Odesa since the 1990s (2001: 138). Activation of the work of these centers suggests that more work is supposed to be done at these centers after the act, which would then apparently impact more people. Broadening the chain of such centers means the creation of new centers. Kutova also emphasizes the division between teaching at HEIs and research, and states that research may be part of HEIs activities (2001: 133). This claim is useful for understanding why aspect 8 of the act suggests that research gender centers are supposed to work in cooperation with HEIs, implying that these

centers do not necessarily have to exist within universities. However, it is unclear how exactly these centers are supposed to cooperate with higher education.

Aspect 9 of the act is worded in the following way, “Conducting polling in higher educational establishments of Ukraine concerning the problem of the implementation of gender equality in higher education.” According to the act, this polling was supposed to be conducted by April of 2010. The requirement of this aspect is unclear because of the absence of an explanation of what polling about gender equality is, and what for what reason it was supposed to be conducted. If the aim of this polling was to find out the situation of gender equality at HEIs, it was illogical to implement other aspects targeting the achievement of gender equality in higher education without previous attempts to find out the peculiarities of the problem of gender inequality. The absence of guidelines also implies that the structure of the polling was going to be different at each university. This difference would make it impossible to find out the situation of gender equality because of the absence of comparable data from different universities.

The next aspect related to higher education is aspect 10 “Creating a database of literature sources for gender courses at higher educational establishments.” On the one hand, this aspect serves as a facilitator of the implementation of aspect 7, relating to gender equality courses. On the other hand, aspect 10 does not provide an explanation of how this database can be created, and on what basis it can be created. Furthermore, the statement about the creation of such a database might suggest that no literature was available for the gender equality courses which existed before the act. This suggestion will be proved in my chapter 3 by the discussion of the gender equality course at the pedagogical university.

Another aspect related to higher education is aspect 11 “Organizing analysis of staff and faculty members of higher educational establishments by gender.” According to the act, this analysis was supposed to be conducted in 2010. The purpose of this aspect is unclear. If

the aim of this analysis is to assess the situation of gender equality at HEIs, it is again illogical to implement other aspects targeting the achievement of gender equality without previous attempts to find out the peculiarities of the problem of gender inequality. If the aim was to assess the situation as part of an ongoing evaluation of how gender equality is being implemented. It is strange that such an analysis was not required to be conducted periodically.

Aspect 13 of the act is the following, “Assisting in the creation of departments of gender equality at higher educational establishments.” These departments were supposed to be created by May of 2010. Assistance of the central division of higher education in Ukraine was required for the implementation of this aspect, according to the act. Again limited information about the way this aspect is supposed to be implemented is provided. One of the drawbacks of this aspect is that it is unclear who is supposed to teach at such departments – for instance, professionals in gender equality have not been trained in Ukraine because of the absence of such an area of academic specialization before the act was published. Another drawback is that gender equality seems to be a very limited area for the work of the whole department.

Aspect 14 “Implementing training programs concerning the problems of gender equality for the faculty and staff members of higher educational establishments” requires that trainings had to be conducted during 2009 and 2010. Again, explanations of how these trainings should look, how often they should take place are missing. It is also unclear why they had to be conducted only in 2009 and 2010, since it would be logical to train new faculty and staff members who come to work at universities even after 2010 if gender equality is to be achieved.

The final aspect concerning gender equality in higher education is aspect 17 “Organizing discussions related to the problems of gender equality at student council

meetings.” It is mentioned in the act that these discussions should be organized on a regular basis. This aspect might suggest that such discussions could raise students’ awareness about the question of gender equality in higher education. However, I find the idea of imposing what students should discuss at their student council meetings obtrusive.

The meaning of effective addressing of gender equality in higher education in Ukraine should be similar to that found in the Millennium Project report and the two World Summit Outcome documents. Specifically, the achievement of gender equality in higher education should be considered as a way to trigger further achievement of gender equality in other spheres. Understanding the meaning and importance of gender equality, and thus absence of gender prejudices should enable people involved in higher education to recognize instances of gender inequality and find ways to combat it. This understanding should be developed by all people at higher educational establishments. Such awareness in gender issues would facilitate transmission of the ideas of gender equality and its importance to other spheres, such as, for instance, work, family, etc.

In this chapter, I have discussed inconsistencies in the process of the transfer of the MDGs by the UN to Ukraine and its result on the national level. In addition to this, I have paid specific attention to the analysis of the UN MDG 3 “Gender equality and empowerment of women” to show that the question of gender equality was inadequately addressed by the UN in the process of implementation of the goals on the UN level. Then I have analyzed in detail how the question of gender equality in higher education was downgraded in Ukraine. Finally, I have shown that this question was ignored to some extent after the MDGs were transferred to Ukraine until 2009 when an act that specifically targeted the achievement of gender equality in education was issued. However, as I have shown, it was not effective in terms of addressing gender equality.

### **Chapter III. Implementation of Act №839 "About the Implementation of the Principles of Gender Equality in Education" on the University Level**

I have explained the inconsistencies in the process of adoption of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) by the UN, the negative effect of those inconsistencies on the transferring of the MDGs to Ukraine and the confusion in addressing the question of gender equality on the national level. This chapter focuses on my case study results. I analyze the implementation of the eight aspects of act №839 *About the Implementation of the Principles of Gender Equality in Education* (see appendix 1) as this act is the only document in Ukraine that targets the acquisition of gender equality specifically in education, including higher education. It also represents a renewed and recent attempt to achieve MDG related to gender equality. I argue that the issue of gender equality has been only technically addressed on the level of universities, because the implemented aspects do not contribute to the promotion of gender equality, and there exists unaddressed misunderstanding of the essence and importance of the idea of gender equality. To analyze the implementation of the aspects, I use data from official websites and the libraries of the three universities. I also analyze the interviews with administrators, professors of gender equality courses, professors of other subject areas and students at the pedagogical, economic and medical universities in Ternopil. I also discuss the results from making petitions to rectors of each university to let human resources offices provide me with the information about the amount of university workers by gender.

My findings show that not all of the aspects of the act that relate to higher education have been implemented at the three chosen for my study universities in Ternopil. The largest number has been implemented at the pedagogical university and the least – at the medical. However, a lot of people are not aware of the aspects that have, indeed, been implemented. This suggests that the implemented aspects do not facilitate gender equality at the

universities. Furthermore, the purpose of some of the implemented aspects has been changed, and many do not seem to be promoting gender equality. Therefore, I have distinguished three levels related to the implementation of the act that I will analyze: first, the actual fact of implementation, second, people's awareness of the implementation and the content of what is being done, and third, promotion of gender equality. The results of this analysis of these levels are displayed in Table 1 (see appendix 5). I determined the first level based on the empirical evidence, and the last two based mostly on my analysis of interviewee's answers, but also on some empirical information as well.

### **3.1. Fact of Implementation**

I judge the fact of implementation from the information on the university official websites and literature in university libraries. In addition to this, I consider the existence of people who are involved with the implementation of certain aspects, for instance, professors of gender equality courses.

Aspect 7 concerning gender equality courses has been implemented at the pedagogical and economic university. Evidently, such a course exists at the pedagogical university because the printed program of the course *Preparation of the Youth for Family Life* states that this is a gender equality course (Program of the course, 2009). A gender equality course is also taught at the economic university. A printed program of the course *Basics of Gender Equality* (Program of the course, 2009) was found at the university library. In addition to this, two professors who introduced and teach this course at the Department of Social Work were found. Ironically, a printed program of the gender equality course *Gender Problems in the Sphere of Health Protection* (Collected volume of the programs, 2009) was found in the library of the medical university. However, the course has not been taught, according to the professor who created the program:

*- There was a direction that a plan of such a course had to be created. I do not remember where this requirement came from, I think from Kyiv. Our department was*



*assigned as responsible for this. ... So we made this curriculum. ...There was only this plan of the course, but the course has not been taught (interview 21).*

The fact that the program of the gender equality course was created, and the course has not been taught to students might result from the absence of sufficient control from the national level over the implementation of the act on the university level.

Aspect 8 related to broadening the chain of gender equality research center, activation of their work and cooperation with higher HEIs has been implemented only at the pedagogical university. The Center of Gender Studies was created in 2002 at the university, which was even seven years prior to the issuance of the act. Annual international conferences, the publication of conference materials<sup>21</sup> and contests of students' papers on topics related to gender problems are organized by this center since 2009. No information about the cooperation of this center with the economic or medical university was found on the official websites of the universities.

Aspect 10 related to the creation of literature sources for gender courses has been implemented at each of the three universities, since the earlier mentioned programs of gender equality courses are in the university libraries. In addition to this, the library of the economic university has a textbook for the course *Basics of Gender Equality*, and the library of the pedagogical university contains all the publications from the annual conferences that are organized by the Center of Gender Studies.

Aspect 13 related to the creation of departments of gender equality has been implemented only at the pedagogical university. Department of Pedagogy and Gender Equality was created on the basis of the Department of Pedagogy and Psychology with the financial assistance of the United Nations Development Program in Ukraine (collected volume, 2010: 8).

---

<sup>21</sup> Collected volume of the conference *Gender Competences of the Student Youth*. (2008). Ternopil: TNPU; collected volume of the conference *Gender and the Youth: European Challenges*. (2009). Ternopil: TNPU; collected volume of the conference *Gender Problems of Globalization: Ukrainian Realities and Opportunities*. (2010). Ternopil: TNPU.

Aspect 14 related to training programs on gender equality for staff and faculty members has been implemented at the pedagogical and medical universities. The pro-rector of the studies division at the pedagogical university claimed that such training programs for faculty members take place once every three month (interview 1), however, I could not verify this claim empirically. The decision was made that training programs on gender equality for professors took place at the economic university since two administrators, one professor of gender equality course, and one professor of other subject areas claimed the existence of such programs:

*- ...there was a training program on gender identity last year. It was in cooperation with Swedish people. We have a certificate that we passed those courses (interview 14).*

I was shown a certificate by the professor of a gender equality course who attended this training. The certificate verified the claim.

The implementation of the following aspects has not been supported at any university: aspect 9 concerning polling about the implementation of gender equality, aspect 11 about an analysis of university workers by gender, and aspect 17 concerning discussions related to the problems of gender equality at student council meetings. All of the respondents denied participating in witnessing or hearing about these issues. However, I can only base compliance on the answers of the interviewees, as no documentary source was available.

So the pedagogical university is the leader in implementation. This fact might suggest that the question of gender equality is categorized as a part of social sciences (the area of specialization of the pedagogical university). An example of an association of gender issues with social sciences can be traced in an answer of an administrator from the economic university:

*- I am sorry, but we teach economics to students here. Go to the pedagogical university, there might be something like this [department of gender equality] (interview 10).*

The existence of such an association was also proved by the prevailing association of gender issues with pedagogy and psychology by interviewees from all four groups at each university. For instance:

- *Maybe only courses in Pedagogy and Psychology are related to this topic [gender equality] (interview 4).*

- *...only psychologists can be good specialists in teaching courses that are related to gender issues (interview 6).*

- *... pedagogical university must have such a department [of gender equality], because there are people who do psychology, and psychologists should study these issues in depth (interview 10).*

The equation of gender equality issues and psychology by those involved with implementing aspects of the act suggests that the idea of gender equality is not associated with feminism, but rather with essentialist sciences.

### **3.2. People's Awareness**

If some aspects have been implemented, what is the level of awareness of people who are not involved directly in these new gender equality activities? I cannot judge this empirically, but rather rely on the rich data from my interviews. I have noticed a tendency for those at the pedagogically university to be aware to some extent of three of the five implemented aspects. Those interviewed at the economic and medical universities who are not involved directly with implementation have no such familiarity.

People at the pedagogical university tended to know about the existence of the gender equality course (aspect 7), Center of Gender Studies (aspect 8) and Department of Pedagogy and Gender Equality (aspect 13). Respondents of all four groups, except for one professor, knew of the fact of existence and nature of *Preparation of the Youth for Family Life* as a gender equality course. This might be because the rector of the university teaches it, and the course is mandatory for all students of the university. The existence of the Center of Gender Studies was known to all the interviewees. However, only administrators, as well as one

student who was a participant at one of the conferences organized by the center knew the types of activities the center is involved with. On the one hand, the work of the center is rather open to public, as all the materials from the conferences are published and made available through the university library. On the other hand, the statements of my interviewees suggest that the activities organized by the center are either not well-advertized or they are available only for certain people or are just ignored by many. The existence of the Department of Pedagogy and Gender Equality was known to all the interviewees. However, none of them knew what the department does, except that it offered the course *Preparation of the Youth for Family Life*. Indeed, its work in terms of gender equality is limited to teaching only this course. People at the pedagogical university tended not to know about the existence of literature for the gender equality course or training programs for faculty and staff members. It is obvious that no one knew about literature as I discovered that no literature was assigned for the students to read on this course (interview 6, 7). The fact that only one administrator knew about the existence of training programs on gender equality (interview 1) suggests that maybe those programs are only for certain people chosen by the university administration, just as in the case of the economic university, that I will address in this section.

None of the interviewees from the economic university, who were not involved with the work of the implemented aspects of the act, confirmed their awareness of any implementation of the act at their university. I think one reason why the existence of the gender equality course (aspect 7), literature for it (aspect 10), and training programs (aspect 14) is not known to such people is the lack of availability of basic information. For instance, the gender equality course *Basics of Gender Equality* is mandatory but available only for the students of the Institute of Social Work of the economic university (interview 13). Consequently, literature for this course is needed only by the students of this Institute. People from other

institutes or departments are not likely to use such literature as they tend to claim that gender equality is not their specialty, and that they do not need it:

- *...I work at this technical department, so I think it is not worth having this [discussions of gender equality] (interview 15).*

- *I do not think it [gender equality course] is important for economists (interview 17).*

The existence of training programs on gender equality was not known by the general public apparently because of the specific manner in which these programs are organized. The availability of such programs is not announced generally. It was clear from the interview with the professor who participated in the training that participants were selected for these trainings by the administration of the university:

- *Was this program only for the professors of your Institute of Social Work?*

- *No. It was for professors of this university who are interested in this, but we were selected (interview 14).*

The existence of literature for the planned but not taught gender equality course at the medical university is not known to people. It is so apparently because the topic of gender equality is not discussed at this university as it is considered unnecessary:

- *Since they [students] study... so much crap that does not relate to their specialty, they definitely do not need another one [discussions about gender equality] (interview 25).*

There exists a serious awareness problem related to the implementation of the aspects. It seems that people who are not directly involved with the work of the aspect do not have a possibility to get interested in this work because they do not know about its existence.

### **3.3. Promotion of Gender Equality**

In this section I address the third level of implementation of the act, i.e., promotion of gender equality. I show that the majority of the implemented aspects did not preserve such a purpose at the local level. I argue that the reason for this was the inconsistencies in the implementation of policies related to the MDGs that were transferred from the UN to the national level of Ukraine. *Act About the Implementation of the Principles of Gender Equality*

*in Education* did not contain any definition of gender equality. The meanings of the aspects of the act, and the way how those aspects should contribute to the promotion of gender equality were not explicit. Moreover, there was no previous work done to figure out the exact situation concerning gender equality at the university level, which would have been helpful to design the plan to promote gender equality in the act more effectively. This act also did not address the resistance of people involved with the universities to the idea of gender equality. This resistance was supported by confusion in defining the meaning of gender equality, and failure in recognizing the existing gender inequality at universities. I argue that for these reasons the purpose of the act was usually not preserved. One of the reasons for this was the problematic way of addressing gender equality on the national level. I want to prove the existence of resistance to the idea of promoting gender equality by conducting thematic analysis of the interviews with the four groups of people at the three universities.

Aspect 7 related to gender equality course at the pedagogical university is implemented without the preservation of the purpose to promote gender equality. *Preparation of the Youth for Family Life* reinforces heteronormativity, where women are placed in an underprivileged position in relation to men:

- ... *students are taught how to live a family life, what kind of relationships should be between a husband and a wife. ...Volodymyr Petrovych ...gives advice on how a men and a woman have to behave in different situations in order to avoid conflicts. ... When the wife is not at home, the husband can, if his wife trusts him, wash dishes and clean the house a bit. ...Men can even try cooking (interview 6).*

Based on in this example of the professor of how to avoid a conflict, provided by a student who took this gender equality course, house work is presented as a woman's domain. Moreover, family life is presented to students only from the position of heteronormative sexual relationships.

Only limited information about this course could be obtained from its teacher since he refused to follow my interview scenario and answered abruptly only some of my questions,

after getting to know my current academic field, which is Gender Studies. Lack of information from this professor restricts my ability to analyze his perspective on gender equality. However, this professor might have acted in such a reserved way because he realized that he is far from being a gender equality expert, and did not want to reveal this to me. He even refused to name his course to me:

- *What courses do you teach that are related to gender equality?*
- *I will tell you what courses I teach, and you can define yourself if they are related to gender equality or not (interview 2).*

Library search revealed that the program for this course was first published in 2005, it was only republished in 2009 with the addition of the explanation that this course is about gender equality. This fact is important as it suggests that this course was not supposed to promote gender equality. It just started to be presented as a gender equality course without any modifications of its previous content only in 2009 after the act that required a gender equality course be taught was issued.

*Basics of Gender Equality*, which is the gender equality course at the economic university, does not apparently promote gender equality either. Although this course was specially created as a gender equality course (even reflected in its name), it also falls into the trap of promoting heteronormativity with women's underprivileged position:

- *Students are interested in the idea how a woman can save the family and self-actualize herself at work... Young girls cannot imagine a combination of these roles. They imagine either a career or a family. This problem should be solved. They should know how to combine everything (interview 13 with the course professor).*

In addition to this, the professor stated, while explaining the reason why she taught that course, that she had a background in psychology, and claimed that psychologists are the best specialists in the area of gender issues as they know how men and women think and behave. This signifies the essentialist position of this professor in approaching gender, which actually should be deconstructed for the purposes of reaching gender equality (Love and Kelly, 2011: 228).

Aspect 8 related to gender research center, which is implemented only at the pedagogical university and seems to be the only implemented aspect which promotes the idea of gender equality. The activities of the Center of Gender Studies presents the idea of gender equality as a cultural value that stands for respect of equality of opportunities of different gender identities (collected volume, 2010).

The meaning as implemented of Aspect 10 concerning literature for gender equality courses can be judged on the basis of the analysis of the gender equality courses themselves. Neither *Preparation of the Youth for Family Life* nor *Basics of Gender Equality* promotes equality of opportunities of men and women. This fact suggests that the literature used for teaching these courses might do the same. Moreover, students are not required to read anything for the gender equality course at the pedagogical university:

- *So you did not have any assigned readings for Volodymyr Petrovych's [professor of Preparation of the Youth for Family Life] course, did you?*

- *No. We just had a course of lectures. (interview 6).*

- *...maybe if the requirements were bigger and there was some specific literature sources assigned for this course [Preparation of the Youth for Family Life] it could be considered to be very important (interview 7).*

Aspect 13 related to the creation of departments of gender equality has been implemented at the pedagogical university. However, nothing has, probably, changed since the modification of the name of the department. The available website list of courses that are taught by the faculty of this department demonstrates the availability only of the courses in pedagogy and psychology, including the earlier mentioned *Preparation of the Youth to Family Life*.

The implementation of aspect 14 relating to training programs on gender equality for staff and faculty members at the pedagogical at economic universities cannot be assessed, as no description of these training programs could be provided by interviewees. Most of them



were not aware of the existence of such programs. Furthermore, people who participated in such trainings were not willing to share information about the content of the programs.

After demonstrating that the majority of the implemented aspects did not preserve their original purpose of promoting gender equality, I argue that the reason for this is the unaddressed problem at the national level – the resistance of people involved with the universities to gender equality. This resistance is supported by the confusion in defining the meaning of gender equality, and also failure to recognize the existing gender inequality at universities.

### **3.3.1. Confusion of the Meaning of the Concept Gender Equality**

On the one hand, most of the respondents demonstrated their understanding of gender equality as equality of rights and opportunities of men and women. This definition seems to be productive for the promotion of gender equality. However, on the other hand, my respondents also expressed ideas which signify the existence of their resistance to the achievement of gender equality. The following three types of perceptions of the idea of gender equality were noticed. First, gender equality was referred to as an obtrusive new foreign idea which is not applicable to Ukraine. This idea is concordant with Arnot and Fennel's (2008) view that gender equality can sometimes be viewed as a "Western version of modernization" (p.3), however, my findings show that such modernization is not welcomed. Second, it was explained as an idea that contradicts nature and destroys, when it is exercised, heteronormative family, and thus, causes nostalgia for the past heteronormative relationships between the two genders that were perceived as perfect. Third, gender equality was perceived as an unimportant topic that should only be of interest to the people who want to deal with it on the academic level, rather than a social problem that should be addressed. The results of these observations are presented in Table 2 (see appendix 6).

Not only did administrators, professors of other than gender equality subject areas and students, but also professors of gender equality courses, express resistance to the idea of gender equality.

*- ...the importance of this problem [gender equality] is exaggerated to some extent abroad. It is invented in many respects. ...I can say that gender equality should have its limits. ... They [people abroad] start saying that there should be equality in the family. No, there should be head of the family, the family is based on this, if you understand. ... we should not blindly copy what is going on abroad. It is true that a lot of families were destroyed because a woman decided that she wants to be equal to a man. (interview 14).*

*- [There is] gender catastrophe. Nowadays, the majority of men in Ukraine became infantile. ... There are studies of the youth that prove that young people are androgynous.... Along this comes a total destruction of the family. ... They [men and women] were told that they are the same. But I am sorry, if they are the same, I can be pregnant first part of the time and you, man, should take my pregnancy and be with it for the other part of the time. Equality is equality. Obviously, there should not be equality. ... And It is terrible. You should not do this. This is going against biology, against norms. If we [men and women] will think in the same way, nothing good will happen. A woman was created for a man with the purpose to help him avoid boredom. ... This is the aim with which her brain was created. ...if she has to go to work and earn money, perform political functions, be a public activist, sorry, it is not a woman any more but a multi-functional machine. ... You know it is good to keep in mind what other people are doing. But it is an absurd to think that if it is so good somewhere, so let's do the same here ourselves. (interview 21).*

*- ...there is even protest against this excessive gender equality. I even have an acquaintance from the Department of Pedagogy and Gender Equality. She is against of this name of the department, the inclusion of the words gender equality (interview 4).*

Negative attitude to the ideas related to the promotion of gender equality at the pedagogical university was discussed by a professor of gender equality course at pedagogical university:

*- Informational war started against gender [gender equality]. ...[there are] negative statements about gender [gender equality] on the pillars on the streets (interview 2).*

People seem to misunderstand the idea of gender equality and the reason why they need it. Therefore, policies in the area of the promotion of gender equality are considered to be not a tool for the effective controlled implementation of gender equality, but as a tool for the intrusion of the ideas that are resisted. If professors of gender equality courses do not

consider gender inequality to be a serious problem and, moreover, argue against the ideas of gender equality, any progress of the universities towards the achievement of gender equality in higher education by the implementation of act №839 becomes impossible.

### 3.3.2. Failure to Recognize Gender Inequality

Most of people are able to define gender equality as equal rights and opportunities of men and women. However, most of the interviewees tended to claim that gender inequality is absent in higher education in Ukraine, and at their university specifically, while at the same time providing instances of inequality without recognizing them as such. I argue that this is one of the reference points for the inconsistencies on the national level of policy implementation, because this failure in recognizing the existent gender inequality supported resistance that was not addressed in any way by the government. Failure in recognizing the existing gender inequality was shown in the following: first, not recognizing inequality when men are underprivileged; second, not recognizing the extra burden of women's labour caused by housework and childbearing, in addition to employment as inequality; third, essentialising physical and psychological differences between the two genders and perceiving inequality caused by it as a norm. The results of these observations are presented in Table 3 (see appendix 7).

People tend to claim the absence of gender inequality even if underprivileged position of men, in comparison to women, is mentioned. It might be caused by identification of gender inequality as women's problem:

- *Do you think there is a problem of gender equality in any area of higher education in Ukraine?*
- *Quite the contrary. If we look at the number of men and women, there are over 80% of women employed at that university (interview 11).*
- *Girls have better attitude from professors. If the knowledge of boys and girls is the same, girls may get a better grade, because there are very few of them, and we respect them (interview 15).*

Extra women's labour burden is caused by housework, and bearing and raising children. It is not recognized as a cause of inequality between men and women. This inability to recognize this extra burden as inequality was noticed in the following interviewees' assumptions. First, the lack of women in some spheres is caused by women's choice not to be present in those spheres, rather than by their inability to manage some type of work together with house labour and child rearing. Second, the ability of women to manage both employment and house work is considered to be a skill leading to women's self-actualization, and thus, gender equality, rather than to inequality.

*- Let me tell you the results of my own research. I am chief editor of a journal where those people who want to be candidates of sciences and doctors publish their articles. We have such a journal History of Ukrainian Geography. So 63% of men and 37% of women publish their articles and intend to get degrees. But this does not mean anything. Maybe a woman does not want to study for those degrees (interview 4).*

*- Students are interested in the idea how a woman can save the family and self-actualize herself at work. ... Young girls... imagine either a career or a family. ... They should know how to combine everything (interview 13).*

Instances of gender inequality tend to be unrecognized also because they are perceived as a result from biologically determined differences in social roles of men and women, and their intellectual and physical abilities that are considered to be a norm.

*- I do not see any expressions of gender inequality. I do not know. These international students who come to us from some Eastern countries tend to have an arrogant attitude towards female professors. We had this. I do not know if this is gender inequality. But these are their traditions of their countries in the East...*

*- Are these radical views expressed by male or female students?*

*- Male students. Their girls know their place, and they do not forget about their place here as well (interview 20).*

*- There are situations in the learning process at the departments where there are more male professors and students, they say that if something is hard for girls to look at or listen to, they can leave the classroom. Girls are not made to do something that they cannot do (interview 26).*

Apart from the three ideas in which failure to recognize gender inequality tends to be expressed, people seem not to notice underprivileged position of women in the fact that top management of universities is represented solely by males. I managed to get a report (see

appendix 4) about university workers by gender only from the pedagogical university. It suggests such a tendency. Although there are more female faculty members, there are more men who are heads of departments (29 men and 21 women). Furthermore, all of the deans, pro-rectors, and the rector are males. So there is definitely gender inequality in top management positions at the university, which was shown to be unrecognized by most of the interviewees at this university. One of my interviewees mentioned a similar tendency at economic university:

- *There were 1/3 of women and 2/3 of men in top management, meaning rector and pro-rectors, until the last year. But I think there are more than 1/3 of women in the sphere of some lower levels of management (interview 12).*

Failure in recognizing gender inequality is an obstacle on the way of achieving gender equality. Almost all of the interviewees are unable to analyze situations and recognize evident instances of gender inequality. This leads to the perception of the discussions related to the promotion of gender equality as unneeded. Such an attitude to the ideas of gender equality might be the reason why the purpose of the implemented aspects of the act, which was to promote gender equality, was usually not preserved. This absence of the idea to promote gender equality by the implemented aspects devalues the actual fact of implementation of those aspects and even the awareness of general public about the implementation of the aspects and their work.

In this chapter, I have discussed the shortfalls of the implementation of act №839 *About the Implementation of the Principles of Gender Equality in Education* on the university level found from my case study. I have shown that the question of gender equality failed to be addressed effectively on the university level as a result of problematic policy transfer from the upper levels and poor definitions of gender equality on those levels. Misunderstandings in the definitions were passed on, inconsistencies multiplied, resistances to the issues of gender equality were not overcome. The result was that gender equality was addressed only

technically on the university level, which is not sufficient to achieve the gender equality in higher education.

## Conclusions

The question of gender equality as part of the UN Millennium Development Goal “Gender equality and empowerment of women” is probably not addressed effectively on the university level in Ukraine. This problem is connected to misunderstandings of the concept of gender equality on the international, national and university levels, and inconsistencies of the top-down MDGs policy transfer that did not solve, rather increased, the problem with misunderstanding the concept of gender equality.

There were inconsistencies in the implementation of the MDGs by the UN, which is the international level here. The idea to write the MDGs came to Kofi Annan with a delay, which affected compliance of the UN countries to implement the MDGs. The majority of the UN member-states became committed to implement only the defined values in the Millennium Declaration (2000), which was the outcome document of the first Millennium Summit. The values were defined too broadly. This implied impossibility to track the progress of the countries towards the implementation of those values because of the absence of any points of reference for comparability in the results of the counties. The MDGs were spelled out finally in the UN Road Map document (2001), which was not signed by the countries. This fact meant that the goals and their structure, i.e. their amount and order, their targets and indicators, were not binding for the countries that signed the declaration. The nonbinding status of the MDGs resulted in a lot of inconsistencies in the process of transferring of these goals to the national level, as we can see in the case of Ukraine.

Apart from general inconsistencies with the adoption of the MDGs, that affected the way the goals could have been transferred to Ukraine, the framing of the goal “Gender equality and empowerment of women” was also problematic. The trouble was that the assigned target and indicators for this goal reflected the idea that gender equality meant the same as gender parity. As I have stated in the theoretical framework for my analysis, parity

and equality are not the same issues because parity does not resolve the problem with the achievement of equality in opportunities.

Inconsistencies in the implementation of the MDGs on the UN level and framing of the goal concerning gender equality led to inconsistencies in the transferring of the MDGs to the national level of Ukraine (2003), and ineffective addressing of these goals on that level. Ukraine made large scale changes to the UN MDG agenda, and no doubt the nonbinding status of the MDGs contributed to Ukraine's decision. In making these changes, Ukraine changed the 'essence' of the goal related to gender equality. Achievement of gender equality in education which was the only target of the UN goal related to gender equality was downgraded for no valid reasons. The question of gender equality in higher education in Ukraine was downgraded to the level of the required activity to reach indicators, and hence, targets of the Ukrainian goal "Gender equality." This implied the recognition of gender equality in higher education as an issue of little importance.

The downgrading of gender equality in higher education in the process of transferring of the UN MDGs to Ukraine was followed by a long period in which the subject received little attention in the policy documentation (unsurprisingly perhaps given the downgrading) and thus, it could not have been addressed in practice. Attention to implementation was really given in 2009, when the act About the Implementation of the Principles of Gender Equality in Education was issued. Eight aspects of this act related to the promotion of gender equality specifically in higher education. However, this act was problematic for a number of reasons. Gender equality was not defined in it. The meanings of the aspects of the act, and exactly how the fulfillment of these aspects would contribute to the promotion of gender equality were not made explicit. There was no previous work performed to figure out the exact situation in regard to gender equality at the university level, which would have been helpful in order to design an effective plan for the promotion of gender equality.



Problems with the implementation of the MDGs on the UN level were added to by more problems in addressing the goals on the level of the Ukrainian government. When these problems transferred to the university level, the inconsistencies again multiplied and gender equality seems, in the case of Ternopil at least, to have failed to be addressed effectively. This failure can be seen at the following levels: first, the actual fact of implementation, second, people's awareness of the implementation and the content of what is being done, third, preservation of the original purpose of the aspects to promote gender equality. I have found out that the pedagogical university was the leader, according to the fact of implementation of the aspects. Five out of eight aspects have been implemented at this university. Three out of eight aspects have been implemented at the economic university, and only one aspect has been implemented at the medical university. However, the fact of implementation is undermined by the other two levels that I examined. There was noticed a tendency amongst those people I interviewed who were not involved with the work of the implementation to not know either about the existence of such implementation or about the actual work of the implemented aspects. Moreover, people who were involved with this work intimately tended to overlook their original purpose to promote gender equality. This was caused, I have argued, by the existing resistance to the idea of gender equality, the elimination of which has not been effectively addressed in any way by the international or national levels. Indeed, resistance has not even been challenged by the attempt to implement the MDG due to the problematic or absent definitions of gender equality at the upper two levels.

This resistance was supported by the following two factors. First, there was confusion in understanding the meaning of gender equality. Most of the interviewed people were able to define gender equality as equal rights and opportunities of men and women. This definition had a positive connotation for the promotion of gender equality. However, the attitude of

people to gender equality was negative, which was noticed in the following ways. Gender equality was referred to as an obtrusive new foreign idea which is not applicable to Ukraine and the degree of implementation of which is to be regulated. Gender equality was explained as an idea that contradicts nature and destroys, when it is exercised, heteronormative family, and thus, causes nostalgia for the past heteronormative relationships between the two genders that were perceived as perfect. Gender equality also tended to be perceived as an unimportant topic that should be of the interest of the people who want to deal with it on the academic level, rather than as a social problem that should be solved.

Second, negative attitude to the idea of gender equality was also at the heart of people's failure to recognize existing instances of the violation of gender equality at universities. Failure in recognizing the existing gender inequality could be seen in the following: first, lack of recognition of inequality when men are underprivileged; second, lack of recognition of the extra burden on women's labour caused by housework and childbearing, in addition to employment, as inequality; third, essentialising physical and psychical differences between the two genders and perceiving inequality caused by it as a norm.

As a consequence, even if the final report of 2015 about the implementation of the MDGs by Ukraine demonstrates the achievement of gender equality, attitudes and lives are unlikely to have changed in the higher education sector. However, there is not such an issue as blame here. None of the three levels, the international, the national or the local, can be blamed in the case of gender equality in Ukrainian universities. There were problems in the implementation of the MDGs in general and the goal related to the gender equality in particular at each level.

My research provided the analysis of the reasons of failure of the top-down implementation of gender equality in Ukraine. Based on my findings, I can say that policy implementation in the opposite direction, from the bottom, that is, from the level of

universities, is not likely to be possible in higher education of Ukraine, because of the resistance against the ideas of gender equality on the ‘bottom,’ which is the level of universities. Therefore, it is valid to analyze and correct the mistakes, made in the process of the top-down implementation, which was at least efficient in the sense that there was no resistance to gender equality on the ‘top’ which is the UN level. Here are a few thought how this could have been done in a different way.

The UN definition of gender equality in terms of parity already demonstrated misunderstanding of the idea of gender equality, which was doomed not to promote the equality of opportunities of women. The definition of gender equality as opportunities and ways to achieve them, provided in the Millennium Project report and the World Summit Outcome documents, might have been more effective in the implementation of gender equality on the national level of the countries, including Ukraine.

It is very unlikely that the binding status of the MDGs would have changed anything for Ukraine, as there were problems with addressing gender equality in higher education on the national level as well. Even if Ukraine started implementing gender equality earlier and issued the act of 2009 earlier, nothing would obviously change on the university level because of the ways the aspects of the act were created and outlined.

However, explicit definition of gender equality, definitions of the ideas stated in the aspects, the ways and aims of their implementation would have been helpful for a more effective implementation of the act at universities. The association of gender equality with feminism should have been explicitly stated. Such an association was missing in the documentation of Ukraine. Obviously, it could not have appeared on the local level itself. The idea that gender inequality is a social problem, rather than an area of academic interest of people who are involved with the field of social sciences, should have been put forward.

However, effective needs assessment before writing the act – finding out what the situation with gender equality is – would be essential to put forward more concrete and effective changes. Evidence of the existing resistance against gender equality and inability to notice the instances of inequality would be targeted to overcome. The evidence of such resistance would hopefully raise the question of training professors who would then teach gender equality courses or administrators who would organize training programs on gender equality for university workers. Cooperation with foreign professionals in the field of gender studies could be the most effective way to give the background knowledge for Ukrainian professor and administrators. Gender research centers could be one of the potentially suitable actors who could initiate such cooperation. These centers would influence universities because, according to the act, they were supposed to cooperate with higher education establishments. In addition to this, international connections of the center at Ternopil pedagogical university, for instance, in terms of organizing conferences could be expanded to other ways of experience exchange that would be helpful in designing trainings for professors on gender equality. Moreover, it would be productive to study the question of gender equality not as a separate limited area, but rather as one of the questions in the range of gender issues. Such an approach would eliminate problems with deciding on what the whole department of gender equality can be involved with. It would be more reasonable to have a department that would deal with a range of gender issues that could vary among the universities of different specializations. Consequently, there would be a chance for such departments to be successful because there would be more than actually one gender equality course to teach. Such an approach would also be productive in terms of understanding the interconnectedness of gender issues, including gender equality, with every sphere of life and type of activities in them.

In my thesis I have analyzed that the goal on gender equality in higher education Ukraine in the context of the MDG project is probably failing for a number of misunderstandings of definitions and inconsistencies in policy transfers. I have also suggested directions for building change in addressing the question of gender equality.

## Appendices

### **Appendix 1. Act №839 from 10/09/2009 “About the Implementation of the Principles of Gender Equality in Education” (extracts)**

Translated from Ukrainian.

Plan of actions concerning the implementation of gender equality in education [extracts]

№	Name of action	Time of fulfillment	Responsible for fulfillment
7	Continuing the implementation of courses of gender equality at higher educational establishments of I-IV levels of accreditation	On a regular basis	Institute of innovative technologies and the content of education (Udod O.A.), division of higher education (Bolyubash Ya.Ya.)
8	Broadening the chain and activate the work of educational and research gender centers, laboratories, which work in cooperation with higher educational establishments	On a regular basis	Division of higher education (Bolyubash Ya.Ya.), rectors of higher educational establishments
9	Conducting polling in higher educational establishments of Ukraine concerning the problem of the implementation of gender equality in higher education	By April 1, 2010	Division of higher education (Bolyubash Ya.Ya.), Institute of innovative technologies and the content of education (Udod O.A.)
10	Creating a database of methodological support of gender courses at higher educational establishments	2010	Institute of innovative technologies and the content of education (Udod O.A.), division of higher education (Bolyubash Ya.Ya.)
11	Organizing analysis of workers of higher educational establishments by gender	2010	Division of higher education (Bolyubash Ya.Ya.)
13	Assisting in the creation of departments of gender equality at higher educational establishments	By May, 2010	Division of higher education (Bolyubash Ya.Ya.)
14	Implementing training programs concerning the problems of gender equality for the workers of higher educational establishments	2009-2010	Division of secondary and pre-school education (Yeresko O.V.), department of post-secondary education, educational work and children's rights protection (Serednytska A.D.), Program of equal opportunities and women's rights in Ukraine of the Program of UN Development
17	Organizing discussions related to the problems of gender equality at student council meetings	On a regular basis	Ministry of education and science of the Autonomous Republic of the Crimea, managerial divisions of education and science of regional, Kyiv and Sevastopol state administrations

Source: <http://osvita.ua/legislation/other/4849/> (accessed May 28, 2012)

## **Appendix 2. List of Interviewees**

(interviews conducted between April 10-20)

### **Pedagogical University**

1. Buyak Bohdan Bohdanovych, administrator (pro-rector of studies division);
2. Kravets Volodymyr Petrovych, administrator (rector), professor of gender equality course (Department of Pedagogy and Gender Equality within the Institute of Pedagogy and Psychology);
3. Kikinezhdi Oksana Myhailivna, professor (Institute of Pedagogy and Psychology);
4. Ditchuk Ihor Lvovych, professor (Institute of Geography and Tourism);
5. Pushkar Oleg Ivanovych, professor (Institute of Geography and Tourism);
6. Martsenyuk Vadym, student (Institute of Chemistry and Biology);
7. Kykish Maryana, student (Institute of Foreign Languages);
8. Derkach Nataliya, student (Institute of Foreign Languages);
9. Shulga Iryna, student (Institute of Pedagogy and Psychology).

### **Economic University**

10. Adamyk Bogdan Petrovych, administrator (pro-rector of studies division (humanities));
11. Tybin Anatoliy Myhailovych, administrator (dean of the Institute of International Business and Management);
12. A, administrator (head of the Department of Foreign Languages);
13. Nadvynychna Tetyana Longinivna, professor of gender equality course (Department of Sociology within the Institute of Social Work);
14. Furman Anatoliy Vasylyovych, professor of gender equality course (Department of Sociology within the Institute of Social Work); and B, professor (Institute of Social Work);
15. C, professor (Institute of Computer Engineering);
16. D, professor (Department of Foreign Languages);
17. Yulya, student (Institute of Accounting and Auditing);
18. Hrustyna, student (Institute of Accounting and Auditing);
19. Kavun Alina, student (Institute of Accounting and Auditing).

### **Medical University**

20. Vadzyuk Stepan Nestorovych, administrator (director of the Institute of Medical-Biological Problems);
21. Lytvynova Olga Nestorivna, professor who created the program of gender equality course (Department of Social Medicine, Health Protection with Medical Statistics);
22. Doroshenko Oleksandr Volodymyrovych, professor (Department of Normal Physiology);
23. Pankiv Igor Bohdanovych, professor (Department of Normal Physiology);
24. Ziatkovska Neonila Yevgenivna, professor (Department of Normal Physiology);
25. E, professor (Department of Pharmaceutical Chemistry);
26. Tkachenko Hrustyna, student (Institute of Medicine);
27. Kulyk Vadym, student (Institute of Medicine).

### Appendix 3. Interview Scenario

<i>Groups of interviewees</i>	<i>Research question 3</i>		<i>Research question 4</i>
	<i>What aspects of act №839 from 10/09/2009 “About the Implementation of the Principles of Gender Equality in Education,” that relate to higher education, are implemented on the university level?</i>		<i>What is the effect of addressing gender equality in higher education on the international and national levels on the way gender equality is addressed on the university level in Ukraine?</i>
All groups			<p>1. Are you familiar with the meaning of the word “gender”? If yes, what is it?</p> <p>2. How would you define “gender equality”?</p> <p>3. Do you think there is a problem of gender equality in any area of higher education in Ukraine in general and at your university in particular? Is this problem important, and why?</p>
	Aspect 7 of the act: gender equality courses	Is there a course about gender related issues for the students of this university?	<p>4. Do you think such a course is important for the students of all majors, and why?</p> <p>5. Are gender issues addressed in any other courses that are not specifically related to gender equality? If yes, how? Is it important for them to be addressed, why?</p> <p>6. If they don’t know about such a course: Would you be interested to take/teach/administer gender equality course, why?</p> <p>7. Do you think professors of such courses should be professionally trained to teach gender equality courses, why?</p>
	Aspect 8: gender research centers	Is there a gender studies research center at your	8. If there is such a center, have you been involved with the work this



		university? If yes, what does it do?	center does? If yes, what was it?  9. If there is no center, do you think it is important to have one? Why?
	Aspect 9: polling in universities about gender equality	Have you administered or participated in, or heard about the gender analysis/polling at your university? If yes, when was it, what was it based on, how frequently was it conducted?	10. If yes, did this analysis encompass all of the aspects that the idea of gender equality, in your opinion, should have?  11. Do you think it is important to have gender equality in terms of numbers among staff, faculty and students, why? If yes, in all departments, why?
	Aspect 10: literature sources on GE in the libraries (for GE courses)/ I can also check this myself	Do you know if university library has any sources about gender issues?	12. If yes, do you use them and why?  13. What is the literature about?  14. Do you agree with the ideas in this literature?
	Aspect 11: analysis of university workers by gender	(except students)  Have you administered or participated in, or heard about any gender analysis of university workers at your university? If yes, when was it, what was it based on, what were the results, how frequently was it conducted?	(all groups)  15. Is specific gender important for certain university work positions (e.g. rector, secretary), why? If yes, give examples?
	Aspect 13: departments of gender equality	Is there a department of gender equality at your university? If yes, what does it do, professors of what academic background teach there?	16. Do you think it is important to have such a department, why?

	Aspect 14: Training programs on gender equality for professors	(except students)  Are there any training programs for faculty and staff members concerning gender equality? If yes, what are they about, what is the goal, how is the achievement of the goal tested?	(all groups)  18. Is it important to train professors of all subject areas in gender equality, why?
Professors who teach gender equality courses	Aspect 7 of the act: gender equality courses	What is the name of the course?  What is its goal?	Have you received any special training to teach this course?  Why do you teach this course?
	Aspect 10: literature for gender equality courses	What readings are assigned for this course? What are they about?  Where are the authors from?  When was the majority of the readings published?	Can you think of any recommendations that could improve this course?
Ordinary professors			Are gender related issues addressed in state curriculum of the courses that you teach? If yes, how? If no, do you think it is important that state curriculum addressed gender issues, why?
Students	Aspect 17: discussions about gender equality in student council	Have you participated in/heard about any discussions related to gender organized by student council office? If yes, what were they about?	
			Do you think certain subject areas should be taught by professors of specific gender, why?

## Appendix 4. Report from Pedagogical University Human Resources Offices

Translated from Ukrainian

Ministry of education and science of Ukraine, of the youth and sports of Ukraine  
Ternopil Volodymyr Hnatyuk National Pedagogical University  
46027, Ternopil, M.Kryvonosa Street, 2, tel. (0352)43-60-02, fax (0352) 43-60-55, e-mail:  
[info@tnpu.edu.ua](mailto:info@tnpu.edu.ua)

№66 from 20.04.2012

Reference given to Kushnir Iryna Yuriyivna,  
a student of Central European University

Some data about the workers of Ternopil Volodymyr Hnatyuk National Pedagogical University

	Total	Men	Women
Professors	510	206	304
Including			
Candidates of Sciences	314	119	195
PhD holders	48	26	22
Heads of Departments	50	29	21
Deans	10	10	0
Pro-rectors	3	3	0

Director of human resources office (signature) I.P.Kuzmovych

Copy of the original document



Міністерство освіти і науки України, молоді та спорту України  
ТЕРНОПІЛЬСЬКИЙ НАЦІОНАЛЬНИЙ ПЕДАГОГІЧНИЙ УНІВЕРСИТЕТ  
імені Володимира Гнатюка

46027, м. Тернопіль, вул. М.Кривоноса, 2, тел.(0352) 43-60-02, факс(0352) 43-60-55, e-mail: [info@tnpu.edu.ua](mailto:info@tnpu.edu.ua)

№ 66 від 20.04.2012 р.

На запит студентки Центрально-Європейського  
університету КУШНІР Ірини Юріївни

Окремі дані про склад викладачів Тернопільського національного  
педагогічного університету імені Володимира Гнатюка

	Всього	Чоловіків	Жінок
Викладачів	510	206	304
В тому числі:			
Кандидатів наук	314	119	195
Докторів наук	48	26	22
Завідувачів кафедр	50	29	21
Деканів	10	10	0
Проректорів	3	3	0

Начальник відділу кадрів

І.П. Кузьмович

## Appendix 5. Table 1

*Levels of the implementation of the aspects of act №839, that relate to higher education, on the university level*

		Aspects of act №839																							
		7			8			9			10			11			13			14			17		
Levels of implementation		F	A	P	F	A	P	F	A	P	F	A	P	F	A	P	F	A	P	F	A	P	F	A	P
Univ.	pedagogical	+	+	-	+	+/-	+	-			+	-	-	-			+	+	-	+	-		-		
	economic	+	-	-	-			-			+	-	-	-			-			+	-	-	-		
	medical	-			-			-			+	-	-	-			-			-			-		

Key: F – fact of implementation; A – awareness of people who are not directly involved with the work of the implemented aspect about the fact of implementation; P – preservation of the purpose to promote gender equality.

Source *Interview transcripts, official websites of the pedagogical, economic and medical universities, university libraries.*

## Appendix 6. Table 2

*Resistance to gender equality by group of interviewees and university*

		Foreign idea that needs regulation	Destructive force of the family	Unimportant topic that should be addressed only by the people who are interested in it
Ped.u.	Admin. (N)			1
	Prof. of GE course (N)			
	Prof. of other subj. Areas (N)	2	2	1
	Students (N)			3
Econ.u.	Admin. (N)	3		
	Prof. of GE course (N)	1	2	1
	Prof. of other subj. Areas (N)		2	2
	Students (N)			3
Med.u.	Admin. (N)	1		
	Prof. of GE course (N)	1	1	
	Prof. of other subj. Areas (N)	2	2	3
	Students (N)			2

Source *Interview transcripts*

### Appendix 7. Table 3

*Recognition of inequality in higher education by university and groups of interviewees*

Inequality in higher education		Pedagogical university				Economic university				Medical university				Total (N)
		Admin.	Prof. of GE courses	Prof. of other subj. areas	Stud.	Admin.	Prof. of GE courses	Prof. of other subj. areas	Stud.	Admin.	Prof. of GE courses	Prof. of other subj. areas	Stud.	
Yes (N)		1				1					1			3
No (N)				2	3	2	2	2	3			5	2	21
Instances of unrecognized inequality	Towards men (N)			2	2	1		1		1	1		1	9
	Women's extra labour burden (N)			3	2		2	1						8
	Inequality as a norm (N)			2	3	4	2	3		2	1	3	1	21

Source *Interview transcripts*

## Bibliography

Act №1834 About Adoption of State Program of Implementation of Gender Equality in Ukrainian Society until 2010 (2006).

Retrieved from

<http://zakon2.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/1834-2006-п> (accessed May 12, 2012).

Act №839 About the Implementation of the Principles of Gender Equality in Education (2009).

Retrieved from

<http://osvita.ua/legislation/other/4849/> (accessed May 12, 2012).

Collected volume of the conference *Gender and the Youth: European Challenges*. (2009). Ternopil: TNPU.

Collected volume of the conference *Gender Competences of the Student Youth*. (2008). Ternopil: TNPU.

Collected volume of the conference *Gender Problems of Globalization: Ukrainian Realities and Opportunities*. (2010). Ternopil: TNPU.

Collected volume of the Programs of Courses about the Problems of Gender Development. (2009). Kyiv: PTS "Foliant."

Constitution of Ukraine (1996). Retrieved from

<http://www.president.gov.ua/en/content/chapter02.html> (accessed May 12, 2012).

Facultative Protocol to the UN Convention about Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (2005). Retrieved from

[http://zakon2.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/995\\_794](http://zakon2.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/995_794) (accessed May 12, 2012).

International Pact about Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (1973). Retrieved from

[http://zakon3.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/995\\_042](http://zakon3.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/995_042) (accessed May 12, 2012).

Law about Providing Equal Rights and Opportunities for Women and Men (2005). Retrieved from <http://zakon2.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2866-15> (accessed May 12, 2012).

Millennium Project Report "Investing in the Development: A Practical Plan to Achieve the Millennium Development Goals" (2005). Retrieved from

<http://www.unmillenniumproject.org/documents/MainReportComplete-lowres.pdf> (accessed May 12, 2012).

National current progress report (2012). Retrieved from

[http://undp.org.ua/files/en\\_30316MDGs\\_progress\\_presentation\\_2012.pdf](http://undp.org.ua/files/en_30316MDGs_progress_presentation_2012.pdf) (accessed May 12, 2012).

National Report of the MDGs (2003). Retrieved from

[http://www.forumpartnerships.zsi.at/attach/UA\\_03\\_NS\\_MoEEI\\_Millenniumgoals.pdf](http://www.forumpartnerships.zsi.at/attach/UA_03_NS_MoEEI_Millenniumgoals.pdf) (accessed May 12, 2012).

National Report of the MDGs (2010). Retrieved from [http://undp.org.ua/files/en\\_52412MDGS\\_UKRAINE2010\\_REP\\_eng.pdf](http://undp.org.ua/files/en_52412MDGS_UKRAINE2010_REP_eng.pdf) (accessed May 12, 2012).

Official website of economic university.  
<http://www.tneu.edu.ua/> (accessed May 12, 2012).

Official website of medical university.  
<http://www.tdmu.edu.te.ua/eng/general/index.php> (accessed May 12, 2012).

Official website of pedagogical university.  
<http://old.tnpu.edu.ua/> (accessed May 12, 2012).

Official website of the Millennium Project.  
<http://www.unmillenniumproject.org/index.htm> (accessed May 12, 2012).

Official website of the UNDP in Ukraine  
<http://www.undp.org.ua/en/media/41-democratic-governance/1241-the-largest-in-eastern-europe-gender-project-comes-to-an-end-analyzes-results> (accessed May 12, 2012).

Program of Equal Opportunities and Rights of Women in Ukraine (2005). Retrieved from [http://www.undp.org.ua/images/stories/ua\\_11592EOWR\\_prodoc\\_ukr.pdf](http://www.undp.org.ua/images/stories/ua_11592EOWR_prodoc_ukr.pdf) (accessed May 12, 2012).

Program of the course *Basics of Gender Equality*. (2009). Ternopil: TNEU.

Program of the course *Preparation of the Youth to Family Life*. (2009). Ternopil: TNPU.

Road Map Towards the Implementation of the United Nations Millennium Declaration (2001). Retrieved from <http://www.un.org/documents/ga/docs/56/a56326.pdf> (accessed May 12, 2012).

UN Convention about Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (1999). Retrieved from [http://zakon1.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/995\\_207](http://zakon1.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/995_207) (accessed May 12, 2012).

UN Millennium Declaration (2000). Retrieved from <http://www.un.org/millennium/declaration/ares552e.pdf> (accessed May 12, 2012).

World Summit Outcome document (2005). Retrieved from <http://www.who.int/hiv/universalaccess2010/worldsummit.pdf> (accessed May 12, 2012).

World Summit Outcome document (2010). Retrieved from <http://www.un.org/en/mdg/summit2010/pdf/mdg%20outcome%20document.pdf> (accessed May 12, 2012)

Aikman, S., Unterhalter, E., and Challender C. (2005). The Education MDGs: Achieving Gender Equality through Curriculum and Pedagogy Change. *Gender and Development*, 13.1, 44-55.



Alston, P. (2005). Ships Passing in the Night: the Current State of the Human Rights and Development Debate Seen through the Lens of the Millennium Development Goals. *Human Rights Quarterly*, 27.3, 755-829.

Antrobus, P. (2006). Gender Equality in the New Millennium: Goal or Gimmick? *Caribbean Quarterly*, 52.2/3, 39-50.

Arnot, M. and Fennel, S. (2008). “(Re)visiting Education and Development Agendas: Contemporary Gender Research.” Gender Education and Equality in a Global Context: Conceptual frameworks and policy perspectives. Fennel, S., and Arnot, M., (Ed.). *New York: Routledge*. Retrieved from <http://recoup.educ.cam.ac.uk/publications/FennellandArnotBook08.pdf> (accessed May 28, 2012)

Avalos, B. (2003). *Gender Parity and Equality in Chile: A Case Study*. Background paper prepared for the Education for All Global Monitoring Report 2003/4. Retrieved from <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0014/001467/146745e.pdf> (accessed May 28, 2012)

Bhala, S. (2003). Crying Wolf on Poverty: Or How the Millennium Development Goal for Poverty Has Already Been Reached. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 38.27, 2843-2856.

Deacon, B. (2005). The Governance and Politics of Global Social Policy. *Social Policy & Society*, 4.4, 437-445.

Grunberg, L. (2001). *Good Practice in Promoting Gender Equality in Higher Education in Central and Eastern Europe*. Grunberg, L. (Ed.). Bucharest : UNESCO.

Haines, A. and Cassels, A. (2004). Can The Millennium Development Goals Be Attained? *BMJ: British Medical Journal*, 329.7462, 394-397.

Heyzer, N. (2005). Making the Links: Women’s Rights and Empowerment Are Key to Achieving the Millennium Development Goals. *Gender and Development*, 13.1, 9-12.

Hulme, D. (2009). *The Millennium Development Goals (MDGs): a Short History of the World’s Biggest Promise*. BWPI Working Paper No. 100, University of Manchester: BWPI. Retrieved from <http://www.bwpi.manchester.ac.uk/resources/Working-Papers/bwpi-wp-10009.pdf> (accessed May 28, 2012)

Johnson, R. (2005). Not a Sufficient Condition: The Limited Relevance of the Gender MDG to Women’s Progress. *Gender and Development*, 13.1, 56-66.

Kutova, N. (2001). *Good Practice in Promoting Gender Equality in Higher Education in Central and Eastern Europe*. Grunberg, L. (Ed.). Bucharest : UNESCO.

Lapovsky Kennedy, E. and Beins, A. (2005). *Women’s Studies for the Future: foundations, interrogations, politics*. New Brunswick, New Jersey, and London: Rutgers University Press.

Love, A. and Kelly, K. (2011). Equity or Essentialism?: U.S. Courts and the Legitimation of Girls' Teams in High School Sport. *Gender & Society*, 25.227, 227-249.

Orlando, M. and Verba, M. (2005). Do Only Big Cities Innovate? Technological Maturity and the Location of Innovation. *Economic Review*, IIQ, 31-57. Retrieved from <http://ideas.repec.org/a/fip/fedker/y2005iqiip31-57nv.90no.2.html> (accessed May 28, 2012)

Pawson, R. (1996). Theorizing the Interview. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 47.2, 295-314.

Ritchie, D. (1995). *Doing Oral History: Practical Advice and Reasonable Explanation for Anyone*. New York: Twayne.

Shumylo-Tapiola, O. (2012). *Ukraine at the Crossroads: Between the EU DCFTA & Customs Union*. Paris: Ifri

Si-eun, L. (2008). *Women in Communist Russia 1917-1945*. Term Paper, AP European History Class. Retrieved from <http://www.zum.de/whkmla/sp/0910/lse/lse1.html#i> (accessed May 30, 2012)

Stake, R. (2003). "Case Studies." Strategies of Qualitative Inquiry. Denzin, Norman K. and Lincoln, Yvonna S. (Ed.). *London: Sage*.

True, J. and Mintrom, M. (2001). Transnational Networks and Policy Diffusion: The Case of Gender Mainstreaming. *International Studies Quarterly*, 45.1, 27-57.

Unterhalter, E. (2008). "Global Values and Gender Equality in Education: Needs, Rights and Capabilities." Gender Education and Equality in a Global Context: Conceptual frameworks and policy perspectives. Fennel, S. and Arnot, M., (Ed.). *New York: Routledge*. Retrieved from <http://recoup.educ.cam.ac.uk/publications/FennellandArnotBook08.pdf> (accessed May 28, 2012)

Warren, P. (2006). MDG Activism and Campesino Detachment: Can They Walk at the Same pace? Field Observations in the Uplands of Jocotán, Guatemala. *Mountain Research and Development*, 26.1, 9-14.