

Multiple Meanings
of Gender Equality
A Critical Frame Analysis
of Gender Policies in Europe

Edited by

MIEKE VERLOO



CENTRAL EUROPEAN UNIVERSITY PRESS
BUDAPEST – NEW YORK

© 2007 Central European University
Copyeditor: *Tom Bass*
Design and typesetting: *Judit Kovács • Createch*
Production: *Center for Policy Studies*

Printed in Hungary by
Createch Ltd.

English edition published in 2007 by
Central European University Press
An imprint of the Central European University Share Company
Nádor utca 11, H-1051 Budapest, Hungary
Telephone: (+36-1) 327-3138 or 327-3000
Fax: (+36-1) 327-3183
E-mail: ceupress@ceu.hu
Website: www.ceupress.com

400 West 59th Street, New York NY 10019, USA
Telephone: (+1-212) 547-6932
Fax: (+1-646) 557-2416
E-mail: mgreenwald@sorosny.org

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in retrieval system,
or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the permission of the Publisher.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Multiple Meanings of Gender Equality : A Critical Frame Analysis of Gender Policies in Europe /
edited by Mieke Verloo.

p. cm. — (CPS books)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978 963 9776 08 1 (pbk. : alk. paper) (CPS Books, ISSN 1587 6942)

1. Sex discrimination against women—Europe. 2. Sex discrimination against women—Government
policy—Europe. I. Verloo, Mieke, 1950- II. Title. III. Series.

HQ1237.5.E85M85 2007

305.42094—dc22

2007034572

Taming the Male Sovereign? Framing Gender Inequality in Politics in the European Union and the Member States

*Emanuela Lombardo, Vlasta Jalušič,
Maro Pantelidou Maloutas, and Birgit Sauer*

1. Introduction: Questioning Gender Inequality in Politics

Statistics on the status of women in European politics show a slowly but steadily increasing number of women in political institutions in Western European countries (European Commission 2005), while in former state-socialist countries, democratization was accompanied by the masculinization of parliaments (Rueschmeyer 1998; Jalušič and Antić 2001; Sauer forthcoming). Gender inequality in politics was not at the top of the agenda of autonomous women's movements in Western European countries. Autonomy meant opposing state and party institutions; issues such as body politics, violence against women, and work participation were at the center of Western European women's movements of the 1970s and early 1980s. In state-socialist countries, state party systems preserved gender inequality in politics but established special systems for the representation of women in parliaments,¹ either with a quota system across the social spectrum (Einhorn 1993: 150) or with seats reserved for state women's organizations.

With the establishment of women's policy agencies since the 1980s, the issue of gender inequality in politics moved to the fore, and party women started to fight for representation and quota systems (Hardmeier 2004 and Lovenduski 2005). Since the 1990s the issue has entered the political agenda of the EU and the member states' political debates. It has been incorporated increasingly into official policy documents on gender equality, and discussed in EU countries by both policy and gender researchers, alongside feminist practical and conceptual debates (Phillips 1995 and 1997; Squires 1999; Dahlerup 1988 and 2006; Lovenduski 2005; Fraser 2003).

1. Whereby the parliaments were rather token institutions and the factual political power was located in the leading institutions of the Communist Party—like the Party's Central Committee.

Gender inequality in politics as a policy “problem,” however, can be framed in different ways, intentionally or unintentionally,² and the measures proposed to confront it are subject to various interpretations. This chapter will reflect on how the issue has been framed across Europe by presenting the MAGEEQ results of a comparative analysis of policy frames on gender inequality in politics at the EU level and in six member states—Austria, the Netherlands, Spain, Greece, Slovenia, and Hungary.³ The period studied is 1995–2003.

Gender inequality in politics, as a policy area, is explicitly gendered in the sense that the impact it has on roles of women and men in society appears more visible than it might be for other topics, such as agriculture or transport (see Meier et al. 2005). It seems as if here it would be easier than in other areas to formulate effective strategies to increase women’s voice, presence, and participation. It is thus interesting to see the extent to which gender policies include contested or ambivalent meanings of gender and how do these meanings influence the framing of gender in/equality policies (Bacchi 2005; Jalušič and Hrženjak 2006). The main research questions of this chapter are: what does gender inequality in politics mean in the six selected countries and in the EU? How is the problem of gender inequality in politics represented (diagnosis)? Which solutions are offered to the problem (prognosis)? The chapter will depict the different representations, both explicit and implicit, that political actors provide of the definition of the *problem* of gender inequality in politics and of the *solutions* proposed. It will analyze which actors are given a *voice* to express them in the analyzed texts and which actors are absent; who are deemed to be the *problem holders* and the *target groups* of the measures taken; and who are the *norm groups*. It will furthermore discuss *inconsistencies* in the framing of the problem and solution, and the extent to which frames are *gendered*. It will then map the frames within the EU context to see how the issues and frames *cut across the European space* from east to west, north to south. In conclusion, the chapter attempts to show some of the effects and predicaments of the framing of gender equality policies and pose critical questions to the formulation of policy measures on gender inequality in politics in the EU.

2. The Problem of Representation: Feminist Debates

While we decided in this chapter to frame the issue as “gender inequality in politics,” since this appears as a more open signifier which could be filled with a variety of meanings, the most commonly referred way of addressing the issue is by the term

2. See discussion of intentionality in the introduction of this book.

3. See Annex 1 for the list of texts on gender inequality in politics analysed by the MAGEEQ Project.

“representation,” a label that we see as a specific form of treating the issue. Most of the gender-sensitive literature on gender inequality in politics deals with the question of *how gender differences could be represented in politics* (e.g., Diaz 2005; Mansbridge 2003 and 2005; Paxton/Kunovich 2003). However, if representation is a dominant concept in issues of gender inequality in politics, the literature differentiates among several concepts of representation, usually based on Hanna F. Pitkin’s (1967) analysis. One main differentiation is, according to Pitkin, between quantitative and substantive representation. Speaking of women, quantitative or descriptive representation refers to the number of women in elected bodies, parties, and leadership positions. This dimension of representation is also called “social” or “mirror” representation, based on the idea that democratic bodies should mirror the population. Qualitative or substantive representation refers to the process and output of politics and policies. Are women, women’s issues, needs, and interests represented in policy processes and outcomes? Here representation means not only “standing for” but “acting for” women (Squires 1999). Although the feminist literature is skeptical about this form of “functional” representation, because the concept of “women’s interests” is misleading (Young 2000 and Phillips 1995), the differentiation is helpful as a heuristic tool, as it raises many normative questions as to how the issue should be perceived in view of a democratic coexistence of gendered subjects.

Arguments that problematize the concept of representation also contribute to reinforce the dominant status of this notion in existing political theory. What is problematic in the notion of representation is that it denotes the existence of an already existing common aim of the given group, so that the representative may function as an intermediary, accountable to its assignors. Such a preexisting common aim is something that does not exist with respect to the heterogeneous social category of “women.” In the same manner that there are no common interests of all women, there are no common political perspectives and no common proposals for the resolution of problems (see the debate between Sapiro 1998 and Diamond/Hartsock 1998). Additionally, representing someone means acting in her or his name, and being *accountable* to her or him for any actions I may do (see Pitkin 1967: 8–9). To what instance could women “representatives” of women be accountable? Is the electoral process sufficient to provide such accountability? Furthermore, descriptive representation cannot be considered an advance over representation as accountability, because as a rule, women representatives have no prescribed way of being accountable to women as a social category. As for “fair representation,” it is not something that can be achieved by a decision nor can it be guaranteed in advance, since it depends on the continuing relationship between representatives and the represented, as Phillips (1995) notes in her critique of the concept of representation. She correctly points out that “anyone concerned about the exclusion of women’s voices or needs or

interests would be ill-advised to shut up shop as soon as half those elected are women” (Phillips 1995: 82; also Pantelidou Maloutas 2006).

Other feminist research on women’s political exclusion deals more with the mechanisms that reproduce the problem of a low participation of women in politics, especially party politics and the barriers in the political realm that prevent women from participation and representation. Joni Lovenduski and Pippa Norris (1995) differentiate between a “demand-oriented approach” (Why do parties [not] recruit women?) and a “supply-oriented approach” (Why do women [not] run for office?). While the supply-oriented approach focuses on women—they should change, they should be trained, educated, and encouraged for participation—the demand-oriented approach focuses on parties and voters—how to encourage parties to recruit women and the electorate to vote for women? The shift from a supply-oriented perspective to a demand-oriented approach opened the perspective for the analysis of social structures and the structure of politics and decision-making as male terrains, and as constructing barriers for women in politics.

A variety of other concepts in feminist research, such as “critical mass” (Dahlerup) or “politics of presence” (Phillips), have flourished next to the concept of representation. The argument of critical mass (Dahlerup 1988 and 2006) includes the idea that policy output and style may change as soon as a certain number of female representatives enter decision-making bodies—the critical mass of approximately one-third. In Dahlerup’s concept, numbers do matter since, after the critical mass of one-third of women (in political bodies) is reached, they *might* be able to transform the political agenda or at least change the decision-making style. While some scholars point at the difficulty of critical mass theory to account both for women as individuals rather than as a group and for the dynamic nature of political interactions (Mateo 2005), others support the potential for change of a critical mass of women, especially when these women are in contact with feminist organizations or institutions that promote gender equality (Mazur 2002).

Another strand of feminist literature is characterized by the gender difference argument. Bringing women in politics aims at making a difference in politics. The expectation is that women in parliamentary and government politics will influence the policy agenda and outcomes by bringing a different, supposedly more gender-aware, perspective on public issues (Lovenduski 2005; Norris 1996; Dahlerup 1988 and 2006). As Galligan and Tremblay (2005) point out, the expectation that women will make a substantial difference in politics goes together with an underlying high expectation that women in politics will represent women’s interests, which in turn presupposes a shared gender awareness and common goals among female politicians. The analysis of Childs (2004) on New Labour Party women MPs in the United Kingdom shows that female politicians believed they were representing women’s con-

cerns and achieving gendered outcomes. The contribution that women MPs claim to make, however, is arguable on the basis of the fact that feminist groups do not always recognize it (Galligan and Tremblay 2005). Arguments about difference also discuss shifts in the style and approach to politics that a feminization of the political space would supposedly bring, in the direction of less confrontational and less sexist political institutions (Lovenduski 2005).

There also exists a corpus of feminist literature within democratic theory on how to overcome gender inequality in politics and how to transform representative democracies. Within this scholarship there are at least two arguments that focus on group representation: Anne Phillips' "politics of presence" and Iris Marion Young's group representation. Phillips (1995) suggests that not only political ideas but the experience of women should be present in the policy process. Here, the identity of the representatives and their descriptive similarity with the electorate is crucial (Squires 1999). Phillips argues that the notion of women representing (interests, needs of) women runs into danger of essentialism and ignores the accountability of elected women towards their male and female party constituency. Thus, she pleads in favor of an identity-based argument for group representation, one that holds quota as a means to foster the mere presence of women in politics as a matter of justice, distancing herself nevertheless from the idea that women in politics *represent* women.

A different concept of representation that unites a politics of presence (social representation) with the need to provide fair representation to the ideas of oppressed social groups (functional representation) is Iris Marion Young's (2000) notion of "group representation." Young pleads for both resources and special institutional mechanisms for group representation in order for oppressed social groups to be able to voice their issues in the political arena. She suggests that women as a "serial group" should be represented in politics (Young 1994). According to Young's notion of "gender as seriality," rather than based on similar interests, the unity that exists among women is a result of the material organization of (patriarchal) social relations that, at the same time, is determined by and determine women's position within society.

While the former arguments on group representation have connected the question of justice with recognition, in the last decade feminist democratic theory has put also the question of redistribution (Fraser 1995) on the feminist agenda. This body of scholarship stresses the importance of addressing both recognition and redistribution, by introducing the issue of social or class inequality next to that of gender inequality. Nancy Fraser (1995 and 1997) has argued in favor of bringing attention back to redistribution and, as a result, of refocusing on the ideological conception of representation that the most recent feminist debates had overlooked. This process of refocusing requires linking the struggle for a more fair representation with issues of unequal socio-economic redistribution (Squires 1999). The debate on recognition

and/or redistribution offers yet another perspective on the concept of representation, which can lead the discussion towards how to deal with the intersection of class and gender differences which constitute inequalities, and what type of differentiated solutions could be needed, like for instance deliberation (Fraser 1997 and Young 2000).

Whereas the issue of recognition and redistribution is still related in some way to the main scholarly conceptualizations of the problem as representation, recent research has offered alternatives, such as gendering policy outcomes or reflecting on the notion of women's interests. As comparative gender policy research suggests, in the last thirty years state feminism has developed by integrating women in policy processes (descriptive representation) and by gendering policy outcomes (substantive representation) (Mazur 2001; Stetson 2001; Outshoorn 2004; Lovenduski 2005). New lines of research also address the importance of doing empirical research that respects the undefined character of women's interests (Celis 2005). Gender inequality in politics in this research targets not only the number of women, but also the presence of both the issues and aims of women's movements in policy decisions. However, in spite of their relevance, these alternatives so far seem to be a separate strand that has not influenced the dominant conceptualization of the issue of women and representation in the literature.

3. Quantitative Representation of Women: The Major Frame in Problem Definition and Solution⁴

In this section frames on the diagnosis and prognosis of the problem of gender inequality in politics found in the EU and the member states' policy documents are linked to the conceptual questions of political representation of women. We consider the extent to which the problem definitions and measures are more targeted on parties or on the electorate (political culture), as we saw in the discussion of Lovenduski and Norris (1995); or on polity, politics, or policies (see research on comparative gender policies); or whether the frames tend more to social (identity), functional (interest), or group representation of women as in the theorizations of Phillips and Young.

The debate on gender inequality in politics started in Austria, the Netherlands, Slovenia, and Spain before or around the mid-1990s, while in Greece and Hungary it was most lively around or after 2000. There is a double "narrowness" in the frames

4. See Annex 2 for the numbers of women in elected and decision-making bodies in the case studies and periods selected.

we found. *Firstly*, the problem of women's inequality in politics is framed mainly as women's quantitative underrepresentation in elected decision-making bodies, in political parties, in top positions, and on candidate lists. *Secondly*, it is addressed mainly as inequality in elected bodies such as parliaments, and in state administration, while gender inequality in leadership positions rarely is mentioned. In most of the cases this frame does not reflect quantitative *presence* as defined by Phillips (1995), that is, the presence of different experiences of people, men, and women, but rather expresses the idea of mirror representation. It is the "unequal" physical presence of women in political decision-making that is the problem.

While the range of relevant political institutions varies across countries, it is always *quantitative representation* that is the major frame. Sometimes, like in Austria and the Netherlands, this also refers to top positions and well-paid jobs in the civil service and business sector, where women are underrepresented and men are over-represented. In Hungary, the issue is framed in terms of both low levels of women in politics (quantitative presence) and of the disadvantageous position of women in high-ranking positions in the public sphere (politics, public administration, and labor). In Slovenia it is also, though more rarely, defined as women's underrepresentation in all public spaces. Here, moreover, we find reference to an unequal representation of *men* in the judicial powers where women's numbers seem to prevail, which could be labeled as a "poor" men's frame. In Greece the issue is mainly framed as "few women in decision-making" and as a lack of equal opportunities for women in political decision-making (Pantelidou Maloutas 2005). In the Netherlands, unequal distribution of power and influence between the sexes is a noticeable problem framing. The notion of "balance" plays a central role. In Spain, where representation is the most present issue, the low participation of women is a question, whereby the term "participation" refers to "presence" of women in political parties, decision-making, and elected bodies. The argument about women's unequal representation is sometimes articulated as a lack of "parity democracy," in which a more equal representation is interpreted as a sign of a more democratic representation.

Whether the problem is articulated as women's representation, participation, or presence, in all countries it is framed in terms of *numbers* and *shares*. In some cases the issue is even presented in terms of target figures set by national governments and European institutions (percentages of women in elected and decision-making bodies), which is the case for the EU, the Netherlands, Austria, and, to a lesser extent, Slovenia.

The major voices speaking in this frame, in all countries and the EU, are almost exclusively the policymakers' voices, in particular female policymakers, female MPs, or party women, with some cases in Spain, Slovenia, and Greece where a civil society voice is observable as well, though to a very limited extent. While the speakers in

all frames make reference to international documents, treaties, and agreements to support their diagnosis (UN and EU documents), reference rarely is made to gender experts and civil society actors.

Problem definitions and solutions tend to be located at the level of *individual women*. Women are seen as the problem-holders because they lag behind men in political representation, and in this sense they are implicitly compared to the norm-group “men.” The solution mentioned is that women should change or be encouraged to run for office and be trained to become politicians, which shows a focus on the “supply-oriented” approach. Policy discourses, thus, tend to reproduce traditional gender stereotypes about the active male citizen and the inactive female citizen who has a problem with the functioning of democracy. The normative scale to define who has a problem, and indirectly who is not a competent enough citizen, may also include race and ethnic stereotypes, as for instance in the Netherlands, where a specific group of women—“allochthonous (migrant) women”—is seen as the problem group. Only very few documents and frames depict men as problem-holders and responsible for gender inequality in politics. Austria is one of the countries where the frame of male networks being responsible for female underrepresentation is at least mentioned.

The solution of the problem framed as women’s quantitative underrepresentation is to *raise the number of women* in politics. Policymakers in different countries differ in their choice of strategies to raise the number of female representatives, for instance, through quotas or target figures. In policy discourse there is little debate on *why* bigger numbers of women in politics should be the main goal. Arguments in favor of women’s increased numbers sometimes are made in the name of democracy and equality, in particular in the EU, Spain, and Greece. However, neither the question of justice nor more functional questions—be they framed as representing women’s interests or needs, or as changing the output of a policy towards more women friendly politics—are discussed in the documents. The aim of parity of number is seen as the main achievement and the main goal, to be accomplished through means such as quotas, mentoring of women, monitoring of affirmative actions, and gender mainstreaming.

Turning one’s eyes to only the numbers seems to be a very basic approach to inequality, because it narrows the problem down to the mere physical presence of an essentialized group and restricts the range of possible aims and strategies for solving the problem. Yet, public space is about physical presence as well, and policymakers may try to rely on the “critical mass” argument in order to put the issue on the agenda (Dahlerup 1988 and 2006). Another problematic aspect of only or mainly relying on numbers is the shortcut made between women (present in political bodies) and the qualitative or substantive representation of women. Most of the policy documents

analyzed in this study implicitly suggest that women “as women” would act in favor of substantial female representation, that they will (automatically) act for a women-friendly outcome of politics. The underlying assumption of this mechanism is that quantitative representation automatically leads to substantive or qualitative representation of women. However, not only empirical results show that the idea of a “critical mass” has to be differentiated (Tremblay and Pelletier 2000), but also large sectors of contemporary gender literature acknowledge that women’s common identity “as women” risks reducing the multiplicity of different women’s positions into one essential hegemonic identity that excludes women’s differences.

4. Alternative Frames on Gender Inequality in Politics: Broadening the Approach

The analyzed policy documents also include other problem definitions that do not occur as frequently or as comprehensively as the quantitative representation frame, but suggest interesting alternative definitions and solutions to the problem of gender inequality in politics. However, most of them refer to a notion of representation too. One set of them still presents a *narrow framing* of the issue, in that it keeps arguing *why it is a problem* that decision-making bodies have low numbers of women. If there are no women in politics, the argument goes, women’s interests are not represented or put on the agenda, representatives do not “act for” women and there is no women-friendly outcome of politics. Documents do not differentiate between “standing for” and “acting for” and most of them again assume that the low number of women is the reason that women’s interests are not represented and that the policy outcomes are not women-friendly. Mostly, in the conception and framings of European policymakers there is a sometimes overt, sometimes latent preconception that women in politics necessarily represent women.

A more utilitarian variation of the same frame asks why quantitative underrepresentation of women might cause a problem for democracy. This could be labeled the *women difference* frame: if women are underrepresented, the argument says, politics is lacking the feminine part. This frame is grounded deeply in essentialist notions of femininity, opposite to a naturalized masculinity in politics. Moreover, the frame is combined with a utilitarian discourse that aims at bringing in women’s capacities as a means to further “democratize democracies.”

Another framing of the problem of why quantitative underrepresentation is a problem for a polity is that it is a symbol for a country lagging behind European standards. This *Europeanization or modernization* frame wants to encourage policymakers by blaming countries for lagging behind in the European context. As it can

be expected, this framing of the problem has a clear East-West divide, in that it occurs in Hungary and Slovenia, former state-socialist countries, and in Greece, part of the EU since 1981. However, it does not occur in Spain, which is part of the EU only since 1986.

While most policy frames focus on women's need to change, fewer frames suggest that the structures of the polity are the problem, for instance, election laws that disadvantage women or parties that do not nominate women to run for office (demand frame). The solution then would be to change the polity and to focus on parties as gatekeepers. Only a small set of frames presents this somewhat *broader approach* to the problem, often departing from the causes of quantitative and qualitative underrepresentation of women in politics. Such frames can be grouped around the *women-unfriendliness of the polity* and the political structures. These frames include reference to the gender bias of existing electoral systems and to a *poor or weak policy of affirmative action in politics*. Framing also refers to the *social structure* either described as male dominance in society or as patriarchy. The gendered division of labor and discrimination of women in the labor market are seen as causes for political inequality. Similar framings are gathering around *social citizenship* and the lack of social infrastructure or a *bad social policy* to overcome structural inequalities, by proposing to change the existing sexual division of labor and underlying social inequality. In this group of frames that pay a greater attention to the structural causes of gender inequality, social structures are mentioned and made responsible for the problem, such as power structures and patriarchy or the majority electoral system. However, these frames rarely are found in official policy documents, and if they are present, they are expressed through the voice of gender experts (in the case of the EU, the European Parliament Committee of Women's Rights), activists, and left-wing politicians.

The broader approach to the problem of gender inequality found in the last group of frames can also be traced in frames that focus on the need to build *velvet triangles* (Woodward 2004) between state feminists, party women, and women's movement in order to empower women's political action. The frame on *gender mainstreaming* points at the relevance of tackling the problem of gender inequality in politics through incorporating a gender perspective in all public policy areas. This frame, which occurs more frequently in the Netherlands, Austria, Spain and, to a lesser extent, in the EU, suggests that the aim of integrating gender into all policies can be achieved through measures such as gender impact assessment or monitoring the progress of women through the elaboration of indicators for follow-up and the gathering of gender-specific statistics.

A strong frame on men as the cause of the problem of gender inequality in politics does not exist. On the contrary, the *poor men's frame*, which is mainly found in texts opposing quotas, sees men potentially outnumbered by women because of quotas

and paints the picture of a supposedly threatening feminization of the sphere of power. While a general call to *change political culture* through awareness-raising measures is rather frequent in the policy texts across countries, and particularly in the EU, a frame to *change the male political elite* is far more rare and would indeed be a paradigm shift in the prognosis towards changes in the political representation of men. This frame appears in Austrian documents a few times, with reference to the need for men to renounce their power and to bring more women in politics, and in Spain only in a single case of male self-criticism concerning the existence of machismo within parties.

5. Inconsistencies and Absences in the Framing of Gender Inequality in Politics

Our analysis of policy documents dealing with gender inequality in politics shows evidence of inconsistencies, absences, and competing policy frames. A first inconsistency is that the relation between diagnostic and prognostic frames is *unbalanced towards solutions* to the problem, since policy texts tend to focus on proposing measures to solve a problem that has not been diagnosed in the first place. One of the consequences is that the suggested solutions are provided without a thorough analysis of the situation of gender inequality in politics. This could indicate that the proposed measures inadequately answer the complex reality of the problem and that, to be more effective in problem solving, policies would require a more comprehensive diagnosis of gender inequality in politics. The reasons for a poor problem definition could be due either to the lack of knowledge and conceptual clarity on the part of policymakers, or to the lack of political will to provide a more articulated diagnosis that would challenge existing gendered power hierarchies.

Another inconsistency is that even where policy documents focus on both *prognosis and diagnosis*, these *do not necessarily match*. The diagnostic frame on the problem of male domination and patriarchy has no matching frame in prognosis that, for instance, would propose measures to overcome the structure of male domination in society and politics. The democracy frame in the problem definition has no matching solution frame that would say that democracy necessarily needs instruments and measures to represent gender differences in order to function well.

The lack of consistency and the existence of competing premises is particularly relevant for understanding the potential dangers in the implementation of policy measures. For example, the lack of a parallel discourse on changes to the male political elite required for aiding the entrance of more women into elected and decision-making bodies could suggest wrongly that male change is not needed to bring about

gender equality in politics. This situation could occur because the dominant prognostic frame of *increasing the number of women* through quotas and positive actions does not correspond to a parallel frame that suggests a *change of the male political elite*. As a result, this could create a potential conflict between the proposed measures to increase women's numbers and the missing measures demanding male politicians change their patriarchal attitudes in order to facilitate women's entry in the currently male-dominated political institutions. Frames do not only reveal inconsistencies but also *absences in the discourse*. Most of the documents, with few exceptions, such as Austria, mainly focus on women as the main problem-holders and *men* as the implicit or explicit norm group. Furthermore, the message to "encourage women" is ambiguous, as it provides women with resources for entering politics, while confirming a patronizing idea that women need encouragement and support, while men do not need training and information on the causes of male domination in politics, its effects on women and society, and the development of more gender equal attitudes. Moreover, since men are implicitly measured to a double normative standard, being the norm to whom women should conform to and the group dominating power positions, the premises that may allow women to challenge such power appear rather weak.

Absence can also be interpreted as lack of articulation, for instance, of *roles*, or as *lack of voice* of certain actors. In most frames where specific roles are absent, gendered structures of power—addressed as patriarchal structures or women-unfriendly electoral systems—are mentioned as responsible for the problem. Voices speaking in the texts are policymakers, mostly women. This in itself appears like an argument in favor of increasing the number of women in politics, otherwise the issue of gender inequality in politics would not be raised at all. Gender experts and the women's movement rarely appear in official texts, but when they do so they usually give voice to the frames that show a more structural approach to the problem and solution.

6. Gendering Inequality in Politics and Neglecting Other Inequalities

The issue of inequality in politics appears explicitly gendered because the unequal roles of women and men are far more visible here than in other policy areas. But how is this explicit genderedness treated in the analyzed texts? What meanings are attributed to gender? In most of the policy documents, women (and men) are seen as a homogenous group—either with similar characteristics and potentials or with similar interests. The gendering strategy varies according to the type of frame in the diagnosis or prognosis. When the frame is quantitative representation, the major framing of the issue, texts mainly take into account the physical presence of given women and thus focus on the mere sex of people. In diagnosis, the (physical) lack of

women is seen as the major problem of gender inequality in politics. The same applies to the policy solution of raising the number of women. In both cases, gender seems to represent a mere “natural” sex and a given, fixed, and dichotomous category: women opposed to men according to their “sex.” Moreover, most times women are the main focus of diagnosis and prognosis—it is not men’s over-representation that is depicted as a problem, but women’s underrepresentation. Since they do not frame the issue in relational terms, nor do they take into account the socially constructed dimension of the relation between women and men, policy documents on gender inequality in politics actually appear to be gender-blind.

The notion of physical presence of “natural sex” that we found to be the core of most problem definitions and solutions in our policy documents studied here differs from the idea of Phillips who distinguishes the “presence of ideas” and the “presence of people, of experiences.” Only in the *gender difference* frame—where the lack of women is depicted as a lack of women’s qualities and characteristics in politics or when women are expected to bring something different into politics—are women treated as gender rather than naturalized sex. However, this framing relies upon essentialist ideas of women’s characteristics, which are supposed to be all the same and different from men’s characteristics in politics.

The little consideration for the social dimension of gender is also reflected in the fact that women as a category are not “internally” differentiated in terms of social differences. The interplay of gender with other social differences and inequalities such as ethnicity, class, and social status or age is absent in almost all policy documents on gender inequality in politics. Differences only occur as differences in political ideology, that is, as differences among women belonging to different parties. A sign of the absence of concern for intersectionality is, for instance, the fact that the lack of voting power for migrant women is not seen as a problem of gender inequality in politics in the analyzed documents. This absence is particularly striking given the historical background of women’s struggles for the vote in Europe.

7. Comparing Gender Inequality in Politics across Europe

Our analysis of policy documents on gender inequality in politics shows that in the six countries and in the EU the main frame presents the issue as a quantitative problem that should be solved by increasing the number of women in politics. Keeping in mind this generally uniform trend in the framing of the problem and solution, our analysis also shows specific country patterns in framing the issue of gender inequality in politics. It shows some differences between the southern countries (Spain and Greece) and the EU, as well as between younger and less stabilized

(Greece, Hungary, Slovenia, and Spain) and older and more well-established democracies (Austria and the Netherlands). The pattern can also be described in terms of differences between liberal democracies and former socialist countries. The latter had a tradition of women's quotas in parliament, although imposed from above.

In the problem definition, the EU, Austria, the Netherlands, and Slovenia share a focus on targets, percentages of women in political institutions that must be achieved, while this frame is not so strong in Greece, Hungary, and Spain. In this sense, there exists a North/EU-South divide, in which northern countries share with the EU a "public management" discourse on achieving target figures, but there is not a clear East-West divide. Due to the socialist legacy of tokenism, post-socialist countries tend to be against quotas. In this respect, the Slovenian focus on achieving a certain percentage of women appears as an exception when compared to other post-socialist countries, including Hungary. The role of the state in the frames differs too. The southern countries do not blame the state for its failed policies on representation. This frame is present in countries either with strong corporatist structures or a state-socialist tradition—in Austria, the Netherlands, Hungary and Slovenia, as well as in the EU. Moreover, the interpretation of women's underrepresentation as a failure of democracy is more present in the EU, Spain, and Greece, partially in the former socialist countries, but not in Austria and the Netherlands, countries that perceive themselves as stable and "good" democracies.

While the EU shares the frame of the gendered division of labor as a problem for gender inequality in politics with the former socialist countries as well as with Spain and Greece, this frame is less strong in the Netherlands and Austria where again corporatist traditions, characterized by state's negotiations with employers' organizations and trade unions, might have established the hegemony of the class cleavages. The frame of Europeanization—in which the lack of female representation is framed as a problem of fitting into Europe—is present in the analyzed post-socialist countries Hungary and Slovenia. In Greece, a country in which the modernization/tradition divide has deep cultural roots, the framing of gender inequality in politics is linked to the discourse on the need for modernization of the country. By contrast, the weakness of the "Europeanization" frame in Spain is striking. Despite the evidence that Spanish gender policy has been Europeanized since Spain's membership in 1986, and that Spanish state feminists recognize the key role of the Union in supporting progress in Spanish gender policy, official documents analyzed here do not emphasize the need to comply with EU policies to increase women's representation. This official disregard shows the poor record of implementation of EU gender legislation on the part of Spanish courts and legal practitioners (Lombardo 2004).

The countries' problem solution patterns are more uniform than they are in diagnosis. The main uniformities across countries and the EU at the level of prognosis

consist in framing the general goal of policies on gender inequality in politics as women's quantitative representation. Quotas are present and dominant on the EU level and in all other countries, with the exception of Hungary and the Netherlands, where this is a minor frame. In general, it is common to propose the adoption of a state regulation as a major strategy to overcome the problem of gender inequality in politics, a suggestion less frequent only in Greece and the Netherlands.

A gap between the EU and the member states appears in the monitoring processes, mainly at the EU level, while it is absent in the nation-states. The EU emphasis on monitoring rather than regulatory activities can be explained due to the lack of EU competence in the area of gender inequality in politics. In effect, the monitoring progress of women in politics is a frame typical of the EU approach to gathering information, statistical data, and monitoring activities to support member states in policy implementation. However, the lack of this frame at the national level is evidence of a poor culture of evaluation of public policies in the member states that could hinder an effective implementation of other EU policies too.

The overall picture is more differentiated when it comes to the type of approach that should be adopted to solve the problem and the actors that should do something about it. As far as the adoption of a broader approach to policymaking is concerned, in spite of the (mainly soft) EU legislation on gender mainstreaming, the latter is in fact a weak frame at the EU level for solving the problem of gender inequality in politics. At least at the rhetorical level, the frame is rather strong in Spain and the Netherlands, and less frequent but present in Austria. Rather than focusing on gender mainstreaming, Greece recurrently uses women's capacities as an argument for solving the problem of gender inequality in politics. Such a gender difference argument is uncommon in the remaining countries. It is absent on the EU level, in Slovenia, and in the Netherlands, and it is a minor frame in Hungary, Austria, and Spain.

With respect to who should do something to solve the problem, the EU and Spain suggest the strategy of encouraging women to participate in politics (a "supply-oriented" approach). The option of making parties responsible for the solution is absent only at the EU level, while it is present in Slovenia and Austria, less frequent in Spain and the Netherlands, and weak in Greece and Hungary. This may depend on several factors, among which are different national traditions of demanding the accountability of political parties, the centrality of the party system in the functioning of democracy, parties being more or less trustworthy, etc. Finally, the idea that a "triangle of empowerment" between femocrats, female politicians, and women's movement actors would contribute to the solution of gender inequality is not a strong frame in the debates, possibly due to the limited presence of feminist voices in the documents: only in Spain this appears as an important strategy, while it is absent in Greece, and less frequent or weak in the other case studies.

If we look at what should be the object of change, member states and the EU place the emphasis on different aspects of the solution. Some countries, such as Slovenia and Spain, partially, show a special interest in changing the polity like the election system or the constitution. This frame is less strong in Austria and the Netherlands and is weak at the EU level. When the object of change is the gendered division of labor, the frame is strong only in Spain and the Netherlands, while it is less frequent at the EU level and in Hungary, and a weak frame in Greece and Austria. Changes in the political culture, for instance, concerning the perception of women politicians in society, are strongly recommended only in Spain, while this is a less strong framing at the EU level and in the Netherlands, and a weak frame in Greece and Austria. In conclusion, although clearcut shifts and cleavages between South/North and East/West cannot be identified in the framing of gender inequality in politics across Europe, a number of group and specific country patterns could be found that concern small variations in the major frame and in the articulation of alternative frames.

8. Conclusions

From Pitkin (1967) onwards, the literature on gender inequality in politics has placed the concept of political representation at the core of its theorizations. In this respect, our analysis presents analogies with existing scholarly debates, as it shows clearly that the major framing of the problem and the solution across all countries and the EU remains that of women's quantitative political representation. This has important implications. When using this frame, policymakers implicitly or explicitly are relying on a (normative) theory of democracy: democracy is representative democracy and representation is about numbers of people—the majority rule. Policymakers mainly stick to the idea of quantitative representation, but they do not argue why raising the number of women should contribute to democracy.

In this sense, it appears as if concepts such as Phillips' "politics of presence" or Dahlerup's "critical mass" are somehow in the background of policymakers' debates, although the latter seem to lack articulated arguments (that are present in the literature) to support their standpoints. This might explain why the quantitative shift proposed in the majority of policy discourses on gender inequality in politics rarely is seen to be in need of shifts in power and political structures. Policymakers seem to adopt a rather simplistic approach to the problem, when in fact the change required to bring about political equality appears more complex than a shift in numbers may suggest (Lovenduski 2005; Lombardo and Meier 2006).

Indeed, a mere focus on numbers not supported by other structural measures that address, for instance, reconciliation of family and personal life with politics and

targeting male politicians, could have the effect of de-politicizing the issue. This is because, although setting targets can have its positive side by giving an easy visibility to the issue, a predominantly numerical framing may risk suggesting that the problem of gender inequality in politics can be solved by achieving some target figures, not by changing existing gendered power relations. This dilemma has been conceptualized as the “benchmarking fallacy” of women in political decision-making (Meier et al. 2005).

Apart from the co-occurrence of the quantitative frame in all countries, there emerge articulations of minor frames that provide interesting insights on the nature of the problem of gender inequality in politics. Some of the issues that emerge in the frames are debated in the literature on political representation, particularly with respect to the barriers to women’s political participation represented by party and electoral politics (Lovenduski and Norris 1995). Policy frames found include, among others, male domination and patriarchy, the unfriendliness of electoral systems to women candidates and voters, the importance of women’s triangles of empowerment, and structural obstacles to women’s political representation caused by the gender division of labor in society as a preconditioning structure of politics as a profession.

These alternative frames appear more often in the discourse of gender advocates, such as women politicians from left-wing parties (often with a feminist background), gender experts, and civil society actors. However, the extremely limited reference to the voice of civil society actors, gender experts, and women’s movements in official policy documents shows that the contribution they could offer to the framing of the problem and the solution of gender inequality in politics is inevitably limited. The absence of their voices and their debates apparently affects the terms in which the problem and solution of gender inequality in politics is debated in the political arena, thus narrowing the definition of the issue only to the concerns voiced by policymakers. The small presence of issues analyzed in the policy documents, such as gendering policy outcomes (Mazur 2001; Stetson 2001; Outshoorn 2004; Lovenduski 2005) and reflecting on the notion of women’s interests (Celis 2005), that we find in most recent scholarly studies in gender and politics could perhaps also be connected to the absence of the voice of gender experts and women’s movements in policy debates.

The policy field discussed in this chapter is gendered in a specific way—it is about the deficits of women in politics. Although documents generally do not blame women directly for gender inequality in politics, women are presented as the problem holders. It is mainly women speaking in the documents, and policy recommendations mainly address women (very rarely men)—if not social structures like general social inequality, sexual division of labor, and patriarchy. Men appear as the implicit norm group and are not asked to change. The concept of gender that is adopted in most policy documents analyzed shows that the issue of gender inequality in politics is not generally framed in substantially transformative terms across Europe. It seems

to pursue practical gender goals related to women's inclusion in the existing political world rather than strategic objectives of transformation of the existing gender order. Difference arguments can be found but are not dominant. Furthermore, the reference to social structures in the frames is helpful for analyzing the problem and exploring the causes of female underrepresentation. However, since this approach is combined with an implicit norm of men and concrete responsibilities are missing when it comes to policy action, the solution might be difficult to achieve. Finally, issues that we find in the literature linking recognition and redistribution, such as Fraser's (1995 and 1997) reflections on the intersection between class and gender inequalities, are extremely rare in the analyzed texts, as are all references to intersectionality.

While country patterns show a general uniformity in the major quantitative framing of the issue, the comparison between nation-states and the EU level shows that the EU makes general diagnoses and recommendations that do not necessarily adapt to the polity and politics of the different nation-states (for instance, different party systems, different polity arrangements). Moreover, since it has no competence on gender inequality in politics, the EU makes general statements about the problem and solution of gender inequality in politics but its action is based on "soft" rather than binding measures that reduce its impact on member states.

Finally, the framing of the issue of gender inequality in politics reveals a number of inconsistencies like: the unbalance towards the prognosis of the problem, which shows a poor diagnosis; a mismatch between diagnostic frames on the problem of male domination that are then left with no solution challenging the male standard; or essentialist perceptions of women and gender that hinder the effective implementation of gender equality policies. It seems that to formulate more transformative and effective policies to solve the problem of gender inequality in politics, policymakers should become more aware of such inconsistencies in order to design more coherent policies. The awareness of inconsistencies would help them, for instance, to adopt a broader approach to the issue of gender inequality in politics, that would tackle not only the number of women in politics but also more structural issues concerning the challenging of male domination in politics and the unequal sexual division of labor. Or it could serve to make women *and* men, rather than only women, the main subjects holding the problem of gender inequality in politics and the main responsible for solving it. This would require change from male political elites too, thus initiating a process that we could name *taming the male sovereign*. This approach, however, seems to rely on the political will to open debates on the meanings of gender equality in politics with a wider range of political actors, including civil society and the feminist movements. The most direct challenges to male domination in politics often come precisely from the discourse of these neglected actors. In this respect, the inclusion of alternative articulations and voices could open up new possibilities for

representing the problem and solution in ways that go beyond the major quantitative framing of the issue, ways that could even approach the issue in more structural and defiant terms.

Sources Cited

- Bacchi, Carol (2005) "The MAGEEQ Project: Identifying Contesting Meanings of 'Gender Equality.'" *The Greek Review of Social Research*. Special Issue: Differences in the Framing of Gender Inequality as a Policy Problem across Europe 117 (B'): 221–234.
- Celis, Karen (2005) "Reconciling Theory and Empirical Research. Methodological Reflections on Women MPs Representing Women(s) Interests." Paper presented at the ECPR conference, Budapest, Hungary.
- Childs, Sarah (2004) *Women Representing Women: New Labour Women and the Substantive Representation of Women MPs*. London: Frank Cass.
- Dahlerup, Drude (1988) "From a Small to a Large Minority." *Scandinavian Political Studies* 11 (4): 275–298.
- Dahlerup, Drude, ed. (2006) *Women, Quotas and Politics*. London: Routledge.
- Diamond, Irene and Nancy Hartsock (1998) "Beyond Interest in Politics: A Comment on Virginia Sapiro's 'When Are Interests Interesting?'" In *Feminism and Politics*, edited by Anne Phillips, 193–202. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Einhorn, Barbara (1993) *Cinderella Goes to Market. Citizenship, Gender and Women's Movements in east Central Europe*. London: Verso.
- Fraser, Nancy (1995) "From Redistribution to Recognition? Dilemmas of Justice in a 'Post-Socialist' Age." *New Left Review* I/212 (July–August): 68–93.
- (1997) *Justice Interruptus: Critical Reflections on the 'Post-Socialist' Condition*. London: Routledge.
- (2003) "Soziale Gerechtigkeit im Zeitalter der Identitätspolitik. Umverteilung, Anerkennung und Beteiligung." In *Umverteilung oder Anerkennung? Eine politisch-philosophische Kontroverse*, 13–128. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.
- Galligan, Yvonne and Manon Tremblay, eds. (2005) *Sharing Power. Women, Parliament, Democracy*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Hardmeier, Sibylle (2004) "Repräsentation." In *Politikwissenschaft und Geschlecht*, 149–170. Wien: UTB.
- Horváth, Anna, Andrea Krizsán, and Violetta Zentai (2004) "Country Study: Hungary. Political Representation." *MAGEEQ Research Report*. Vienna: IWM.
- Jalušič, Vlasta and Milica Antić (2001) "Women—Politics—Equal Opportunities. Prospects for Gender Equality Politics in Central and Eastern Europe." Ljubljana:

- Peace Institute. Available online http://www.mirovni-institut.si/eng_html/publications/pdf/MI_politike_women-politics-eq_opp_eng.pdf.
- Jalušič, Vlasta and Majda Hrženjak (2006) "The Meaning of Gender/s: the Political Dimensions of Gender in Policy Practice." Paper delivered at the IPSA World Congress, Fukuoka.
- Lombardo, Emanuela (2004) *La europeización de la política española de igualdad de género*. Valencia: Tirant Lo Blanch.
- Lombardo, Emanuela and Petra Meier (2006) "Gender Mainstreaming in the EU: Incorporating a Feminist Reading?" *The European Journal of Women's Studies*. 13 (2): 151–166.
- Lombardo, Emanuela, Vlasta Jalušič, Maro Pantelidou Maloutas, and Birgit Sauer (2005) "Comparative Frame Analysis: Gender Inequality in Politics." *MAGEEQ Research Report*. Vienna: IWM.
- Lovenduski, Joni and Pippa Norris (1993) *Gender and Party Politics*. London: Sage.
- (1995) *Political Recruitment: Gender, Race and Class in the British Parliament*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lovenduski, Joni, ed. (2005) *State Feminism and Political Representation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mansbridge, Jane (2003) "Rethinking Representation." *American Political Science Review* 97 (4): 117–138.
- (2005) "The Fallacy of Tightening the Reigns." In *Repräsentation und Verfassung. Zur Legitimität des europäischen Verfassungskonvents*. *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Politikwissenschaft* 3: 233–249.
- Mateo, Mercedes (2005) *Representing Women? Female Legislators in West European Parliaments*. Essex: ECPR.
- Mazur, Amy (2002) *Theorizing Feminist Policy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mazur, Amy, ed. (2001) *State Feminism, Women's Movements, and Job Training: Making Democracies Work in a Global Economy*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Meier, Petra et al. (2005) "Gender Mainstreaming and the Benchmarking Fallacy of Women in Political Participation." *The Greek Review of Social Research*. Special Issue: Differences in the Framing of Gender Inequality as a Policy Problem across Europe 117 (B'): 35–62.
- Norris, Pippa (1996) "Women Politicians: Transforming Westminster?" *Parliamentary Affairs* 49 (1): 89–102.
- Outshoorn, Joyce, ed. (2004) *The Politics of Prostitution: Women's Movements, Democratic States, and the Globalization of Sex Commerce*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pantelidou Maloutas, Maro (2005) "Comparing Frames, Framing Comparisons: Greece/EU Frames on Gender Inequality in Politics." *The Greek Review of Social*

- Research*. Special Issue: Differences in the Framing of Gender Inequality as a Policy Problem across Europe 117 (B'): 149–168.
- (2006) *The Gender of Democracy. Citizenship and Gendered Subjectivity*. London: Routledge.
- Paxton, Pamela and Sheri Kunovich (2003) “Women’s Political Representation. The Importance of Ideology.” *Social Forces* 82: 87–113.
- Phillips, Anne (1995) *The Politics of Presence*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- (1997) *Which Differences Matter?* Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Pitkin, Hanna Fenichel (1967) *The Concept of Representation*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Sapiro, Virginia (1998) “When Are Interests Interesting? The Problem of Political Representation of Women.” In *Feminism and Politics*, edited by Anne Phillips, 161–192. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rueschmeyer, Marylin (1998) *Women in the Politics of Postcommunist Eastern Europe*. New York, London: M.E. Sharpe.
- Sauer, Birgit (2007) “Demokratisierung als Standardisierung männlicher Politik? Geschlechterkritische Anmerkungen zur politikwissenschaftlichen Transformationsforschung.” In *Go East*, edited by Eva Kreisky and Andreas Pribersky. Wien: Peter Lang.
- Squires, Judith (1999) *Gender in Political Theory*. Cambridge/Oxford: Polity Press.
- Stetson, Dorothy McBride, ed. (2001) *Abortion Politics, Women’s Movements and the Democratic State: A Comparative Study of State Feminism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tremblay, Manon and Réjean Pelletier (2000) “More Feminists or More Women?” *International Political Science Review* 21 (4): 381–405.
- Verloo, Mieke (2005) “Mainstreaming Gender Equality in Europe. A Frame Analysis Approach.” *The Greek Review of Social Research*. Special Issue: Differences in the Framing of Gender Inequality as a Policy Problem across Europe 117 (B'): 11–34.
- Verloo, Mieke and Maro Pantelidou Maloutas (2005) “Editorial: Differences in the Framing of Gender Inequality as a Policy Problem across Europe.” *The Greek Review of Social Research* 117 (B'): 3–10.
- Woodward, Alison (2004) “Building Velvet Triangles: Gender and Informal Governance.” In *Informal Governance in the European Union*, edited by Thomas Christiansen and Simona Piattoni. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Young, Iris Marion (1994) “Gender as Seriality: Thinking about Women as a Social Collective.” *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 19 (3): 713–738.
- (2000) *Inclusion and Democracy*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Annex 1.

List of Texts on Gender Inequality in Politics Analyzed by the MAGEEQ Project

Austria

1. ÖVP party program (1995).
2. Article in *Die Presse* (October 1995).
3. Article in *Die Presse* (January 1996).
4. Dissenting opinion on equal treatment report (December 1996).
5. Article of *Die Presse* (January 1997).
6. Article of *Der Standard* (October 1998).
7. SPÖ party program (1998).
8. FPÖ deputies on amending Federal Equal Treatment Act (June 1999).
9. SPÖ deputies on amending Federal Equal Treatment Act (June 1999).
10. Liberal Forum deputy on Federal Equal Treatment Act (June 1999).
11. ÖVP deputies on amending Federal Equal Treatment Act (June 1999).
12. Green Party deputies on Federal Equal Treatment Act (June 1999).
13. Austria's 5th CEDAW report (September 1999 and April 2000).
14. Article in *Der Standard* (September 2000).
15. Article in *Der Standard* (July 2001).
16. Green Party program (2001).
17. FPÖ Women's Initiative statement on quota (March 2002).
18. Article in *Der Standard* (December 2002).
19. Article in *Der Standard* (January 2003).
20. Government program (February 2003).
21. ÖVP deputy's statement on quota (July 2003).
22. Statement on new Federal Equal Treatment Act (September 2003).

European Union

1. Keynote speech by Mr. Pádraig Flynn, European Commissioner for Social Affairs and Employment (...) Dublin, Ireland.
2. Council Resolution of March 27, 1995 on the balanced participation of men and women in decision-making (OJ C168 4.7.1995).
3. Charter of Rome (1996) Summit on "women for the renewal of politics and society."
4. Garcia Munoz, Victoria, and Emily Carey (1997) "Differential Impact of Electoral Systems on Female Political Representation." *Women's Rights Series 10*. European Parliament: Luxembourg.

5. Leyenaar, Monique (1997) *How to Create a Gender Balance in Political Decision-making*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
6. European Election Brochure (...) "Europe for women, women for Europe," prepared by European Commission DGV, in cooperation with the Women's Rights Committee of the European Parliament.
7. European Women's Lobby (1999) Special edition newsletter: "New European Parliament, A New Commission—How much will women benefit?" July 1999.
8. Finnish Presidency (1999) Report to the Council on "Women in the Decision-making Process" in the Member States and the European Institutions. October 22, 1999.
9. European Parliament Resolution on "Women in Decision-making" (2000) March 2, 2000. B5-0180/2000 OJ C346/82.
10. European Women Lobby's Recommendation on "Women in Decision-making" (2000) May 22, 2000.
11. European Commission (1996) Report from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, and the Economic and Social Committee on the implementation of Council Recommendation 96/694 of December 2, 1996 on the balanced participation of women and men in the decision-making process. OJ L391, COM(2000)120.
12. European Commission (2000) Communication from the Commission of July 7, 2000 addressed to Member States on the Commission Decision relating to a gender balance within the committees and expert groups established by it.
13. European Parliament Committee on Women's Rights and Equal Opportunities (2000). Report on the Commission report on the implementation of Council Recommendation 96/694 of December 2, 1996 on the balanced participation of women and men in the decision-making process. COM(2000) 120—C5-0210/2000—2000/2117(COS).
14. EP debate 96/694 report: European Parliament plenary debate on balanced participation of women and men in the decision-making process (COM(2000) 120—C5-0210/2000—2000/2117(COS))
15. EWL (2004) Lobbying Kit: European Women's Lobby Lobbying Kit for European Elections 2004. "Have we got the balance right?"
16. European Parliament Committee on Women's Rights and Equal Opportunities (2004) Report on the elections of 2004: How to ensure balanced representation of women and men. A5-0333/2003.

Greece

1. Parliamentary discussion on the amendment of Law 2910/2001, Article 75, on the application of quotas in municipal elections.
 - M. Damanaki's speech
 - R. Zisi's speech
 - V. Papandreou's speech
 - E. Kourkoulas's speech
 - P. Foundoukidou's speech
 - K. Papacosta's speech
 - O. Kolozof's speech
2. Papandreou, V. (2003) Speech "Women in Posts of Responsibility: New Policies." May 7, 2003.
3. Soula Efthymiou (2003) Speech "Women Intervene in Local Society" at the regional conference of Pasok women of Thessaly, Greece. May 11, 2003.
4. Center of Research on Equality Issues (2004) "New Directions, Vote for Women, Women in Decision-making." Pamphlet prior to the 2004 parliamentary elections.
5. Diamantopoulou, A. (2001) Speech "Women, A Force for Development and Renewal in Political and Social Life" Panhellenique Conference of Pasok's women section, September 24, 2001.

Hungary

1. Lévai, Katalin and Róbert Kiss (1997) 'Women in Public Life.' In *Changing Roles. A Report on the Status of Women*. Budapest: Ministry for Labor (Secretariat for Women's Issues) in co-operation with TARKI.
2. Alliance of Free Democrats [SZDSZ] (1999) Equal Opportunities for Men and Women.
3. Wiener, György and Mónika Lamperth, Socialist MPs in opposition, Hungarian Socialist Party or MSZP (2000) Proposal for reducing unequal opportunities of women and men in national parliamentary election procedures. March 2000.
4. Parliamentary Temporary Committee Preparing the Reform of the Election System (2000) Protocol. September.
 - a) Péter Hack (liberal MP in opposition, SZDSZ): comments during the debate on the decision whether the Temporary Committee Preparing the Reform of the Election System supports the proposal of MP György Wiener and MP Mónika Lamperth.
 - b) György Rubovszky (right-wing MP of governing party, FIDESZ), Zoltán Balczkó (radical right-wing MP in opposition, MIÉP), Béla Pokol (right-

wing MP of governing party, FKG): comments during the debate on the decision whether the Temporary Committee Preparing the Reform of the Election System supports the proposal of MP György Wiener and MP Mónika Lamperth.

- c) György Wiener (socialist MP in opposition, MSZP): comments during the debate on the decision whether the Temporary Committee Preparing the Reform of the Election System supports the proposal of MP György Wiener and MP Mónika Lamperth.
5. Consideration of reports submitted by Government under Article 18 of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women. Combined fourth and fifth periodic reports of Hungary to the CEDAW Committee, September 2000.
6. Lendvai, Ildikó (2001) “The Women’s Policy of the Hungarian Socialist Party (MSZP).” MONA conference paper.
7. Hungarian Socialist Party [MSZP] (2002) “Program against Poverty and for Equal Opportunities.” Socio-political and Equal Opportunities Cabinet of the Hungarian Socialist Party.
8. Ministry for Justice (2002) Concept and Draft Law on Equal Treatment and Equal Opportunities. November.
9. Protocol of the plenary session of the Parliament on the project for the Law on Equal Treatment and the Promotion of Equal Opportunities, No. T/5585. October–December 2003.
 - a) Péter Harrach (right-wing MP in opposition, FIDESZ): comments during the debate on the project for the Law on Equal Treatment and the Promotion of Equal Opportunities.
10. “Women in Power and Decision-making” (2004) Preliminary country report on the implementation of the Beijing Action Program (internal affairs), 1999–2004.

The Netherlands

1. Emancipation under Execution (1995) Short-term Policy Plan Emancipation in Execution. November 22, 1995.
2. EER electoral system (1996) Gender Impact Assessment on the proposition for a mixed electoral system. July 1996.
3. Cab Standpoint (1996) Cabinet Standpoint on Women in Politics and Public Governance 1996/Letter from the Minister of the Interior (22777, No. 8). November 13, 1996.
4. Parliamentarian Committee for Social Affairs and Employment (1999) “Women in Politics and Public Governance” (KS 22777-11), Minutes of

- general meeting of the Parliamentary Committee for Social Affairs and Employment debating the position of women in politics and public administration. January 20, 1999.
5. Leyenaar (1999) Power and Decision-making: on emancipation and participation. Exploration of the field on behalf of the Dutch women's policy machinery. May 1999.
 6. MJB (2000) Mid-term Policy Plan on Emancipation 2000. November 15, 2000.
 7. Adviesstelsel (2000) "A World to Gain." TECENA'S final report on the advisory system with conclusions and recommendations. December 2000
 8. Minister of the Interior and Kingdom Relations (2001) Letter from the Minister of the Interior and Kingdom Relations informing the Second Chamber of Parliament about the cabinet's resolutions concerning possible arrangements for pregnancy and delivery leave for politicians. April 6, 2001.
 9. Parliamentary Committee for Social Affairs and Employment (2001) Minutes of the General Meeting of the Parliamentary Committee for Social Affairs and Employment consulting the Secretary of State on Social Affairs and Employment A. Verstand on the cabinet's reaction (letter of October 1, 2001) to CEDAW's reaction to the second and third national report (28009, No. 7). November 28, 2001
 10. Parliamentary Debate (2002) Minutes of Plenary Parliamentary Debate on an arrangement proposal for the replacement of political representatives during sickness and pregnancy. February 7, 2002
 11. Parliamentary Questions (2002) Answers to parliamentary questions on women elected in municipal councils. March 28, 2002.
 12. Parliamentary Questions (2002) Questions by members of second chamber to Minister of the Interior on the number of women in the new cabinet. September 13, 2002.
 13. Policy Article 12 (2003) Annual presentation of emancipation policy resolutions. September 2003.
 14. Committee of the Interior (2003) Bill amendment to the Constitution on amendment regulations regarding the election of the Lower and Upper House, the provincial and the local councils on a temporary replacement of their members due to pregnancy, delivery, or illness. Report of the Permanent Committee of the Interior. March 25, 2003
 15. Mediakesstelsel (2004) "New Electoral System Does Not Solve the Problems." Opinion in NRC *Handelsblad*. February 19, 2004.

Slovenia

1. Committee of the Interior (2002) Discussions on the Act on Equal Opportunities of Women and Men at the Committee of the Interior, 26th session. June 18, 2002.
2. Act on Equal Opportunities of Women and Men (2002) Discussions at the National Assembly, 17th session. June 20, 2002.
3. Act on Equal Opportunities of Women and Men (2002) Adopted on June 21, 2002.
4. Letter to the presidents of the political parties and invitation to the public discussion “European Elections—Challenge for Equal Opportunities of Women and Men in Slovenia.” October 20, 2003.
5. Constitutional Commission (2002) Public presentation of opinions at the Constitutional Commission of the National Assembly. “Promoting Equal Opportunities of Men and Women in Standing as Candidates at Elections.” October 28, 2002.
6. Committee of Interior and Justice (1998) Proposal for accepting the obligatory explanation of Paragraph 5, Article 19 of the Law on Political Parties. 24th regular meeting of the Committee of Interior and Justice of the National Assembly of the Republic of Slovenia. September 6, 1998.
7. Proposal for starting the procedure to change Article 44 of the Constitution (Encouraging equal opportunities of men and women to run for election). September 20, 2002.
8. Report of the expert group about the proposal for starting the procedure to change Article 44 of the Constitution of the Republic of Slovenia (Encouraging equal opportunities of men and women to run for election). September 18, 2002.
9. Proposal for accepting the obligatory explanation of Paragraph 5, Article 19 of the Law on Political Parties (Continuation of the 19th regular meeting of the National Assembly), February 29, 2000.
10. Proposal for starting the procedure for the change of the Constitution of the Republic of Slovenia with the draft Constitution Law. November 30, 2001.
11. Proposal of the Act on Changes and Amendments of the Act on Political Parties. Discussions at the National Assembly, 38th regular session. February 28, 1996.

MP (m), SDS, President of the Committee for Internal Affairs and Justice.

MP (m), United List of Social Democrats, Representative of the submitters of the changes.

MP (f), Liberal Democracy of Slovenia, President of the Women’s Policy Commission.

12. Letter to MPs about the changes and amendments to the Act on Elections of MPs of the Republic of Slovenia to the European Parliament. January 16, 2004.
13. Report to the proposal of the Act on Changes and Amendments to the Act on Elections of MPs of the Republic of Slovenia to the European Parliament. January 21, 2004.
 Spokeswoman of the Office for Legislation and Judiciary
 Spokesman of the government
14. Report to the proposal of the Act on Changes and Amendments to the Act on Elections of MPs of the Republic of Slovenia to the European Parliament by Members of the Committee of the Interior. January 21, 2004.
15. Parliamentary debate on the Proposal of the Act on Changes and Amendments to the Act on Elections of MPs of the Republic of Slovenia to the European Parliament by MPs of position parties. February 26, 2004.
16. Parliamentary debate on the Proposal of the Act on Changes and Amendments to the Act on Elections of MPs of the Republic of Slovenia to the European Parliament by MPs of opposition parties. February 26, 2004.
17. UN Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women; Second Report of the Republic of Slovenia on the Implementation of the Provisions of the Convention to the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women, January 1999.
18. UN Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women; Third Report of the Republic of Slovenia on the Implementation of the Provisions of the Convention to the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women, December 2002.

Spain

1. Third Plan for Equal Opportunities between women and men 1997–2000.
2. Fourth Plan for Equal Opportunities between women and men 2003–2006.
3. Third Equality Plan Basque Country 1999–2000.
4. Fourth Governmental Action by the *Catalonia Generalitat* in Equal Opportunities for Women (2001–2003).
5. Fourth Equal Opportunities Plan for Women and Men in the region of Madrid 2002–2005.
6. The Socialist Party's (PSOE) Equality Plan, April 26, 2002.
7. Parliamentary debate on women's rights. April 22, 1997.
8. Law proposal from November 16, 2001 on a reform of the electoral Law 5/1985, June 19.

9. Law 11/2002, June 27, for modifying the electoral law 5/1986, December 23. Castilla-La Mancha.
10. Debate on three law proposals on guaranteeing equality among men and women in their access to electoral positions. April 8, 2003.
11. Fernando Lazaro and Nuria San Roman (1999) “Aznar and Borrel State their Differences Regarding Policies for Women” *El Mundo*. March 7, 1999.
12. Women’s Movement Manifesto for Parity (CELEM—Spanish coordinator for the European Women’s Lobby)
13. María Durán (1999) ‘Initiatives and Reforms of Electoral Legislation. Modifications in the Norm of Financing Political Parties’ *Towards a Parity Democracy: Analysis and Review of the Current Electoral Legislation*.
14. Socialist Party [PSOE] (2004) Electoral program.
15. Leftist Party [IU] (2004) Electoral program.

Annex 2.

Table 1.

Percentages of Women in Parliaments and Cabinets from 1995 to 2004

Country	1995		2000		2004	
	Parliament	Cabinet	Parliament	Cabinet	Parliament	Cabinet
Greece	6.3 (1996)		8.7 (2000)		13.0–14.0 (2004)	President 0 JM 0 SM 17 (2006)
Slovenia	7.8 (1996)		—		12.2 LH 7.5 UH (2004)	President 0 JM SM 6 (2006)
Hungary	11.4 (1994)		8.3 (1998)		9.1 (2002) 10.4 (2006)	President 0 JM 20 SM 12 (2006)
Austria	26.2 LH 20.3 UH (1995)		26.8 LH 20.3 UH (1999)		33.9 LH 27.4 UH (2002)	President 0 JM 0 SM 55 (2006)
Spain	24.7 LH 13.3 UH (1996)		28.3 LH 22.8 UH (2000)		36.0 LH 23.2 UH (2004)	President 0 JM 50 SM (2006)
Netherlands	31.3 LH 22.7 UH (1994)		36.0 LH 26.7 UH (1998)		36.7 LH 29.3 UH (2003)	President 0 JM 50 SM 31 (2006)
<i>EU</i>	1995		2000		2004	
	Parliament	President	Parliament	President	Parliament	President
	President 0 26.8 (1994–1998)	President 0 25.0 (1995–1998)	President 31.0 (1999–2001)	President 0 25.0 (1999–2001)	President 0 30.0 (2006)	President 0 29.0 (2006)

Notes: LH stands for Lower House, UH stands for Upper House, JM stands for Junior Ministers, and SM stands for Senior Ministers.

Sources: Data for the Parliament come from Inter-Parliamentary Union, <http://www.ipu.org>; data for the cabinet come from European Commission, DG Employment, Database on Women and Men in Decision-making, as it is for data concerning the EU institutions, http://ec.europa.eu/employment_social/women_men_stats/index_en.htm.