

# GENDER EQUALITY ATTITUDES STUDY

WAVE 2

[21 OCTOBER 2021]

TECHNICAL NOTE

# INTRODUCTION

The Gender Equality Attitudes Study was developed to quantify the scale of harmful gender-based stereotypes, with the vision to monitor how, if at all, these stereotypes change over time. Under the leadership of UN Women, the study was conceived in partnership with five organizations, namely AT&T, Johnson & Johnson, Kantar, Procter & Gamble and Unilever.

The pilot study was conducted in 2018 across 10 countries. This is the second iteration of the study, with the scope expanded to include 10 additional countries and the opportunity to monitor changes in attitudes over time.

Discriminatory social norms threaten the achievement of gender equality and the empowerment of women. Furthermore, they have a negative impact on the social, economic and sustainable development of countries around the world.

Leveraging attitudinal change as a vehicle for gender equality is a critical tactic towards accelerating the full and effective implementation of the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action, the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and notably, SDG-5, on achieving gender equality and the empowerment of all women and girls.

The results from this study showcase the prevalence of discriminatory attitudes and gender-based stereotypes that perpetuate gender inequality, and demonstrate how deeply entrenched these views are. They are designed to aid all decision-makers, from policy-makers to academics, marketers, private sector leaders and civil society.



# | STUDY DESIGN

This report summarises findings from the analysis of the 20 countries surveyed, across 14 topic areas. The fieldwork took place from April to December 2020. Interviews were online, face to face, or a mix, as appropriate for each country. Approximately 1,000 interviews were conducted in each country. Data are weighted to ensure a nationally representative sample in each country (women and men, age, location, and income). The effective sample size has been used for all significance testing.

The study design is currently based on a binary understanding of gender: people who identify as women or men complete the survey and are asked their perceptions about the topic areas. Its thematic focus areas include education, health, control over personal decisions, marriage and family life, safety and violence, gender stereotypes in the media, work and employment, access to physical property and control over personal finances, barriers to safety at home and in public spaces, barriers to safety in the workplace, and leadership and participation.

In monitoring progress between the two studies, only 8 of the 10 comparable countries are used for analysis throughout the report due to a change in methodology. COVID-19 restrictions during fieldwork impacted the data collection methods for the Philippines and the United Arab Emirates (UAE). Kantar used telephone recruitment to complete the online survey in the Philippines, a change from face-to-face only interviewing in 2018. In the UAE, the proportion of online interviews were increased, a change from predominantly face-to-face interviewing in 2018.

# | STUDY DESIGN

## Sampling & methodology

- 2020 fieldwork took place from April to December. This extended fieldwork period was due to the COVID-19 pandemic and the feasibility of conducting research within each country.
- Interviews were online, face to face or a mix, as appropriate for each country.
- Approximately 1,000 interviews were conducted in each country:
- Women & men (50/50 split)
- Age 16-55 (nationally representative quotas)<sup>1</sup>
- Urban and rural (nationally representative quotas)
- Range of income/socio-economic groups (nationally representative quotas)
- Data are weighted to ensure a nationally representative sample in each country, and the effective sample size has been used for all significance testing.
- Findings have been validated against the World Economic Forum's Global Gender Gap Index.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Age 56+ more difficult to recruit, especially due to COVID-19

<sup>2</sup>. See [here](#) for more details

# STUDY DESIGN

## Geographic coverage

The first wave of the study was conducted in 2018 across 10 countries. The second wave, conducted in 2020, revisited the same 10 countries to measure change over time and included a further 10 countries to expand the global reach.

### Wave 1 & 2













### New for Wave 2



1. Change in methodology due to COVID-19 so data not directly comparable in these 2 countries

# METHODOLOGY

10 countries included in both 2020 & 2018

										
	Colombia	India	Japan	Kenya	Nigeria	Philippines <sup>1</sup>	Sweden	Turkey	UAE <sup>2</sup>	USA
<b>Sample 2018</b> <b>(Web   F2F)</b>	1,002 (701   301)	1,075 (0   1,075)	1,000 (1,000   0)	1,130 (0   1,130)	1,000 (0   1,000)	1,131 (0   1,131)	1,000 (1,000   0)	1,017 (0   1,017)	1,054 (200   854)	1,000 (1,000   0)
<b>Sample 2020</b> <b>(Web   F2F)</b>	1,007 (702   305)	1,053 (0   1,053)	1,001 (1,001   0)	1,133 (0   1,133)	1,000 (0   1,000)	1,000* (1,000   0)	1,001 (1,001   0)	1,000 (0   1,000)	1,022 (501   521)	1,000 (1,000   0)
<b>Language(s)</b>	Spanish	Hindi, Gujarati, Kannada, Bengali	Japanese	Swahili, English	Pigdin, Hausa, Yoruba, Ibo	Tagalog, Cebuano, English, Ilonggo	Swedish	Turkish	Arabic, English	English
<b>Field dates</b> <b>(2018)</b>	12 July – 21 August 2018									
<b>Field dates</b> <b>(2020)</b>	F2F: 15 Oct-20 Oct  Online: 16 Oct-28 Oct	19 Oct-18 Nov	2 Nov-7 Nov	29 Jun-15 Jul	21 Jun-7 Jul	9 Nov-10 Dec	8 Apr-21 Apr	10 Nov-13 Dec	F2F: 16 May-31 May  Online: 6 Nov-17 Nov	8 Apr-23 Apr

1. Telephone (CATI) recruitment to online survey in 2020 due to COVID-19, a change from F2F in 2018

2. Increase in proportion of online interviews in 2020 due to COVID-19, a change from predominantly F2F in 2018

# METHODOLOGY

10 additional countries included in 2020 only

										
	Austria	Brazil	Denmark	France	Mexico	Poland	Senegal	South Africa	Spain	Vietnam
<b>Sample (Web   F2F)</b>	1,000 (1,000   0)	1,001 (767   234)	1,001 (1,001   0)	1,000 (1,000   0)	1,000 (750   250)	1,001 (1,001   0)	1,075 (0   1,075)	1,000 (0   1,000)	1,000 (1,000   0)	1,000 (0   1,000)
<b>Language(s)</b>	German	Portuguese	Danish	French	Spanish	Polish	French	English	Spanish	Vietnamese
<b>Field dates (2020)</b>	8 Apr-24 Apr	F2F: 9 Nov-25 Nov  Online: 3 Nov-7 Nov	8 Apr-23 Apr	8 Apr-20 Apr	F2F: 29 Oct-13 Nov  Online: 23 Oct-28 Oct	8 Apr-23 Apr	19 Jun-1 Jul	29 Sep-12 Nov	8 Apr-20 Apr	11 Nov-27 Nov

# Number of interviews in 2020 and weighting applied

20,295 interviews in total

	Austria	Brazil	Colombia	Denmark	France	India	Japan	Kenya	Mexico	Nigeria	Philippines	Poland	S. Africa	Senegal	Spain	Sweden	Turkey	UAE	USA	Vietnam
No. of interviews	n=1,000	n=1,001	n=1,007	n=1,001	n=1,000	n=1,053	n=1,001	n=1,133	n=1,000	n=1,000	n=1,000	n=1,001	n=1,000	n=1,075	n=1,000	n=1,001	n=1,000	n=1,022	n=1,000	n=1,000
Effective base	955	732	942	893	856	1,051	928	1,037	962	729	976	761	643	1,073	892	978	701	924	987	996
Weighted to the following proportions																				
<b>Gender</b>																				
Women	50%	50%	50%	50%	50%	50%	50%	50%	50%	50%	50%	50%	50%	50%	50%	50%	50%	50%	50%	50%
Men	50%	50%	50%	50%	50%	50%	50%	50%	50%	50%	50%	50%	50%	50%	50%	50%	50%	50%	50%	50%
<b>Age</b>																				
16-19	8%	11%	14%	10%	9%	15%	9%	18%	13%	18%	14%	8%	11%	14%	7%	10%	13%	6%	10%	14%
20-34	34%	42%	49%	34%	36%	49%	41%	54%	43%	54%	45%	41%	48%	52%	34%	45%	47%	54%	39%	43%
35-55	58%	47%	37%	56%	55%	36%	50%	28%	45%	28%	41%	51%	41%	34%	59%	45%	40%	40%	51%	43%
<b>Location</b>																				
Urban	59%	87%	76%	88%	81%	31%	92%	26%	80%	52%	46%	60%	65%	55%	81%	86%	76%	85%	82%	30%
Rural	41%	13%	24%	12%	19%	69%	8%	74%	20%	48%	54%	40%	35%	45%	19%	14%	24%	15%	18%	70%
<b>Income/socio-economic class</b>																				
Low	37.8%	27%	29%	43.8%	45.1%	38%	53.2%	80%	57%	30%		14.2%	39.6%	45%	38.9%	18.2%	30%	20%	19.5%	65%
Mid/low		49%																		
Mid		21%	45%			51%	28.9%	15%	22%	55%	47%	71.2%	36.7%	50%		63.2%	55%	50%	34.0%	24%
High	54.5%	3%	26%	49.4%	50.9%	11%	11.2%	5%	21%	15%	53%	9.5%	23.7%	5%	58.3%	14.4%	15%	30%	43.7%	11%
Prefer not to answer	7.7%			6.8%	4.0%		6.7%					5.1%			2.8%	4.3%				2.8%

Effective base used for all significance testing

Income/socio-economic group for weighting defined relative to range within each country



# Cohort base sizes in 2020

20,295 interviews in total

## 2020 Gender cohorts (all countries combined)

	Women	Men	Age 16-19	Age 20-34	Age 35-55	Women 16-19	Men 16-19	Women 20-34	Men 20-34	Women 35-55	Men 35-55	Women Low education	Women Mid education	Women High education	Men Low education	Men Mid education	Men High education
No. of interviews	10,148	10,147	2,361	8,993	8,941	1,121	1,240	4,496	4,497	4,531	4,410	3,370	3,499	3,255	3,295	3,368	3,455
Effective base	8,877	8,833	2,099	7,902	7,711	955	1,147	3,954	3,948	3,968	3,744	2,828	3,058	2,980	2,765	2,920	3,129

## 2020 Income & location cohorts (all countries combined)

	Low income	Mid income	High income	Rural/village	Small/mid town	Large town/city	Rural low income	Rural mid income	Rural high income	Small/mid town low income	Small/mid town mid income	Small/mid town high income	Large town/city low income	Large town/city mid inc.	Large town/city high inc.
No. of interviews	7,664	8,128	4,100	6,795	5,234	8,266	3,546	2,358	798	1,771	2,161	1,124	2,346	3,610	2,178
Effective base	6,010	7,588	3,827	5,052	4,834	8,083	2,585	1,750	641	1,399	2,213	1,093	2,065	3,808	2,114

Low/mid/income and low/mid/high education groups for cohort analysis defined by splitting respondents into three groups as close to equal size as possible within each country, and then calculating average across countries. This was done to ensure that base sizes areas robust as possible and that each country has an equal contribution to the cohort average.

Low/mid/high income/socio-economic class for weighting (shown on previous page) defined relative to range within each country to ensure results are nationally representative.

Effective base used for all significance testing

# QUESTIONNAIRE DESIGN

↓

Screeners

Age, gender & urbanicity

Access + Control

11-point scale  
(1 new statement vs. 2018, 1 removed)

Gender stereotypes

5-point agreement scale  
(2 media portrayal statements amended vs. 2018)

Roles in society

5-point agreement scale  
(new format for 2020)

Future ideals

5-point importance scale

Demographics

SEC/household income, education & children  
in household

# Access + Control

Benchmark data available except for new public safety statement  
11-point agreement scale

## MOST WOMEN/MOST MEN/YOU

- In general, how easy is it for [MOST WOMEN/MOST MEN/YOU] to get a QUALITY EDUCATION in your country?
- In general, how easy is it for [MOST WOMEN/MOST MEN/YOU] to be hired as a SKILLED WORKER in your country?
- In general, how would you rate the QUALITY OF BASIC HEALTH CARE for [MOST WOMEN/MOST MEN/YOU] in your country?
- In general, how much influence do [MOST WOMEN/MOST MEN/YOU] in your country have on their DECISION OF WHOM TO MARRY?
- In general, how much CONTROL do [MOST WOMEN/MOST MEN/YOU] in your country have OVER THEIR LIVES?
- In general, how much CONTROL do [MOST WOMEN/MOST MEN/YOU] in your country have OVER THEIR PERSONAL FINANCES?

2018 statement removed: In general, how SAFE are MOST MEN in your country when they are IN THEIR HOME?  
By SAFE, we mean “free from physical, mental, or emotional harm”.

## WOMEN/MEN

- In general, how easy is it for [WOMEN/MEN] to RUN FOR ELECTED OFFICE in your country?
- In general, how easy is it for [MOST WOMEN/MOST MEN] in your country to BUY PROPERTY in their own name?

## WOMEN

- In general, how SAFE are MOST WOMEN in your country when they are IN THEIR HOME? By SAFE, we mean “free from physical, mental, or emotional harm”.
- NEW for 2020: In general, how SAFE are MOST WOMEN in your country when they are IN PUBLIC SPACE? By SAFE, we mean “free from physical, mental, or emotional harm”.

## GENERAL

- How would you rate the QUALITY OF FAMILY PLANNING SERVICES in your country?

# Gender stereotypes

Benchmark data available except for media portrayal statements

**5-point agreement scale (strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree, no opinion)**

- It is important for women to have access to family planning
- When a mother works for pay, the children suffer
- When a father works for pay, the children suffer
- For the same job, men should be paid more than women
- A woman should not earn more than her husband
- A woman should be free to refuse sex with her husband / partner
- There are acceptable circumstances for someone to hit their spouse or partner
- Women call attention to themselves based on how they dress
- It is appropriate for men to discuss a female colleague's appearance at work
- It is essential for society to treat women as equals to men
- NEW for 2020: In the media in my country (i.e., television, advertisements, or public communication), women are typically portrayed in traditional female roles – wife, mother, caregiver or supporting tasks
- NEW for 2020: In the media in my country (i.e., television, advertisements, or public communication), men are typically portrayed in traditional male roles – providing for the family, as a leader or a business man

2018 statements removed: Media in my country (i.e., television, advertisements, or public communication) only portrays women/men in certain roles



# | Roles in society

New format for 2020, no benchmark data

## 5-point agreement scale (strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree, no opinion)

- Is it more important for a boy to get a university education than a girl
- A man's job is to earn money; a woman's job is to look after the house and the family
- Women should work less and devote more time to caring for their families
- It is natural for men to earn more than women, as they should be the main providers
- Women should be free to make choices regarding marriage – if they marry at all as well as when and whom they marry
- When jobs are scarce, men should have more right to a job than women
- In a time of a shortage of food, priority should be given to men
- In general, men are better business executives than women
- Service jobs (i.e. secretarial, administrative, cleaning) are better suited for women
- In general, men are better political leaders than women
- Having a paid job is the best way for a woman to be an independent person

Different format in 2018: 3-point scale (primarily women, both women and men equally & primarily men), different statement wording



# | Future ideals

Benchmark data available for all statements

5-point importance scale (not at all important, somewhat unimportant, somewhat important, completely important, no opinion)

- More opportunities for women in business
- More opportunities for women in politics
- More access to higher education for women
- More respect for women's rights in all areas
- More affordable primary healthcare for women
- Equal pay for equal work regardless of a person's gender