



Contract No. 028545-2

QUING

Quality in Gender+ Equality Policies
Integrated Project

Priority 7 – Citizens and Governance in a knowledge based Society
7.1.2. Gender and Citizenship in a Multicultural Context

Deliverable No. 71: Final WHY Report

Authors: Mieke Verloo & Sylvia Walby

Due date of deliverable: 28.02.2010
Actual submission date: 30.06.2010

Start date of project: 01.10.2006

Duration: 54 Months

Project co-funded by the European Commission within the Sixth Framework Programme (2002-2006)

Dissemination Level

PU	Public	X
PP	Restricted to other programme participants (including the Commission Services)	
RE	Restricted to a group specified by the consortium (including the Commission Services)	
CO	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	

IWM Vienna

Contents

	Page
Introduction	4
The WHY research process and the QUING objectives	5
The WHY papers: substantive findings	7
Paths, borders and bridges: impact of ethnicity and religion on women's movement in Turkey	7
Institutionalising intersectionality in Portugal: towards a multiple approach?	9
Is gender equality soluble into self-governance? Europeanizing gender at the sub-national level in Spain	12
Intersectionality and the quality of gendered employment policy	16
Intersectionality in Gender+ Training	19
The politics of intersectionality in Spain: shaping intersectional approaches in a multi-level polity	21
Children and fathers first? Fertility treatment policies in Denmark, Finland and Sweden	24
European vs. national in Polish gender equality debates and policy documents	26
Roma in European gender equality policy debates: intersectionalized and feminized	29
'Beyond the 'worlds of compliance': a sociological and discursive approach to the Europeanisation of gender equality policies	31
Rethinking the effects of Europeanisation: civil society and state framing of gender equality policies in Turkey and Croatia	34
Institutionalising intersectionality in Italy: gatekeepers and political dynamics	37
On the interface between civil society and state and its implications for the quality of gender equality policies in Estonia	40
Beyond the 'worlds of compliance': a sociological and discursive approach to the Europeanisation of gender equality policies: women and employment: does France go it alone?	43
Intimate citizenship policies in Greece and the impact of religion and the Church	46
Family policy debates in post-state socialist Hungary: from maternalism to gender equality	49
Stretching EU conditionality: mechanisms of Europeanization in making domestic violence policies in Central and Eastern Europe	53

Intersectionality: who's concern? Institutionalizing equality policy in new Central and Eastern European Members States of the EU	57
In the background of non-discrimination discourse: from the rights of same-sex partners to the rights of children. The use of the Europeanization frame in non-heterosexual intimacy policies in Europe	59
Norms and silences in gender equality policies: an analysis of policy debates on domestic services in Spain and Sweden	61
Domestic services or maid? Discourses on gender equality, work and integration in Nordic policy debate	64
Identifying gender transformation in welfare state policies: an analysis of leave regulations and framing in EU member states and the EU	67
Accommodating multiple discrimination equality bodies in Belgium and the Netherlands analyzed from an intersectional gender perspective	70
The political treatment of inequalities in Europe: a comparative analysis of Italy, Portugal and Spain	75
Framing gender intersections in the European Union: what implications for the quality of intersectionality in policies?	78
Institutionalising intersectionality in the European Union? Policy developments and contestations	83
Europeanization of gender equality policies through the needle's eye of Slovakia and the Czech Republic	87
Gender policy as a means of Europeanization: the case of Greece	89
Limits of Europeanization: marriage, family and reproduction policies in Lithuania	94
Gender+ equality policies as Europeanisation of old and new member states? An ongoing process	97
Going international? Civil society voices and the role of international actors in Austrian and German gender equality policies	100
Towards a processual intersectional policy analysis	103
Linking demographic balance and gender equality: analysing reconciliation and reproductive rights in gender equality policies	106
Religion, church, intimate citizenship and gender equality: an analysis of differences in gender equality policies in European Catholic countries	108
Intersectionality and the quality of equality architecture in Britain	111
The WHY papers and the QUING objectives	114
Bibliography	128

Introduction¹

QUING has set out to contribute to a better understanding of gender+ equality policies, and to bring forward further developments that could improve the quality of these policies. In order to do this, QUING's objectives range from contributions that centre on conceptualizations of crucial elements of gender+ equality policies, notably on intersectionality and the form of civil society engagement, to contributions that focus on systematically gathering and analysing the current content of gender+ equality policies, including the standing and voice of civil society, and the relationship between gender+ equality policies at Member State level and on the level of the European Union. Together these contributions also deliver new or improved concepts and typologies. Finally, the results of the empirical research are woven into applicable gender+ expertise in the form of standards for gender+ training.

Overview of QUING Objectives

QUING has four sets of Objectives. The first set is to conceptualize what is needed for inclusive gender+ equality policies. Inclusive means gender equality policies that are empowering and contributing towards active citizenship of all (inclusive). The + means that they are not biased towards other inequalities but rather incorporate attention for other inequalities where they intersect with gender inequality, so as to be adequate in Europe's diverse and multicultural contexts. The objectives in the first set (1-4) are grounded in the recognition of actual problems in current gender equality policies in the European Union, its member states and its candidate states.

1.
 - Conceptualizing the relationships between different inequalities, especially between gender, race/ethnicity, religion, class and sexuality
2.
 - Conceptualizing and mapping the interfaces between civil society and policy making
3.
 - Conceptualizing participatory forms of gender and diversity mainstreaming by accentuating voice and civil society interfaces
4.
 - Conceptualizing and mapping of civil society texts on gender + equality

The second set of Objectives is to systematically gather and present material on the actual content and quality of current gender+ equality policies. The Objectives in this set (5-7) include the ambition to understand and explain the practices that will be systematically described.

5.
 - Assessing the content and quality of gender+ equality policies in the EU's multicultural context
6.
 - Assessing the standing and voice of civil society in gender + equality policies
7.
 - Explaining deficiencies, deviations and inconsistencies in EU and Member State's gender + equality policies

The third set of Objectives (8-9) is to contribute to social science theory by delivering concepts typologies and other theoretical and empirical contributions.

8.
 - Developing an institutional approach to practices of citizenship
9.
 - Developing a typology of gender regimes in Europe

The last Objective, 10, is to actively contribute to the further quality of policymaking on gender and citizenship in a multicultural context by creating and disseminating high quality standards for the training of civil servants towards better policy making, and ensuring their maintenance by high quality partner.

10.
 - Defining more inclusive standards for gender+ expertise

¹ This report has to be seen as Work in progress towards the QUING final report.

All these objectives are reached through five main activities. Three of them are strongly interconnected: LARG, STRIQ and WHY. These three activities divide the work analytically, whereby LARG concentrates on a systematic description and analysis of the content of gender+ equality policies in the 27 Member States and the European Union (plus Turkey and Croatia)², and STRIQ focuses on the conceptualization and analysis of intersectionality in European gender+ equality policies³. The WHY report builds on both of these activities, and adds a focus on understanding and explaining the variety of gender+ equality policies in Europe.

This report contains four parts. After this introduction, the second part outlines the research process and the work done. The third part presents the main substantive findings, and is followed by a section that outlines how the QUING findings contribute to reaching the objectives that QUING has set out to achieve, and that discusses the conclusions.

The WHY research process and the QUING objectives

The research process and outputs in the WHY activity

In the context of the WHY activity, a classic set of research sequences has been followed. Starting with a review of the literature, a manual has been made outlining a methodology of discursive institutionalism, translated into a country study manual and a comparative study manual. These manuals highlighted what are considered to be the most important dimensions shaping gender+ equality policies in Europe. Subsequently, for all 29 countries and the European Union, a study has been made in which data about all crucial elements that shape and condition gender+ equality policies have been brought together. Based on the literature review and these country context studies, 34 Papers have been written that address a wide variety of issues in gender+ equality issues, often in a comparative way. In the course of the project, these WHY outputs have also been presented and discussed during QUING workshops. Finally, this final report has been made.

Overview of Deliverables in WHY

D12. Review of the literature on gender equality policies in the EU and its Member States

D20. Manual for the methodology of discursive institutionalism

D23. Country study methodology manual for WHY

D24. Comparative study methodology manual for WHY

D31. Report on QUING LARG & WHY Interim Workshop 5-6 October 2007

D41. WHY country context studies

D47 / D49. Series of WHY papers

D73. WHY conference

D71. Final WHY report

² See LARG report, www.quing.eu.

³ See STRIQ report, www.quing.eu

The WHY research process and the QUING Objectives

The WHY Deliverables all contributed significantly to the Objectives of QUING, each in their own specific way. The D12 *Review of the literature on gender equality policies in the EU and its member states* (Walby 2007), reviews the literature on gender equality policies, both the theoretical literature and the empirical literature on gender equality policies in the EU and its Member States. This literature review concludes that the differences in the content and quality of gender equality policies are varied and complex, especially in the way gender equality concerns are present within the policy and in the institutional resources associated with the gender equality policies (the law, the gender machinery and the extent to which civil society is effectively engaged during the process of policy development and implementation). The overview identifies the following key variations that require explanation: the extent to which policies in areas that are potentially relevant to gender equality explicitly refer to gender equality or not; the extent to which these policies address the intersection of gender with other inequalities (discussed more fully in the report on intersectionality); the extent to which civil society has both the opportunity and the resources to engage in the development and implementation of gender equality policies; differences between the gender + equality policies in individual countries and those at the level of the EU. The literature review contributed to Objective 5 (*assessing the content and quality of gender+ equality policies in the EU's multicultural context*), Objective 7 (*explaining deficiencies, deviations and inconsistencies in EU and Member State's gender+ equality policies*), Objective 2 (*conceptualising and mapping the interfaces between civil society and policy making*), Objective 3 (*conceptualising participatory forms of gender and diversity mainstreaming by accentuating voice and civil society interfaces*) and Objective 6 (*assessing the standing and voice of civil society in gender+ equality policies*), as well as the wider concerns of Objective 8 (*developing an institutional approach to the practices of citizenship*) and Objective 9 (*developing a typology of gender regimes in Europe*).

The three manuals that have been made (D20/23 and 24), bring together elements from political science, sociology and gender studies, leading to an outline of all the most important factors for understanding the nature and variety of gender+ equality policies (important for the data gathering) and to a pluralistic model that could be used in the analysis and understanding of the policy and civil society texts on gender+ equality policies gathered in QUING. Starting with the literature review (D12), showing how to understand the many ways in which policies can be gendered, and how this can vary between policy areas, and focusing on institutional resources, gender machinery and governmental institutions, the differences in the content and quality of gender+ equality policies were seen to be of two kinds: symbolic (presence, vision and related conceptions of progress) and institutional (understood as either part of the policy or part of the explanation of variations in policies). The major potential explanations for the differences in content and quality that were identified were seen to be linked to the content and nature of the civil society/state interface, political opportunities and coalitions or opponents, and to the wider environment (most importantly gender regimes) including the wider international environment. The further manuals for the collection of data and for the analysis of the data were strongly building on this assessment of the state of the art contained in the literature review. They partly referred to the data to be collected on the content and quality of gender+ equality policies (see also LARG report; those were collected in the issue histories, the selection and analysis of policy documents and in the country context studies), and partly to the data needed to explain or understand the identified variations of gender+

equality policies. This last data included: the nature of the interface between civil society and the state, economic, organisational and symbolic resources of civil society, the relationship of groups associated with various inequalities, data on the gender regimes, and the international context. These data were gathered and presented in the Country Context Studies (D41). The manuals D 20/23 and 24 mainly contained proposals how to organize these data and how to analyse and present them. For the comparative analysis, next to a series of specific reports that compared each country to the European Union (in the context of LARG), the pluralistic nature of the conceptual framework allowed researchers to identify and use the most relevant or promising factors for their WHY papers (D47/D49). QUING workshops were the main forum where the outlines and draft reports and papers were discussed.

The WHY papers: substantive findings

Edited by Sylvia Walby from Deliverable No. 47/49: Series of explanatory country and thematic comparative reports in WHY

Introduction

This section of the final report concerns the detailed substantive findings of the WHY projects. It contains summaries of the findings of WHY project, which have been drawn from the deliverables and presentations made by QUING members.

'Paths, borders and bridges: impact of ethnicity and religion on women's movement in Turkey' by Feride Acar and Gülbanu Altunok

This paper aims to assess the impact of the intersection of gender with ethnicity and religion on the development of collaborative activism on issues concerning gender equality in Turkey. Throughout our research, in the context of QUING, we had studied policies on gender and equality and their preparation processes with respect to both state and civil society action as well as the interaction of the two. For QUING, identification of alliances among women across the state and civil society and unpacking the nature of such alliances is important in order "to investigate the extent to which these make a difference to the content and quality of gender equality policies." QUING has focused on the "institutionalized aspects of the interface between civil society and state actors", and has attempted to analyze policy documents by using 'frame and voice' methodology to assess the contours and meanings of 'gender equality' discourse among different actors at national contexts.

In the European context, debates on the intersection of gender with other complex and multilayered inequalities based on ethnicity and religion have gained increasing currency at institutional levels both within the state and civil society. As prominent examples of this one can point to debates such as the headscarf issue or the status of migrant women that are increasingly articulated in policy documents produced by the state and the civil society. In Turkey, although gender equality debates have increasingly loomed in the background of politics and social change, and ethnicity and religion have been increasingly recognized in civil society more as forces unpacking socio-political dynamics,

awareness of the intersection of the latter two with gender has not been as prominent, particularly at the institutional level. Therefore, texts that focus on concrete reflections of intersectionality and policies based on such an awareness are limited, if not entirely lacking. Therefore, better understanding of the positions, divisions and coalitions among groups in the civil society is essential in order to assess the terrain and gauge the potentialities of equality policy making. In this study, we have attempted to discuss the planes of coalition and consensus and/or the demarcation lines between various strands of women's activism in Turkey by looking into the evolution dynamics as well as the extent and nature of interactions among women's organizations in order to complement QUING text analyses.

In Turkey, several successful examples of coalition platforms among women's groups have occurred in the last decade. In these cases the internationally oriented platforms have led the way. While different veins of the women's movement have found it easier to coalesce under the perceived 'neutrality' of international standards, these platforms enabled them to come together to promote gender equality and respond to specific developments or violations when need be. The women's movement also gained significant experience through national campaigns for law reform (as exemplified in the Penal, Civil and Constitutional amendment processes). In these cases, communication among different stakeholders and cooperation across identity barriers for the higher purpose of gender —conceived as 'sameness of rights'— was achieved. In this process, one also notes the tendency to move from general, gender-based types of collaboration to more specific gender equality oriented issues which may signal a proliferation of equality politics and/or reflection of interest-based collaborations.

In the last two decades, an increased number of women came to engage in political activism. The rise of Islamist, Kurdish and feminist political opposition in the country fuelled this tendency and in the early phases, these groups differing in terms of members' backgrounds, their political agendas and styles of mobilization were very detached from if not hostile towards one another. The major dividing line between Kemalist women and others was the former's unyielding commitment to secularism and the Republic's equality policies when Kurdish and Islamist groups criticized these policies for preventing religious expression, ignoring ethnic identity claims and feminists accused them of being blind towards gender inequality, particularly in the private sphere. Islamist and Kurdish women's groups, despite the ground they shared in their opposition to state policies and their affiliation with identity politics, none the less kept a distance from each other by virtue of their allegiance to exclusionary community loyalties. Some feminists, owing to their opposition to patriarchal culture, were sceptical of the kind of identity politics characterizing Islamist and Kurdish movements but shared with them a fundamental distrust of the state.

In spite of this general picture of detachment and incompatibility, increased contact and even coalitions among different women's groups have been achieved in the recent years. The increase in the numbers and variety of organizations, associations, platforms etc. of women, working on diverse gender equality issues increased the chances of contact between different activists in the country. Experience in political activism, albeit in different veins, helped improve women activists' self confidence, contributed to their empowerment and was effective in helping some women's groups achieve relative autonomy from their community base. Knowledge on feminism and familiarity with universal standards of women's rights also help increase women's awareness of diverse gender equality issues and their capacity to form common platforms. These platforms in turn were

influential in the recognition of differences, mutual understanding of positions and even transformation of attitudes.

Yet still, it has been noted that cooperation among women's groups in Turkey are largely dependent on individual initiatives and persistence. In the Turkish experience, common platforms are fragile and temporary in character, primarily because of their ad hoc nature. Competitions amongst groups over resources from the state and international agencies and linkages to state authorities continue to be important. Religious, secular and /or ethnic ideology based differences, which run deep in personal and community psyches, continue to be important dividing lines of the women's movement. In our interviews this fact was reflected as the "trap of identity politics" and "borders and minefields" to watch for.

Women from different groups generally express their trust in other women and their hope in the potential of women's solidarity and cooperation. The development of a shared language that articulates common concerns in neutral manner is important. Discourses that are legitimated by reference to universal rights and international standards find easier acceptance. To the extent that feminists can rightfully claim affinity with this heritage and address the multiple dimensions of inequalities from a vantage point equidistant to all others, they appear to have the best potential to play a catalytic role in fostering cross-border alliances across the women's movement in Turkey.

Walby asserts that a politics of equality is in re-birth within feminist politics (i) with the increased participation and involvement of women in political processes (ii) increased legitimacy of a universal women's rights discourse and (iii) increased use of coalitions by diverse groups. The trajectories of different veins of the women's movement in Turkey, as well as responses of activists/analysts in our interviews, reveal hope in this regard.

'Institutionalising intersectionality in Portugal: towards a multiple approach?' by Alba Alonso

During the last decades, the feminist research agenda has widened in order to grasp not only inequalities related to gender, but also its intersections with other strands such as class, race or disability (See for instance Crenshaw, 1989, 1993, 2002; Brewer et al., 2002; Browne and Misra, 2003). The underlying aim is to highlight the extent to which women's experiences are shaped by more than one inequality. This combination of strands does therefore not merely represent an addition of oppressions but an intersection among them which creates a unique and qualitatively different situation. Parallel with this general concern, literature has recently opened a new avenue of analysis. Here the aim is not only to scrutinize the effects of the cross-cutting axes but also to explore how these intersections have been tackled by public policies, if this is the case. Generally speaking, scholars have claimed that in order to implement better and fairer policies where women -and men- were not considered as homogeneous, an intersectional perspective is needed (Lombardo and Verloo, 2009, 2008; Squires, 2005; Beveridge and Nott, 2002). This new approach is expected to overcome a common shortcoming based on a twofold tendency to super-inclusion (a group-centred problem is seen as general) and to sub-inclusion (a general problem is seen as group-centred), which are both related to the incapability to consider those individuals at the intersections (Crenshaw, 2002). Given this new approach, the interest on studying whether or not intersectionality has been introduced in policy making has clearly increased. The guiding question of this emerging research

agenda is, can we find any evidences indicating that intersectionality is being put into practice? In other words, are the public policies being revised in order to take into account the fact that inequalities are not always independent? And going a step forward, is this new strategy being institutionalized?

The Portuguese case offers a great opportunity for exploring these two emerging questions – institutionalization and potential requirements-, since this country is undertaking its first steps towards intersectionality, as well as developing a particular way of dealing with it. Inequalities are increasingly treated as intersecting, moving from the former unitary approach (Hancock, 2007), where they had been treated as completely independent, to an incipient multiple approach, where additions and interactions are at least mentioned. Growing cooperation among equality bodies as well as the approval of several policy plans focused on tackling several strands at the same time, indeed point to the emergence of a more complex perspective. Besides, Portugal has a special feature, that is, its long tradition on setting up participatory councils focused on engaging civil society organizations. Currently, there are thus not only old councils attached to the equality machineries, but also new emerging structures, which are clearly and intentionally intersectional. Both elements give us the opportunity to explore the extent to which an evolution towards an intersectional approach is likely to occur, as well as to assess these participatory experiences. In doing so, I will start by addressing the literature on intersectionality, seeking to explore some of the main pending questions. Subsequently, I will analyse the Portuguese main pieces of law concerning anti-discrimination and equality bodies, as well as the most recent policy plans. In addition, several exploratory interviews with policy makers and civil society actors will help to complete and contrast the information included in these policy documents. The core idea is to map the introduction of intersectionality in this country, to highlight its specificities, and finally, to explore how can this instance contribute to the whole debate on this topic.

This article sought to capture what is the Portuguese way of dealing with intersectionality. In so doing, Hancock's typology has been used as a key analytical tool in order to clarify how, when and by whom are inequalities tackled. The main conclusion is that Portugal is progressively moving towards a multiple approach. Equality bodies and legislation still show a strong unitary perspective, since they are mostly conceived for addressing one-single axis. Likewise, the hierarchy among inequalities is still to be removed. There are in fact some inequalities with a long tradition, namely gender, disabilities and race, and others that have just been taken into consideration. Very recent plans and the new institutional architecture nevertheless point to an incipient multiple approach. The equality agenda has been broadened in order to encompass multiple and/or additive inequalities, mainly by considering some individuals at the intersections. The quality of equality policies has thus been improved by considering the heterogeneous composition of target groups, by strengthening the presence of a gender perspective in other equality policies or by including new issues in the policy agenda. It is worth to note that this new approach is remarkably present with regards to gender policies, since women's multiple inequalities take already part in the agenda. Cooperation among equality bodies has also contributed to this emerging model. Rather than introducing the EU integrated approach, the strategy is that of maintaining several bodies centred on concrete strands, along with a growing interest on considering that both policy aims and their respective institutions must be interconnected by a 'net' of policies. In addition to this, Portugal has also shown a great interest on engaging civil society actors into policy-making. Due to a long tradition on creating

participatory councils, new equality policies opted for involving a wide variety of NGOs, representing different strands. This recent shift could potentially treat intersectionality as an open empirical -and political- question.

What is interesting in the Portuguese case is its special institutional arrangement. Literature has usually explored intersectionality by employing a dichotomist model, based on the presence of a pure separated approach, with several equality bodies focused on unitary policies, and an integrated approach, with a single body embracing all the strands and their respective interactions. The evolution towards the latter model has been usually identified as positive, since policies would supposedly adopt a more intersectional perspective. However, the possibility to adopt an intermediate model has not been considered yet. Here, Portugal shows an example of a third way of dealing with intersectionality, where neither an integrated approach nor a pure separate one have been implemented. Rather, the idea was that of maintaining the old equality bodies, though establishing a strong cooperation among them, aim at considering multiple inequalities. This coordinated model goes with policies adopting an incipient multiple approach. Thus, they are targeted at concrete groups at the intersections, giving more room for intra-category diversity. It could be argued that the Portuguese model is under-developed when comparing with the integrated approach that other countries have just introduced. These single bodies have indeed been described as more accurate for tackling intersecting inequalities. However, so far we do not know much about the outcomes of these sort of bodies and/or whether they can actually implement transformative and intersectional policies. What is more, there is nor a deep knowledge on how to implement policies which systematically consider inequalities as mutually constitutive. What is nevertheless commonly accepted is that policies addressing structural inequalities are likely to be poorly implemented as well as diluted in the mainstream. Given both elements, the coordinated model appears as an alternative and potentially more realistic way of approaching this issue. Although inequalities might not be treated as intersectional, coordination among specialized equality bodies could provide with some key elements such as knowledge, tools or policy networks, which have been described as crucial when referring to other policies, namely gender mainstreaming. Furthermore, the coordinated model may contribute to overcome main shortcomings attached to the integrated model –lack of expertise, lack of resources, contradictory goals, workload etc. - as well as to provide with some of their main advantages –transfer knowledge, address multiple inequalities, coherent policies etc.-. If moving beyond institutional architecture, the coordinated model also gives the opportunity to rethink the concept of velvet triangles (Woodward, 2004). The presence of a net of equality bodies might in fact lead to the construction of cross-cutting alliances gathering policy makers, academics and activist focused on different inequalities. Here, we could propose the term rainbow triangles as an appropriate manner of capturing this emerging complexity and exploring new venues for intersectionality politics.

To sum up, intersectionality theory has insisted in the necessity to consider inequalities as mutually constitutive and to move beyond former policies targeted at concrete intersectional groups. However, it has been rarely discussed the feasibility of this new approach and their likelihood to be successfully implemented. The Portuguese instance gives the opportunity to explore an alternative model, based on a multiple approach. Further research is needed in order capture the extent to which this coordinated model can contribute to an intersectional perspective to be actually included.

'Is gender equality soluble into self-governance? Europeanizing gender at the sub-national level in Spain' by Alba Alonso and Maxime Forest

The Europeanization of regional governance has long been addressed through the sole lens of the regional policy of the European Union, hence almost exclusively from a top-down perspective. Yet, limited attention was paid to the different types of regions considered, especially as regarding the emergence of regions with a legislative capacity and which are integral to domestic political systems (Carter & Pasquier, 2006). Meanwhile, attempts to capture the complexity of domestic change as consequence of Europeanization processes have mainly focused on the State-level. Putting forward the EU pressure for adaptation as one of the main impetus for legislative and policy change, often led consecutively to neglect the role of regional domestic agents and institutions.

However, if we adopt a more inclusive definition to Europeanization, as suggested in this article, we might consider the impact of Europe on the regional level also in terms of policy practices and paradigms, 'ways of doing things' and social learning (Baisnée & Pasquier, 2007; Graziano & Vink, 2008). Additionally, discursive usages of Europe, especially as part of centre-periphery dynamics, are also likely to produce (or contribute to) legislative and policy change, even in the absence of pressure for adaptation. This led us to engage the regional dimension of Europeanization through the politics of Gender Equality, a field of public action where this pressure is clearly put on the national level of governance, but where hard-law instruments coexist with a number of soft Europeanization channels.

Accounting for the multi-level dimension of policy making is of specific relevance as Spain is one of the most far-reaching countries in Europe in terms of regionalization. Since early 1980's, on the basis of the statutes of autonomy adopted in the Spanish regions (Comunidades Autónomas, CC.AA), a number of policy fields have been transferred to regional self-governments. Despite the fact that Spanish constitution ascribes to the State the responsibility for ensuring citizen's equality, Spanish regions have thus extended competences and administrative capacities in the field of social policies, for instance (Gallego et alii, 2003). While it is true that institutionalizing gender equality firstly occurred at the national level and then at a different pace in the 17 regions, it can be argued that some regions have held the leadership in the past ten years, thus contributing to shape nation-wide gender equality policies.

Similarly, whereas it could be assumed until recently that the EU policy framework had relatively little impact on the making of equality State policies in Spain (Lombardo, 2004), there are some evidences that “Europe finally hit home”: through a process of norm diffusion fostering mainstreaming instruments (for which UE incentives have not been the sole external intervening variable) and more recently, in the form of a shift from implementation-oriented measures toward “hard” antidiscrimination provisions (Lombardo & Verloo, 2009, Forest & Bustelo, 2009). It will be the main argument of this paper that Europeanization also affected the making of equality policies in the regions to a relevant extent. In order to assess whether policy practices on the sub-national level are Europeanized or not and, if so, which channels of Europeanization have been privileged, it will be necessary to address the diversity of the afore-mentioned phenomena, i.e., the wide range of processes addressed by Europeanization studies, and the differential patterns of Spanish multi-level governance.

As regarding the former, our paper draws on the sociological and discursive turns to be noticed in the literature, especially among authors inspired by neoinstitutionalism (Radaelli, 2004). Hence, it is referred to Europeanization not merely as European integration, but as a set of processes ranging from norms adaptation and diffusion or policy transfers to mutual learning and even the “cognitive usages” of Europe in a context of political bargaining or interest aggregation (Jacquot & Woll, 2003). Consecutively, for the sake of clarity, various paths of Europeanization will be distinguished, since Europe certainly does not hit sub-national entities the same way it affects national polities, even where both clearly overlap as it is the case in multigoverned Spain. As regarding the various patterns of regionalization in Spain, those are to be illustrated by the respective records of self-governed regions in the field of gender equality and its highly differentiated patterns of institutionalization.

Since the QUING project in which this paper originates, mainly addresses the making of gender equality policies in the contexts of nation-states, it fails to account for the variations of such policies on the sub-national level. Given that the latter has turned to be one of the driving forces of the relatively rich record of Spain in institutionalizing gender equality, it makes highly desirable to question its contribution to the overall framing of equality policies. Simultaneously, this paper attempts to capture different patterns of Europeanization at the regional level, emphasizing the level of good practices and policy transfers, as well as the discursive usage of references to the EU by regional actors as an integral part of contentious centre-periphery politics. Therefore, it intends to contribute to the sociological and discursive-institutionalist approaches of Europeanization within the frame of a multi-level polity. In a first section, we attempt to set a common research agenda from the sectional and the multi-level approaches to Europeanization, to be applied to the case of gender equality. After pointing out the challenges attached to a complex assessment of domestic dynamics of Europeanization in a multi-level polity, we uncover the still pending ones as regarding the analysis of Europeanizing gender policies. Section 2 consecutively depicts the dual paths of institutionalization of gender equality policies in Spain – both at the regional and national levels –, paying attention to some structural features of Spanish contentious regionalization, described in terms of “asymmetric instability”. Pointing out the shift to be observed from a weak to a “strong” Europeanization, section 3 contemplates three different avenues for Europeanization (Law-making and Institutions, social learning and political usages), emphasizing the two latter and drawing a set of hypotheses for a plausible research agenda. Advocating a complex assessment of the Europeanization of gender in multigoverned polities, we thus try to frame two broad-based questions: (a) who is learning what from whom? And (b) is gender equality soluble into self-governance?

In the context of multi-governed Spain, the question “who is learning what from whom?” could only receive a complex answer. On the one hand, institutional isomorphism has been a key feature of the autonomic process, with the national level being (almost) faithfully reproduced by the regions. Policy instruments and agendas also manifested this pattern, as it has been clearly exemplified by gender policies, which introduced equality machineries and plans in response to the Women’s Institute example. Furthermore, other structural elements such as the lack of a closed model, the presence of a certain degree of asymmetry between fast and slow-track regions or the leading role adopted by the historic communities, especially Catalonia and Basque Country, helped to construct a “differential fact- comparative grievance- mimesis effect cycle”. Due to this quite competitive and mimetic dynamics between regions, policy learning has also to do with inter-regional relations. When referring to gender policies, it is especially relevant to address this peer learning since the regional level has to some extent acquired the leadership in this field. Here, path dependency and the specificities of the Spanish context seem to shape learning processes.

Nevertheless, given the multi-level dimension of this policy issue, remarkably since the introduction of transversal instruments such as gender mainstreaming and the Open Method of Coordination, the EU impact has also to be regarded. Since regional institutions are developing their own policy instruments for tackling gender discriminations, making direct and explicit references to the EU legal order, Spain perfectly fits with the “emerging picture of a polity with multiple, interlocked arenas for political contest” (Hooghe and Marks, 1996). First empirical results discussed in this paper suggest that “naming Europe” in regional policy and legislative documents is likely to follow different logics according to regional polities, from the diffusion of EU gender mainstreaming along with EU structural funds, to the politicization of gender equality within the frame of regional “politics of identity”. These hypotheses would deserve to be tested on a much larger scale, exploring how political contention around self-governing capacities, nationalist discourses or the importance of EU-funding interact to shape the responsiveness of Spanish regional polities to the policy discourse of the EU on gender equality.

'Intersectionality and the quality of gendered employment policy' by Jo Armstrong, Sylvia Walby and Sofia Strid

This paper addresses intersectionality in employment policy and its implications for the policy quality. Does recognition of the differences between women by factors such as social class and ethnicity improve policy quality or not? Quality is assessed by how far policy promotes transformation in gender relations in paid work and care work. Addressing differences between women has long been a concern for feminists, with the recognition that the category of 'women' is highly differentiated according to ethnicity/religion, disability, age, social class and sexuality. Attention to these 'within group' differences, alongside the concern with 'between groups' gender inequalities, is reflected in recent research on women's position in employment. This work has variously highlighted differences between groups of women according to social class, ethnicity and motherhood status in terms of, for example, rates of employment and pay (Dale et al 2006; Dex et al 1996, Platt 2006; Reynolds 2001; Walby 1997; Warren 2003).

The particular concern is with women's 'non-employment' or economic inactivity, that is, those women who are neither employed nor unemployed but who are out of the labour market either not seeking employment or unavailable to start work. Those women who disproportionately fall into this category include lone mothers; mothers of young children; other women who are unpaid carers; and women from Pakistani and Bangladeshi backgrounds. While the term 'economic inactivity' is the official categorisation, the term nonemployment is preferred here, since, as feminists have long argued, women who do unpaid care work are 'economically active'. Non-employment amongst these women is though important in and of itself since participation in paid work is crucial for accessing economic and social capital, with long term consequences (e.g. on risk of poverty in later life) as well as having wider and less tangible but nonetheless important implications (e.g. in terms of independence).

As will be shown, employment policy in Britain does draw distinctions between the various groups of women who remain out of the labour market. The way in which this is achieved, and with what consequence for the quality of policy, will be discussed by building upon previous research which has pointed to some of the dilemmas associated with the recognition of different groups of women in other policy areas, particularly in relation to gender-based violence (Crenshaw 1991; Dustin and Phillips 2008). These include: a) ambivalence, such that visibility of particular groups may show concern for important differences between women, but it may also serve to create negative stereotypes and stigmatise those women; b) tension in the relations between strands, such as the emergence of dominant strands and conflict over goals pursued; c) variation in the conceptualisation and implementation of strands that may have implications for policy quality. These issues are explored in recent employment policy in order to assess the implications of intersectionality for policy quality.

Overall, the analysis shows that there is a lack of coherence in the conceptualisation of gender equality in employment policy. Elements of an agenda of transformation are present to some degree (e.g. increased childcare, promoting women's participation in employment) but co-exist with an acceptance of women's difference (in their role as primary carers, and in their over-representation in part-time jobs). This seems patterned, with certain visions for certain groups. There are different visions of gender roles for different groups of women, according to household type, ethnicity, whether in poverty, and care responsibility. In turn, the 'ideal' visions appear influenced by the agendas of government departments. Agendas, such as the target to cut rates of child poverty, seem to lead to the identification of particular groups as the focus for policy.

For some groups of women, there seems to be increasing coercion into employment (lone parents), or at least employment amongst these groups is encouraged (minority ethnic women). But employment here appears to be more about alleviating (child) poverty and limiting costs in terms of benefit payment. For other groups of women, choice is promoted (couple families) or, at the least, there is an implicit 'acceptance' of non-employment (e.g. amongst full time carers). Using a framework of choice overlooks the constraints on these women's employment and the ways their 'choices' are socially structured in current conditions of gender inequality.

Policies are not currently situated within a wider drive towards gender equality with one vision of transformation for all women, inclusive of differences across privileged and less privileged groups. Rather, there is a tendency to address gender at the intersection with other strands only when the group in question is of interest in reaching the aims of other agendas: meaning that some groups of women become visible while others do not. The drive to recognise particular groups facing particular barriers goes hand in hand with insufficient attention to barriers facing all women and where overall patterns of non / underemployment are not seen as problematic. Therefore, special programmes are initiated in the absence of mainstreaming of transformative policy.

Theoretically, intersectionality is concerned with relationality, social relations between more and less powerful groups. However, in policy, intersectionality tends to become reduced to static categories such that relationality is lost, with the focus only on empirical 'boxes' of e.g. lone parent or group at risk of poverty- ignoring the 'other side' (e.g. whiteness / privilege / men). Intersectionality in employment policy is selective, with negative implications in terms of quality in relation to gender equality. There is the targeting of only some women who are located at intersection of gender / class and ethnicity, with combating poverty taking priority and equality by gender and ethnicity dropping from view. For quality gender employment policy, then policies that target particular groups of women need to be conducted in the context of a wider policy 'agenda' that works toward a transformation in gender relations, promoting employment amongst all groups of women, across social class and ethnicities, and promoting care amongst all groups of men.

The presence of intersectionality, of the recognition of the specific barriers facing some groups of women, is inconsistent. There is the naming and making visible only of certain groups, specifically those who are claimants of specific benefits and / or living in households in poverty. In this identification of some target groups for active labour market programmes rather than others, there is risk of stigmatisation of those groups that are made visible, with a potential slide into a 'moral' message of work being 'good' for particular groups with negative consequences in terms of how those groups are perceived.

At the same time, other women, including mothers in couple households not in poverty have 'choice' and still others, women who are 'carers' who are excluded from participating in the labour market given the lack of alternative services, are largely hidden from view. The situation is one of double (or triple) standards; paid work is seen as a good thing for some groups of women (lone mothers claiming benefits, women from minority ethnic groups), while 'choice' is accepted or even promoted for other groups of women, and some women seem to be simply neglected. On the one hand, the government is increasingly coercive in terms of forcing some groups into the labour market; while on the other hand, it promotes choice for others- choice in how to balance or reconcile family and work. In this way, non-employment amongst some women becomes legitimate – and somewhat hidden from view- while non-employment amongst others is deemed unacceptable.

In terms of the vision of gender equality pursued then, while on the surface the drive to promote employment may appear to be working towards some transformation / or at least sameness, on closer examination appears to be more accepting of difference, or rather the status quo of women fulfilling the role of primary carers. In the long-term, it is conceivable that in different circumstances policies which do have the effect of promoting women's employment – albeit as an indirect means of reaching another goal- could be substituted by policy which does not have this effect, potentially having a negative impact on the pursuit of transformation in gender relations in work. This is not meant to imply that a good quality policy requires recognition of all 'intersectional groups', this may be practically difficult if not impossible.

Rather, if particular groups are to be targeted then this needs to be in the context of a wider concern for gender equality inclusive of women in general. This would then mean that lone parents, just as mothers in couple households, and women from ethnic minority groups, just as white women, are seen as equally expected to be in the labour market as men. Though of course, such a strategy would not necessarily be without tensions, as indicated in the above discussion of the place of religion alongside a strategy of transformation in gender relations. This strategy would also require consistency across and within government departments ('joined up' government) pursuing one vision of gender equality.

‘Intersectionality in Gender+ Training’ by Susanne Baer, Janet Keim, and Lucy Nowotnick

Training policy makers and civil servants about gender, gender+ inequalities and diversity has become an important key for establishing, enhancing and improving gender+ equality policies in the European Union. While there is a huge market for such trainings, one can also examine a lack of quality measures and standards for trainers, commissioners and participants of gender/gender+/diversity trainings.

An analysis of contemporary training manuals for gender and diversity trainings within the EU and the UN shows that ‘intersectionality’ is a concept which is rarely explicitly used in the training field. Neither the term ‘intersectionality’ nor any other of numerous conceptualisations is used to theorize interlocking types of discrimination. While the field of “diversity trainings” is continuously expanding, the theoretical foundations of these programmes have been described as fragmentary and problematic. Integrating the concept of intersectionality in gender+ trainings highlights the importance to understand and reflect intersectional inequalities and intersectional discrimination in its complexity. The paper takes its point of departure in the examination of that hypothesis. The challenge of transferring theory to the level of policy making is often acknowledged, however, suggestions to meet this challenge are rare. For the context of gender+ trainings, we aim to develop recommendations of how intersectionality could be included in order to understand interlocking types of discrimination and in order to provide tools to analyse policies with regard to whether they take intersectional inequalities into account.

First, we will critically discuss different approaches towards intersectionality and their conceptualisations of intersectional inequalities. We will outline important theoretical contributions and present different aspects of its ongoing conceptualisations. Second, we will present the analysis of training manuals by specifically focussing on the lack of intersectional perspectives. Finally, we will discuss how the theoretical, legal and political conceptualisations of intersectionality can be transferred into trainings by discussing which minimum effects the concept should have on methods/material, training conditions and trainer’s profiles.

There is not one theory of intersectionality, but different conceptualisations and theoretisations of it, including different terms. They can be differentiated with regard to which societal level they analyse, identities, representations or structures, or if they offer a multilevel approach. Another aspect of classification would be the implicit or explicit reference to intersectionality as well as a static or dynamic conceptualisation of intersectionality. They can also be classified along the question of how they understand the ‘intersections’, i.e. the phenomenon of conflation/overlap or accumulation of different inequalities or forms of discrimination.

In this article, the term “intersectionality” is relevant with regard to three different aspects. First, the term is used to name the relation between different inequalities, especially in the field of gender+ equality policies. Second, we refer to the concept as an analytical perspective which could be called an intersectional approach. Third, as mentioned above, “intersectionality” also refers to an ongoing discussion how to conceptualise and analyse overlapping inequalities, multiple discrimination, intersecting categories, or mutually articulating power relations. In our analysis and recommendations, we want to emphasise that it is less important which term is used to implicitly or explicitly name intersectionality, but rather how intersectionality is conceptualised. At this moment, a multilevel dynamic conceptualisation of intersectionality seems most productive to address intersectional inequalities in gender+ trainings since it focuses on the production and possible change of inequalities on all levels of society.

Intersectionality is not only conceptualised in academic theories, but is also an issue in political and legal contexts. Timo Makkonen, a European anti-discrimination legislation scholar, has emphasised the distinction between multiple discrimination, compound discrimination and intersectional discrimination. According to Makkonen, multiple discrimination should describe the phenomenon in which one person is discriminated against on several different grounds at different times. He points to the mathematical connotations the term “multiple” (as well as double, triple etc.) has and argues that it should only be used in connection with situations in which different grounds operate separately. Compound discrimination should be taken to describe a situation in which several grounds of discrimination add to each other at one particular instance: discrimination on the basis of one ground adds to discrimination based on another ground to create an added burden. There can be two or more types of discrimination in play at one given situation. Intersectional discrimination, on the contrary, should be taken to refer to a situation in which several grounds of discrimination interact concurrently and thus form a specific type of discrimination. Since multiple and compound discrimination describe additive forms of discrimination, it is important to differentiate them from intersectional discrimination.

In an analysis of training manuals, Gabriela Dina Rosenstreich conceptualises intersectionality as the “interrelationships between identities, categories and oppression [...] in Diversity Training programmes”. She uses two broad paradigms, which then encompasses five models. The first paradigm she identifies is that of an overriding ‘grand model of oppression’ which explains oppression as manifested in various forms of systems such as racism, sexism etc. There are two models that built onto this understanding: the interchangeable model which describes all forms of discrimination as essentially the same and the interlocking model in which the forms of discrimination are comprising an all-encompassing system in their very interrelation, hence no form of discrimination can be combated in isolation. The second paradigm is called ‘intersectionality’ which is focused more on the position of individuals and for which Rosenstreich identifies three models. The model of intersecting lines or axes describes the question of which ‘car’ (as a metaphor for form of oppression) or selection of ‘cars’ runs you down. This model has to be differentiated from an intersection of sets, i.e. overlapping sets which produce something new and distinct. A third model is the matrix of domination in which the individual is positioned at the intersections of a complex multi-dimensional matrix with diverse axes corresponding to social categories.

In this article, we have examined different conceptualisations of intersectionality by outlining theoretical genealogies as well as political and legal adaptations. Training policy makers on equality issues can be seen as a route to transfer theory into practice. This article has tried to answer questions of how intersectionality is applied and embedded in gender+ training activities by analysing existing training manuals that explicitly aim to contribute to equality policy making. This analysis has shown that although there is an awareness for a complexity of inequalities, both theoretical foundations as well as practical implementations most often lack intersectional perspectives. In this article, we have addressed the gap between conceptualisation and operationalisation and offered suggestions of how to face the challenges of transfer. Thereby, we developed recommendations of how intersectionality can be included in training activities. Nevertheless, we are far from stating that this transfer is an easy task but acknowledge that challenges regarding intersectionality in training activities are complex and diverse. It is important to be aware that there can not be one universal recipe or an overall training model which is usable for every individual context. Rather, one needs to remember that each training is always embedded in a broader context of equality policies that has to be reflected. By providing the trainers and commissioners with a set of questions for self-reflection, we aim to contribute to the improvement of a very diverse market of trainings. This improvement can not be gained by quick answers to the questions posed, but has to be slowly built by continuing questions regarding intersectionality.

**'The politics of intersectionality in Spain: shaping intersectional approaches in a multi-level polity'
by María Bustelo and Maxime Forest**

Policy changes generated in Europe by the growing concern with multiple inequality strands hit Spain only recently. Whereas comprehensive Gender equality machineries and policy instruments have been developed both at the national and regional levels since late 1980s, those proved limited concern for multiple discriminations, as respective strands of inequality were being tackled by specific institutions and policy mechanisms. So far, neither the strong institutionalization of Gender Equality policies nor the "legislative turn" which saw Spain increasingly legislating on Gender equality from early 2000s have been sufficient to engage the fact that gender discrimination is also shaped by other inequalities. Assuming Hancock's distinction of different approaches to the study of inequalities (Hancock, 2007; Kantola and Nousiainen 2009), Spain still can be characterized as pursuing 'Unitary Approaches', in which inequalities are tackled by separate institutions and gender has primacy. By contrast, there has been no trace of a truly intersectional approach, through which intersections between multiple equality strands are analysed, and only little proof of double or multiple discriminations in policy discourses. Instead, Spain is taking its very first steps in institutionalizing a policy aiming at the elimination of multiple discriminations, as those listed in Article 13 of the Amsterdam Treaty. In the matter, even the transposing of European directives has still to be fully completed, in the form of a more comprehensive equality act, to be adopted in 2010.

However, the fact that Spanish policy makers have proved little interest in tackling multiple-discriminations, shall not be interpreted as a lack of public interest for the challenge of diversity. For instance, under the two last socialist terms (2004-), the country has joined the European vanguard in the promotion of sexual freedoms and the recognition of the diversity of private relationships on the first place (Osborne, 2006). Meanwhile, the Spanish population has experienced dramatic demographical transformations that pointed out its growing diversity in terms of ethnicity, religious beliefs or citizenship status, thus inspiring new areas of public intervention. But the failure to properly address multiple discriminations and the way they consolidate each other, sheds light on some structural, context-specific features of the Spanish polity.

This contribution intends to locate the domestic patterns that contributed to shape the making of domestic anti-discrimination policies and to frame the impact of the “external variable” (be it in the form of EU binding regulations or good practices). Those are mainly to be found in some path-dependent features of the politics of antidiscrimination, that have historically put gender first. Nonetheless, beyond a normative assessment of performance in institutionalizing intersectionality, this paper will attempt to draw on more structural features of the Spanish polity, to address the most recent steps taken towards a multiple discrimination approach, to be noticed both at the regional and the national level, in policy plans and legislative documents.

On the one hand, the commitment of Rodríguez-Zapatero’s governments in eliminating gender discrimination has resulted in a more inclusive understanding of gender inequality, pointing out the role of other strands of inequality (as age and ethnicity). This conceptual shift is to be mentioned in the Effective Equality between Women and Men Act (2007) and the subsequent Action plan (2008). Moreover, admonishments from the European Union regarding the transposition of antidiscrimination directives entailed the reshaping of Equality policies, of which the newly established Ministry of Equality (2008) is the best example. On the other hand, the sub-national level and more specifically some regions are taking their first steps to engage multiple discriminations (Bustelo, 2009; Forest, Lopez, 2008). As a multi-level polity, Spain not only witnessed the development of regional legislation and machineries, but also some regions pursuing their own policy goals, this to be illustrated by the fact that regional instruments often anticipated on the developments at the State level, but also by their complexity and inclusiveness.

Thus, the present contribution aims at rising some points of contention in the making of equality in Spain, as well as drawing attention on the possibly diverging patterns offered by multi-level polity as regarding the promotion of diversity and the building of intersectional approaches.

Whereas previous documents issued by the QUING project (Forest, Platero et alii, 2008 ; Forest, Lopez, 2009) located incipient signs of concern towards multiple discrimination in State-level policy documents, the present contribution intended to provide a more complex framing of the making of equality and anti-discrimination in Spain, taking into account two basic features: a policy practice (through the scope of legislation and policy instruments) to be characterized as pursuing a “unitary approach” (Hancock, 2007), and the multi-level dimension of Spanish polity. To a certain extent, those lead to depict the ‘anatomy of an absence’, as the signs of concern for multiple discriminations – not to speak about a structural understanding of the way they shape each other – are weak and relatively recent. Referring to historical institutionalism and to the concept of path-dependency, this contribution thus enlightens the variables that contributed to shape the form, the content and the main instruments of Spanish equality policies in the past decades, which, we argue, left almost no space for tackling more than one (or two) grounds of inequalities at the same time.

However, recent developments taking place both at the national and the regional level and both in legislation and soft policy instruments, make necessary to address at least two levels of interaction. Firstly, the making of anti-discrimination policies sheds light on the growing ‘domestic impact of Europe’, to be explained by a strong misfit between domestic policies and those developed in that field at the EU-level. The establishing of a new Ministry for equality, and the proceeding of the upcoming Equality act (through the constitution of Law-oriented expert groups), as well as the scope of equality strands to be addressed thus may be considered a shift of paradigm. Nevertheless, the path-dependent structure of this Ministry, as well as the strong emphasis maintained on Gender equality seem to illustrate that “‘paradigms’ are by definition stable and self-reproducing and do not ‘shift’ easily” (Geddes, Guiraudon, 2004: 334). Secondly, the regional politics of equality and anti-discrimination also point out the importance of the policy context into which new paradigms and instruments are being transferred and/or autonomously developed. The highly differentiated dimension of respective self-governed polities thus questions existing institutional arrangements around equality issues, the scope of inequalities tackled by regional policy plans as well as more structural features such as the discourses on diversity developed in Spanish CC.AA or the role of civil society organizations in enhancing public response to the challenge of diversity.

Drawing a complex situation, this contribution mainly aims at generating hypothesis on the crucial role of institutional and political contexts in the institutionalization of intersectionality. At the same time, it suggests that the very concept of intersectionality still constitutes a non-stabilized policy approach, which might be subject to stretching in order to take into account not only the scope of inequalities considered, the hierarchy between them and the “best way” to incorporate an intersectional approach into existing policies, but also variables such as the form of the State or the way social diversity is understood in a concrete polity.

Whilst only an additive approach in which a rather structural understanding of gender inequality receives the greatest deal of public attention can be so far identified as a shared policy paradigm in multi-governed Spain, it is worth to note that the absence of an intersectional discourse and a lack of conceptualization and references even in the Spanish academia, do not represent promising indicators of an innovative approach in tackling multiple discriminations. Thus, there is a strong need for a debate at all levels, not only amongst policy makers and other discriminated groups' advocates, but also in the Spanish feminist movement and the academia. A debate that would ideally discuss thoroughly the need for a framework tackling intersections between different strands of equality but maintaining a structural understanding of the way they shape and reproduce each other.

'Children and fathers first? Fertility treatment policies in Denmark, Finland and Sweden' by Maria Carbin, Hannele Harjunen and Elin Kvist

Fertility treatment for lesbian couples has recently been allowed in Denmark, Finland and Sweden. This marks a discursive shift that constructs the lesbian as a mother. However, these newly won rights can be seen as both enabling and restricting; How do political debates on fertility treatment in the three Nordic countries both contest and reinforce norms regarding the relationship of sexuality, gender and parenthood?

Access to fertility treatment has been a greatly debated issue in Denmark, Finland and Sweden over the past twenty years. Especially lesbian couples' and single women's right to get treated has been in focus and created political controversy. Today, in all three countries lesbian couples have access to fertility treatment. The respective laws were passed in 2005 in Sweden and a year later in Denmark and Finland. The debates did not just lead into legislative and policy changes, but they brought along a shift in the discourses concerning parenthood and motherhood. As Mette Bryld (2001) has noted, up until recently, 'the lesbian' was either non-existing in policy discourse or articulated as an inappropriate or unthinkable mother.

Nordic countries are generally considered to be very similar politically and they enforced similar type of legislation when deciding on same-sex relationships (Rydström 2005; Rydström 2008). However, their paths have parted slightly in respect to legislation and policies concerning parental rights of homosexuals. There are for example clear differences in how policies concerning fertility treatment have been constructed: in Sweden only lesbian couples are allowed to get treatment, which means that all single women whether they are homo- or heterosexual are excluded, whereas in Denmark and Finland single women have equal access to treatment. There is also significant variation in the legislation that regulates the position of the lesbian co-mother in the fertility treatment process and after it. In general, it seems that parental rights of homosexuals and those who do not live in heterosexual partnerships remain an issue in all three countries. The case of fertility treatment is but one example of this tendency.

In this article we present a discourse theoretical reading of the processes by which the acts regulating fertility treatments were passed in Denmark, Finland and Sweden. The analysis highlights how norms regarding sexuality and gender are both contested and confirmed in policy debates in respective countries. Our intention is to contrast policy discourses between the three countries in order to deconstruct what is taken for granted in each national debate. Our material consists of the most recent parliamentary debates leading to the passing of the laws in 2005 and 2006 respectively, government bills, laws, and texts produced by civil society actors concerning fertility treatment for lesbians and single heterosexual women, as well as the following debates on recognition of co-mothers.

Policy discourses concerning parenthood have recently shifted in Denmark, Sweden and Finland. New policies that allow fertility treatment for lesbians mark a discursive change that recognises lesbians as mothers and parents. However, there are only some families and some subjects, under specific circumstances, that are recognised. Despite that homosexuality has become socially more accepted and that policy makers argue that a diversity of family forms should be recognised, legislation and policies still reflect a will to normalization. Policy discourses on fertility treatments in Denmark, Finland and Sweden can be interpreted as attempts to weed out the “non-normative parents”. The lesbian co-mother is particularly in danger of being constructed as an “unthinkable parent”.

When contrasting Swedish policies with Finnish and Danish, it is evident that the dominant discourse of the wellbeing of the child with its corresponding arguments of “recognising existing family forms” has led to a legal situation where children born by lesbian couples with the state approved fertility treatments is now regulated. At the same time single women are excluded from the right to fertility treatment and children born outside the state approved fertility treatment are denied their legal rights. The proper family is thus constructed as a unit of two parents and paradoxically the well-being of all children is not guaranteed.

If one contrasts Danish policy debates with Finnish and Swedish ones, it is apparent that the discourse of individual rights is relatively dominant in Denmark. Arguing for equal access to fertility treatment proved to be strategically wise since this articulation led to the lifting of the ban of giving fertility treatments to lesbians and single women. Now the same rules (with anonymous donor) apply for lesbians, single women and heterosexual women in a relationship. However, even though lesbian couples can now get treated, the lesbian partner is not automatically acknowledged as a mother (as is the case for heterosexual couples) but has to apply for adoption.

The threat of the father-less family was perhaps most clearly articulated in the Finnish policy debates – and is reflected in legislation that differentiates between lesbian- and heterosexual couples. Also, the meaning of fatherhood is understood differently in case of heterosexual and lesbian couples. Heterosexual couples can trust that the social father is considered the father, even if donated sperm is used. In case of lesbian couples, the identity of the biological father can be revealed later on, even when the child has got two parents already. This clearly reveals the norm of the heterosexual family and precariousness of the position of the co-mother in Finnish policy discourses. We have found that in general parenthood of heterosexual couples is unquestioned in the policy discourses whereas parenthood of lesbians is still under negotiation. The position of the lesbian co-mother is ambiguous. In Denmark and Sweden if there is a known father (who has contributed to the birth outside of the state regulated system) there cannot be a co-mother. It seems that the acknowledgement of the co-mother is possible only when her rights do not clash with the rights of a father. In Finland, the co-mother is not yet legally recognized. Thus her position remains unclear in the policy discourse. The position of the co-mother is negotiated within and in between the discourses of the importance of the father and the well-being of the child. There is a risk that the rights of the lesbian co-mother are overridden by those of “hypothetical” fathers. In addition, the focus on the “couple”, which is present especially strongly in Sweden, leads to marginalization of single parent families and rainbow families with more than one set of parents.

Interestingly, and despite of the great emphasis laid on the role of the father, two fathers are not yet seen as a legitimate set of parents in policy discourses. On the contrary, in debates concerning fertility treatment the issue of surrogacy has been mostly absent or categorically forbidden by legislation as in Finland and Sweden. It would appear that legislative solutions concerning parental rights of people that do not conform to the norm of the heterosexual nuclear family are often somewhat ad-hoc in nature. As Jens Rydström (2008) has pointed out, the Registered partnership Acts were “exceptional laws for exceptional people” and so are laws on fertility treatments. Since there is no overall policy approach to rainbow families, gaps and loopholes appear in the legislation, leaving some children unprotected by the family laws and some parents without official recognition of their parenthood and therefore limited access to family policies.

‘European vs. national in Polish gender equality debates and policy documents’ by Magdalena Dąbrowska

Analysis of Polish gender equality documents and debates conducted for QUING project reveals very ambivalent approach to EU and the idea of Europeanisation. There is significant tension between voices arguing to adopt “European standards” of gender equality and those calling for defending “national values”. Gender equality policy is an important axis of the debates. The article will use approach of cultural studies, trying to show culture-based relationships between nation, Europe and gender order. The aim of the article is to analyse tension between “European” and “national” in gender equality debates. This will show how nationalism influences quality of gender equality policy. It will also reveal tension between secularisation and notion of Christian values and its impact on gender equality policy.

It seems that gender equality policy is strongly associated with notion of Europeanisation, while traditional gender order (gender inequality) is considered to be a part of national culture. Left and liberal voices should be much more enthusiastic to adopt gender equality policies than rightwing voices. However, this division does not always work. As important as political affiliation of the voice in debate is an issue being discussed. In general, policies relating to gender equality in public sphere (employment, sexual harassment in workplace, trafficking) were introduced due to EU pressure without major debates. Policies referring to private sphere (reproductive rights, intimate relationships, domestic violence) commenced vivid debates between defenders of national values and advocates of Europeanisation. The notions of “Europeanisation” or “European values” are given different meanings depending of the actors, so it is worth to define those concepts in context of gender equality. The most controversial in European/national debates are policies on general gender equality and intimacy, so they will be the main material for analysis.

The most vivid discussions, with frequent reference to notion of “Europe” are associated with debates on gender equality (Law on equal status of women and men), abortion (starting from 1992 abortion law, to recent attempts to introduce full ban on abortion) and rights of same- sex couples (attempts to legally regulate rights of same- sex couples). Those issues not only frequently evoke Europeanisation, but in symbolic way are associated with process of Europeanisation. In debates on abortion and gender equality gendered definition of citizenship and inequity of rights and duties of women and men is evident (Gal, Kligman 2000). Debates on rights of same- sex couples adds to it heteronormative aspect. Discourse explicitly defines the meaning of femininity and masculinity, and in symbolic way are milestones of democratisation and Europeanisation. Process of democratisation and “return” to Europe was commenced by abortion debates. Women's reproductive rights were filtered through new system of values based on Christianity and moral rebirth. Europe was referred to as an enemy and threat to “our” (national) way of life or as a potential- a space for Christianisation (“we” will give “them” true morality). Debates on gender equality are related to accession to EU and acceptance of its cultural and legal norms. Discourse aims to modernise cultural norms of femininity and masculinity and create “new gender contract”. Rights of same- sex couples were strongly allied with democracy, tolerance and European values, especially in civil society discourse. This process was visible not as much in Parliamentary debates on Law on same- sex registered partnerships, but more in the public discourse between 2005- 2007, when conservative governmental coalition run by Right and Justice was at power. Governmental reluctance to gender equality and homosexuality in particular was reflected by political decisions such as ban on Equality Marches (for tolerance, equality and rights of same- sex couples) and homophobic discourse. Political decisions of Kaczynski brothers were widely discussed in Europe as violating “European values” (resolution of EU Parliament).

Process of Europeanisation is not limited to accepting EU laws and mechanisms. It should go deeper, re-form values and lifestyles. In our approach Europe is considered to be “a way of life”. Gender equality is one of marks of Europeanisation. Acceptation of legal provisions on gender equality on the labour market did not involve much discussion. Legal changes were probably treated as a kind of “tax” the country was obliged to pay to access EU and receive its funds. However, acceptance of standards of gender equality included not in EU hard law, but in recommendations caused much more trouble. Debates on abortion, gender equality and rights of same sex couples often used notion of Europeanisation and European values. Debates on those issues had more serious meaning than introduction of some legal provisions. They were also the debates on meaning of national culture, and inevitable changes it has to undergo after joining EU. This paper will analyse cultural meaning of Europeanisation and possible directions of transformation of national culture, with most of the attention paid to gender relations. The debates have at least three levels of meanings concentrated around different values: gender equality vs. gender inequality (traditional gender order); European vs. national and secular vs. religious.

Debates on abortion, gender equality and rights of the same- sex couples often referred to “Europe” and “European values”. Analysis of fragments of Parliamentary debates will show the main contexts in which the notion of “Europe” is used and how is defined. Fragments reveal also process of geography of national identity- should “we” be in “Europe” (accept norms and values), outside it (reject “European norms and preserve “our” national tradition) or maybe EU should “join us” (accept way of life based on Christian tradition and values). Political debates reveal not only various understanding of gender equality, but also complex process of creating national identity in context of Europeanisation.

Finally, I would like to ask how deep Europeanisation and EU induced gender equality can go. Is it possible to differentiate between “public” and “private” Europeanisation? Policies required by EU can quite easily transform public sphere, but what about private sphere? Are Polish women allowed to be “European” free market labour force in the public, but at the same time forced to perform traditional role of “Mother-Pole” in the private sphere? Strong resistance to ideas of gender equality partially explain surface- like character of introduced changes. Denial of gender based discrimination or resistance to anti- discrimination policy makes well- grounded debate on strategies of equality impossible. Anti- Europeanness and “Christian values” are used to reject deeper cultural change. Especially family and private sphere is considered to be an area of resistance. In Polish history family was considered to be a place of preserving national identity under foreign occupation, religion, language and traditional (national) way of life. Deeply reaching modernisation of gender relation is perceived as dangerous for traditional family and thus for the nation.

'Roma in European gender equality policy debates: intersectionalized and feminized' by Jasminka Dedić

The aim of this paper is to explore how are Roma, who constitute the largest ethnic minority in the European Union, constructed in the selected gender+ equality policy debates in QUING's four issues. More precisely, the foci of this analysis are the intersections between "gender" and "Roma (race/ethnicity)" dimensions detected in QUING's gender+ equality policy frame analysis. The preliminary analysis shows that this intersection had been invoked in 16 sampled documents that were produced both by state and non-state actors mainly from the countries with a sizeable Roma or Traveller population, i.e. Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia. Although only one EU document, which was included in the QUING's frame analysis, invokes a gendered Roma category ("Roma women"), the analyzed member states' documents will be explored also in the light of other relevant EU policy documents putting this specific intersectionality on the EU and domestic political agenda as well. As it is evident from the diagnostic and prognostic statements referring to the gender-Roma intersectionality axis found in QUING's software, concerned national documents refer exclusively to "Roma women" and "Roma girls", while only one (Romanian) document contains a reference also to "Roma men". Through these specific intersections and the intersectionality approach developed by Crenshaw (1991), this paper will explore the emerging phenomenon of feminization of Roma community in the EU and in member states' gender+ equality policies. Furthermore, it will also discuss the broader implications of the policy debates focusing on minority (Roma, Muslim, Turkish, immigrant, non-white etc.) women across Europe, and how do they relate to the reproduction of racial and/or ethnic power relations in the European Union and to specific cultural constructions of dominant (non-Roma, non-Muslim, white, autochthonous, European etc.) groups as masculine; in other words, as those that are called to "save" the minority women from "oppression" (see Oprea 2005).

This paper explores the gendering of Roma in European gender equality policy debates; more precisely, it undertakes strategic examination of gender and Romani ethnicity / race intersecting dimensions detected in the QUING's selected policy debates. Nevertheless, before tackling it, it should be noted that the policy documents included in the QUING's frame and voice analysis do not necessarily reflect all relevant gender+ equality policy debates emerging in the European Union and 29 analyzed countries, however, they pertain to be the most recent and the most authoritative and comprehensive documents in QUING's four main issues, i.e. in general gender equality (GEQ), non-employment (NE), intimate citizenship (IC) and gender based violence (GBV). As a result of the coding process, in which the sampled documents were coded, the QUING researchers altogether produced more than 2.000 supertexts. Ultimately, the empirical material was interpreted in accordance with the Critical Frame Analysis approach, which is anchored in Carol Bacchi's (1999) constructionist "What's the problem?" approach (cf. Verloo and Lombardo 2007). At the core of the theoretical and methodological framework of critical frame analysis is that of a "policy frame", which Verloo defines as an "organising principle that transforms fragmentary or incidental information into a structured and meaningful problem, in which a solution is implicitly or explicitly included" (2005: 20).

Critical frame analysis constitutes a relevant methodological tool also for tracing and framing intersectionality in gender equality policies (Verloo and Lombardo 2009). By referring to intersecting dimensions of gender and Romani race/ethnicity, the concept of intersectionality constitutes one of the central concepts in the paper, and therefore, it needs to be further clarified. In relation to “intersectionality”, which has become the “buzzword” of feminist theory and research (Davis 2008, Urbanek 2008), there is a significant conceptual confusion. This can be largely attributed to the “theoretical complexities of intersectionality”, however, on the other hand it indeed seems to be “ideally suited to the task of exploring how categories of race, class and gender are intertwined and mutually constitutive” (Davis 2008: 71). Conceptual confusion is further exacerbated by the fact that this phenomenon has been - more likely than not - “hidden” behind other labels used not only in the policy debates, but also in earlier academic debates (for example, “dual systems”; cf. Walby 2007).

“Intersectionality” was originally coined by Kimberle Crenshaw (1989) to address the problem of exclusion of Black women’s employment experiences, which fell out of both feminist and anti-racist identity politics. Crenshaw (1991) also introduced the distinction between the structural intersectionality and political intersectionality. Thus, she uses “structural intersectionality” to highlight different experiences of Black women emerging when systems of gender, race and class domination converge. The result is “intersectional subordination”, which is produced through the interaction of pre-existing sub-ordinations along different inequality axes, and which creates another, exacerbated dimension of disempowerment. With “political intersectionality” Crenshaw refers to as how are intersecting dimensions relevant to sometimes opposing political strategies (cf. Verloo and Lombardo 2009). As the most authors notice, academic works on intersectionality mostly deal with structural intersectionality, while the exploration of political intersectionality in policy-making is rare (Verloo 2006, Urbanek 2008, Verloo and Lombardo 2009).

As the present work undertakes a strategic examination of how are Roma gendered in recent gender equality policy debates throughout Europe, political intersectionality will be the primary focus of this paper. Furthermore, it draws also from other works theorizing intersectionality, particularly those understanding intersectionality as “a process through which ‘race’ takes on multiple ‘gendered’ meanings for particular women and men” (Ferree 2009: 85). The main feature of the understanding of intersectionality as a process, sometimes also called “constructionist intersectionality” (Prins 2006), “interactive intersectionality” (Ferree 2009) etc., is that it analyzes intersectionality as time and context contingent, rather than fixed and ahistorical (Yuval-Davis 2006, Walby 2007, Ferree 2009, Hulko 2009). Finally, this paper aims to address not only the intersections of subordination, but also to question “privileged intersections”, which is inextricably related to the issue of production of categories and of hegemonic discourses (Bacchi 2005).

According to Yuval-Davis, the intersectionality is “a major analytical tool that challenges hegemonic approaches to the study of stratification as well as reified forms of identity politics” (2006: 201). Indeed, in the present strategic exploration of how are Roma being gendered in European gender+ equality policies analyzed in the QUING project, the intersectional approach provides the ground for reflexive questioning of possible gendered, racist and ethnicized implications of overwhelmingly feminizing intersectional categories, particularly those involving women from race/ethnic, religious or linguistic minorities. Of course, we always have to bear in mind that some categories are more contingent upon specific historical and socio-cultural context, which necessitates the construction of specific categories. However, as Yuval-Davis notes, “some social divisions, such as gender, stage in the life cycle, ethnicity and class, tend to shape most people's lives in most social locations” (2006: 203). Therefore, the intersectional frame analysis should not reflect critically only upon the policy framings and upon the absences in the policy discourses, but should also strive for understanding why those discourses readily employ certain intersectional categories, while others are – intentionally or unintentionally – consistently overlooked.

'Beyond the 'worlds of compliance': a sociological and discursive approach to the Europeanisation of gender equality policies' by Maxime Forest and Emanuela Lombardo

Drawing on the analysis of gender equality policies in Europe carried out within the QUING project, the volume that this chapter introduces aims at contributing to the literature discussing Europeanisation and the comparative analysis of public policies in a gendered perspective. This general purpose makes necessary to clarify various concepts and to set-up the common theoretical and methodological background of the contributions. This introductory chapter has two main aims. The first is to isolate a few research directions, making explicit references to the most recent developments of the literature on European integration and domestic policy changes in Europe. The second aim is to discuss theoretical and methodological aspects of the discursive politics approach that we employ in the volume for our analysis of the Europeanisation of gender and other inequality policies. By articulating a sociological and discursive approach to Europeanisation, this chapter expects not only to introduce the main empirical findings detailed in the other chapters, but also to develop a more comprehensive approach in the analysis of the “external” variable in the making of gender equality policies in Europe, thus contributing to the overall debate on the Europeanisation of public policies.

“Europeanisation”, if a concept at all, is a hugely discussed one. Over the past ten years, it has generated plenty of definitions and attempts of operationalization, whether as a new theory, a very inclusive, all-you-can-eat ‘background’ concept, or a principle for organising existing theories of European integration and (often diverging) empirical findings. The main aim of this volume, nonetheless, is neither to provide a further conceptual clarification or another assessment to this discussion, nor to place a new definition under consideration. Similarly, our purpose is not to contribute to the fortune of a theoretical tool of which the star is fading, as it becomes clear that Europeanisation, be it in its most stretched and “catch-all” use, does not provide any macro-explanation to policy change in Europe. If the value of a concept (not to speak about a theory) is proportional to its ability to make sense of a wide range of phenomena in a variety of contexts through the arrangement of a same set of variables, then Europeanisation can hardly be considered a “long range concept” or an organized theory. Instead, exacting uses drawing on a narrow definition of what is at stake still coexist with stretched uses contemplating a wide variety of political, social and even cognitive phenomena referring to the making of a EU policy framework (Baisnée and Pasquier 2007). Even unspecified, sometimes opportunist “usages” recycling theorization on the overall direction – or even the meaning- of European integration have not vanished.

It is significant, however, that the dynamics addressed under the notion “Europeanisation” tend to prevent any univocal explanation or generalization. While institution building at the supra-national level had been at the core of the preoccupations of intergovernmentalist and neo-functional points of view, Europeanisation studies, beyond the lack of clarity and the broad scope of the concept, have contributed to change the lens through which European integration is analyzed. Indeed, the strengthening of the EU legal and institutional order, as well as successive and increasingly conditional enlargements, have shaped the interest for the “domestic impact of Europe”. Beyond the making of a new model of governance at the EU-level, to be characterized by a very specific process of institutionalization, the emergence of new political and administrative elites or a new arena for interest intermediation, scholars have thus addressed the internalization of EU norms and policies into the national polities. Such an interest, to be declined in each member state as well as in a comparative perspective, has mainly developed from a top-down point of view, focusing on processes of internalization, norm adaptation, with a strong premise: convergence is the rule, conflict or increased variety/divergence, the exception.

These assumptions, nonetheless, have been increasingly questioned in the light of empirical studies carried out throughout the enlarged European Union. By looking at the details of institutional and political “opportunity structures” to be affected by the *acquis* and EU-modeled policy solutions, it became clear that rather than a proxy for convergence, Europeanisation was often a synonym for political contention, competing discursive patterns and institutional “misfit”. As a consequence, over the last decade broader analyses of the EU-MS relations have developed, providing more sophisticated and realistic frameworks. Far from constituting a consistent field of investigation unified by a common research agenda or methodology, these analyses can nevertheless be characterized by a more comprehensive approach that takes into account institutional, discursive, and interactional factors (Radaelli 2000, 2004; Jacquot and Woll 2003).

Drawing on these relatively new premises, and more explicitly referring to sociological and cognitive-discursive approaches to Europeanisation, this volume expects to make a contribution to the literature in the light of the comparative analysis of gender equality policies in 27 member states and 2 candidate countries carried out within the European QUING project³. The main arguments that make such a contribution much needed, also conditioning its value for the overall reflection on the domestic impact of Europe, are the following:

Firstly, whereas the history and development of EU gender equality Law have been intensively explored and often referred to as an illustration of various theories on European governance and integration, only a few gendered contributions made reference to the Europeanisation literature. Secondly, gender equality, as a field of EU intervention, has a rich record as regarding the development of both “hard” and “soft” policy mechanisms, with a special emphasis on the latter, through the diffusion of mainstreaming and the open method of coordination. Hence, it provides an excellent starting point to explore the cognitive dimension of the domestic impact of Europe. Thirdly, drawing on social movement literature and public policy analysis, there is a rich reflection on the making of gender equality and anti-discrimination policies that shed light on the importance of policy frames that shape the meaning of policies in different ways (Verloo 2007). By comparing frames on gender equality and other inequalities around a set of policy issues in 29 countries, the QUING project thus paved the way for an extensive comparison of the domestic impact of Europe in the field. Finally, by covering all the member states, the master project in which this volume originates mobilizes much differentiated institutional, social and political contexts which are likely to shape differently the domestication of EU paradigms and policy practices.

The analysis of discursive and institutional factors that characterises our research agenda and the focus on gender equality and other inequality policies could contribute to further developments in the sociological and cognitive turn to be noticed in the analysis of Europeanisation processes. In particular, our common contribution, by privileging a focus on diversity, aims at challenging the most static and narrowly defined approaches which remains quite pervasive in European studies in general and gendered perspectives in particular. For instance, the strong conditionality of the Enlargement to CEE countries, to which most of the chapters of this volume are dedicated, has generated rather normative and almost exclusively top-down perspectives. These fail to account of the differential impact of the EU and the increased variety of “gender policy regimes”, intuitively maintaining the division of Europe between different “worlds of compliance” (Falkner and Treib 2008). Instead, drawing upon the results of QUING, we suggest a focus on the diversity of the policy response to EU incentives in the member states. Analysing legal and institutional developments, but placing special emphasis on the level of policy practices and discourses, the present contributions all together contribute to a much more fragmented and differentiated outline that suggests mapping and testing a few common variables.

As a very first step, the present chapter provides a review of the literature on Europeanisation and the “gendering of Europe”, defining a joint research agenda. Focusing on gendered studies on EU integration, it firstly makes the distinction between different approaches to Europeanisation and then lists a set of policy transfers to be analysed in our study, as well as the levels of governance addressed in our analysis. In section 2, we extend our reflection beyond the existing literature, to advocate a discursive politics approach and the way it echoes the most recent contributions to the literature on policy change in Europe. In our conclusions we challenge Europeanisation approaches that unilaterally focus on the analysis of compliance mechanisms, leaving out other important factors of policy change as those related to norm diffusion and social learning, and we argue in favour of a more pluralistic and discursive approach to the study of Europeanisation.

‘Rethinking the effects of Europeanisation: civil society and state framing of gender equality policies in Turkey and Croatia’ by Ana Frank

The paper is going to research the effects of Europeanisation on civil society and state actors in framing gender equality policies in two candidate states for accession to EU – Croatia and Turkey. The aim of the paper is to see what strategic and discursive framing civil society and state institutions use and if EU changes and Europeanisation influence actors' strategies and (strategic and discursive) frames. The paper therefore aims to assess differences/similarities in framing specific gender equality policies (i.e. Intimate Citizenship, Gender Based Violence, Non-employment) by state and civil society actors (between two countries). The analysis is based on the material produced in the research project QUING.

Liebert (2003) has shown that rigid country clusters do not make much sense for gender equality policies. Analysing and comparing Turkey and Croatia, countries which are not typical national "cluster countries" makes sense, to assess the meaning and negotiations of Europeanization in two 'non-cluster' countries along different issues of gender equality policies and show whether and how the compliance with the EU varies according to issue and not the "world of compliance" that a specific country as a whole may represent.

A further aim of this paper is to see whether Europeanization works as one-way impact on national political systems (only one-way adaptation) or if it is a negotiable concept being "stretched" and "bended",² along with the negotiations; how are gender equality policies (the concrete issues) stretched and bended in specific socio-historical contexts and/or if it causes any differentiation and resistance and not only convergence/compliance in national political systems.

The paper will build upon theoretical framework on new, more dynamic explanations of Europeanization – as a cognitive, institutional and interactive process of change – dependent on different configurations of institutional framing and agency (Jacquot and Woll 2003, Radaelli 2004) and on methodological/theoretical contributions of Critical Frame and Voice Analysis (Lombardo et al. 2009, Bacchi 2009) as developed in the QUING project. The analysis will be based on the two countries' frame analysis, voice analysis and reference analysis of supertexts in three sub-issues (Non-employment, Intimate Citizenship and Gender Based violence).

In general, as regards international obligations and Europeanization frames with special reference to EU, it seems that in Turkey there is greater occurrence and influence while in Croatia we have relatively few references and frames stressing EU level of influence. Even those frames that stress efficiency-good governance and quality of legislation do not refer to EU level significantly. The international obligations frames do stress international obligations but reference to EU is minor indeed. Even in Intimate citizenship issue where the Europeanization frame is present, it is a minor frame in Croatia and Turkey and it is only expressed by state voices. However it is interesting to note that references to EU in Croatia are most expressed in Intimate citizenship issue, which is a very weak field of competence for EU.

We can conclude that Europeanization has different influence in different policy areas and within voices expressing Europeanization but also in the way Europeanization is used. For example in non-employment issue, where EU has direct influence with hard law imposing legislation on member states thus “pressuring” for adaptation and implementation, the use of Europeanization diverges in Turkey and Croatia. We can see that although in Turkey Europeanization and International obligations are clearly expressed frames while in Croatia they are not relevant, there is a master discourse of economic effectiveness that influences actors of both countries while attempting to pursue specific policy problems and decisions in the non-employment area. Although in Turkey references to Europe, European Union and international organisations are very much present and employed, while in Croatia this is not the case, it may be said that Europeanization “in economic terms” – as an unintentional, discursive economic master frame – has effect in both countries as regards the adoption of the *acquis communautaire* and national compliance.

On the other hand, when it comes to “usage” of Europeanization by actors – as intentional, strategic usage of ideational or norm related Europeanization to “justify” policy decisions – there are clear differences between countries. In non-employment issue in Turkey both state and civil society actors use Europe or Europeaness as normative and ideationally desirable aim, perceived as the direction of progress to push through their agenda, while in Croatia, no sign of European identity or tradition is invoked for policy demands.

In the intimate citizenship issue, where EU competence is limited, we have Europeanization framing by state actors in Turkey, but no Europeanization frames or references by civil society voices. Similarly in Croatia we have clear Europeanization framing and references by state actors but only EU references expressed by civil society actors. It is interesting to see that references to EU are most expressed in IC issue, which is a very weak field of competence for EU.

However here we have examples of Europeanization, which is "used" in two ways, as a justification for adoption and change in legislation and as an excuse to avoid legislation. So non-competence of EU in one specific policy issue may be used as an excuse for nonadoption of equality legislation, although EU recommendations may be clearly in favour of more equality policies. In gender-based violence issue Europeanization seems not to have a greater impact, since international obligations frames and references dominate. So we can see that Europeanization does not work only as one-way impact on national political systems (only one-way adaptation) since it is a negotiable concept being "stretched and bended" along with the negotiations. Besides, Turkish LGBT organisations have even criticised EU of not defending gender equality rights in terms of non-discrimination because of sexual orientation as it defended other discriminations.

Besides the different aspects of Europeanization that we could identify in our analysis, gender equality policies as well are stretched and bended in specific socio-historical contexts, which causes differentiation and resistance and not only "convergence"/compliance in national political systems. According to Lombardo et al. (2009) gender equality "stretch" and "bend", according to the current contextual needs. For example the EU has tended to label gender equality in different ways, but mostly as linked to competition, combating nonemployment etc. This clearly reveals the market oriented inclination of definitions of gender equality within the EU, which is also the case of Croatia and Turkey. This means that gender equality is "bended" to fit "higher" or national goals and interests (e.g. demography). Furthermore gender equality is also "shrunked", which means reduced to gender equality in the labour market. Within EU this is often the case and so it is for Croatia and Turkey.

To rely on Radaelli's question on how to assess whether the change on domestic level is caused by globalizations' or Europeanization's influence, it is possible to say that to some extent both countries respond to EU demands, which can be seen in the incorporation of EU requirements, especially in Non-employment policy field (and to some extent the sub-issue of sexual harassment at work in the Gender-based violence issue), while in the other two issues (Gender based violence issue, and to a lesser extent in Intimate citizenship issue) global influence (in terms of analysed frames and references) has precedence over Europeanization, although international frames represent weak frames in both countries.

However, to problematize Radaelli's conceptualization of global and EU changes: do they really differ from each other in terms of gender equality policies, so that it would be possible to assess which influence is at work? Is not globalization influenced by "European" values? So if we ask whether this change would have taken place without Europeanization, we have to recognize the similarities of processes that both globalization and Europeanization cause in terms of change of gender equality policies and policy making.

'Institutionalising intersectionality in Italy: gatekeepers and political dynamics' by Elena del Giorgio and Emanuela Lombardo

In this paper we analyse firstly how intersectionality has been institutionalized in Italian legislation and equality machinery focusing primarily on the analysis of race and sexual orientation, and, secondly, what are the main dynamics between civil society and institutional actors and among institutional actors themselves – underlying this process. Italian gender equality policies have developed in the nineties due to a favourable juncture of European Union (EU) influence and national political factors. One decade later, through Article 13 of the Treaty of Amsterdam and two implementing Directives, the EU has launched a multiple antidiscrimination approach to cover other inequalities than gender (race or ethnicity, disability, sexual orientation, age, religion or belief) and has required the creation of specific equality bodies. How has the Italian political system reacted to the EU institutional shift towards the treatment of multiple inequalities? To what extent is Italy developing an intersectional political approach towards equality? Who are the gatekeepers in this process of institutionalisation?

The literature on institutionalising intersectionality has predominantly looked at the nature of existing political arrangements. Yet, it has paid less attention to dynamic analyses of interactions amongst the relevant actors involved in the institutionalisation process: government, agencies, political parties, and civil society. In this paper we would like to fill this gap by analysing not only the extent to which intersectionality has been institutionalized in Italian legislation and machinery, but also what are the main institutional and civil society dynamics - of resistance, in/exclusion, cooperation - underlying this process. These dynamics are context-related, thus making the study of intersectionality an 'empirical question' (Hancock 2007).

Our context of analysis is Italy, a country marked by strong ideological divides along the political spectrum and by a consolidated and vital associative tradition, both of which offer opportunities and constraints in the political articulation of intersectionality. We argue that while the EU has opened opportunities for the development of policies and machinery that were not previously available in Italy, the constellation of national gatekeepers, their interactions, and the colour of the party in government affect the specific type of institutionalisation that takes place.

Italy has passed from a unitary gender-centred approach to a multiple one under the EU pressure and occasional governmental window of opportunities. However, gender has not been mainstreamed in other inequality policies, there are no procedures to coordinate action on multiple discriminations, and intersectionality of gender with other inequalities is formally present in the Decrees transposing EU anti-discriminatory directives on race and sexual orientation, but it is de facto absent in policy practice. What we find is rather discriminatory biases in the form of institutional racism and homophobia. In this respect, we conclude that applied intersectionality in Italy is not only embryonic but also volatile and dependant on governmental changes. Here, we wish to discuss the reasons for this failed institutionalisation of intersectionality and the contribution of the analysis of the Italian case for the theory.

The Italian Ministry for Rights and Equal Opportunities, which deals with equality policies on gender, race/ethnicity, and sexual orientation, is highly located as it depends directly on the Presidency. However, the not autonomous status of the body does not favour authority to influence government policy. The Italian Ministry of EO has a broad executive mandate. However, the lack of financial autonomy and the little financial and human resources are severe limitations to the possibility of implementing the mandate. In order to coordinate initiatives the Ministry of EO must rely on the availability of other Ministries, which varies with the government situation. As concerns clarity of functional responsibility, this is also limited by the fact that the EO Ministry's activities highly depend on the type of governmental responsibilities which are assigned to the Minister by the different Cabinet Presidents. Such a weak structure makes the Ministry of EO particularly vulnerable to government changes, a factor that has greatly affected continuity and consistency of equality policy, considered the highly unstable Italian political system. Also interaction with civil society and accountability of machinery in Italy has proved to be highly dependant on government change. Since there are no institutionalised channels for consultation, the relationship varies according to the political will of the Minister of EO and of the government, with centre-left governments being more inclusive than centre-right ones. With regard to gender equality, the characteristics of Italian feminist movement, more 'difference' oriented and sceptical about engaging in relations with state agencies, have limited the impact of the movement on the agencies. LGBT and, to a lesser extent, anti-racist associations have also been affected by governmental changes, with greater cooperation coming in times of centre-left governments, and distance arising in reaction to centre-right discriminatory policies.

The Italian case teaches us that institutional and political preconditions similar to those identified for women's policy agencies are necessary for an institutionalisation of intersectionality that could show minimum quality in its procedures and outcomes. In particular, the autonomous status of the equality body, both politically and financially, and the clarity of functional responsibility appear important aspects to make the agency less vulnerable to governmental changes. The institutionalisation of channels for the consultation of civil society also appears crucial to enable NGOs dealing with different equality issues to make their voices heard in political debates on equality independently of the particular orientation of the majority in government.

The European Union had a tremendous impact on placing equality issues on the Italian political agenda, for gender, race and sexual orientation, as the legislation transposing EU directives shows. It was influential in the establishment of the Ministry for Rights and Equal Opportunities in 1996 to deal with gender equality, and was again behind the creation in 2003 of the anti-racist UNAR body. It was less influential in the formal creation of a body on sexual orientation, which was mainly moved by domestic dynamics of civil society pressure and left-wing government's political will. Binding instruments like EU directives have been effective in obliging unwilling Italian institutional actors to transpose antidiscrimination legislation.

Looking at inequality policymaking through intersectional lenses, that is treating intersectionality as a methodological tool, helps us scholars to focus on previously neglected aspects, which opens interesting research and political horizons. The analysis of the Italian case through intersectional lenses has moved us to explore how multiple inequalities were politically treated and has given us some elements to discuss intersectionality theory. The beginning of an institutionalisation of multiple inequalities in Italy, as hindered as it was by the Berlusconi government, could be considered as a first opening towards intersectional policies in the future, also considering that the anti-racist body (UNAR) was created within the gender equality body (Department for EO). Moreover, the fact that, despite its lack of implementation, the Decrees transposing the EU directives refer to gender intersections with race, sexual orientation, and religion moves us to speak of a case of legislated 'accidental intersectionality'. In this sense, theory could be more specific in distinguishing between cases of accidental or routinised intersectionality, and consider both legislated and implemented intersectionality. Cases of alliance between the feminist and the homosexual movement in specific occasions are interesting for refining intersectionality theory too. The concept of 'alliance' used in the context of intersectional dynamics (Walby 2007) can help us to refine existing vocabulary of intersectionality theory and identify a situation in which inequalities are 'overlapping' or intersecting. That is the two inequalities are overlapping when they are still maintained as separate but happen to come together in particular occasions, for actors' specific strategic or ideological reasons (eg anti-racist and homosexual movements' alliance during the 2009 anti-racist pride). Or inequalities can be intersecting, as it was for gender and sexuality in the case of the alliance between the lesbian and feminist movements to defend sexual rights. In this sense, Hancock's theory of unitary, multiple, and intersectional approach could be revised through the introduction of more precise concepts able to describe the variety of existing empirical realities which are sometimes half way between multiple inequalities and intersectionality.

Finally, the analysis of the Italian case has shown that the process of institutionalising intersectionality is driven by complex, multi-level (EU, domestic), and multi-faceted (political, cultural) dynamics and factors. Thus, we suggest that theories on the institutionalisation of intersectionality could benefit not only from being more deeply grounded within specific national political and cultural contexts, but also from the use of a multiplicity of approaches and methods. These analytical approaches could provide helpful elements to uncover the complex dynamics of interaction among different inequalities that result from the 'framing work' of a multiplicity of actors intervening in processes of institutionalisation of equality, bringing their own agendas and moving within the 'frameworks' offered by the specific political, institutional, and cultural contexts of their time.

'On the interface between civil society and state and its implications for the quality of gender equality policies in Estonia' by Martin Jaigma

Establishment of organisations independent from the state became lawful again in 1989, when the parliament approved the law on freedom of associations. The law tackled both parties and non-governmental organisations. After restoration of independence the number of associations has grown quickly, especially from late 1990s (Hinno 2008, 5). The term civil society itself appeared in the public debates only in the middle of 1990s, until then the discourse related to the building up of nation state dominated. One of the strongest impulses inserting the term civil society into public debate was the pressure for more democracy during the process of joining European Union. Inclusion of civil society was a part of almost all parliamentary discussions that concentrated on the EU integration process. The development of democracy was interpreted mainly through interest groups, non-profit organizations and projects promoting civil society participation (Ling 2008, 11). In spite of the important role played by NGOs during the period in which Estonia regained its independence, civil society is still the frailest element of the country's democracy today. This problem is not caused by an insufficient number of NGOs in the country, as will be pointed out below, but rather by the insufficient resources at the disposal of NGOs, and their insufficient ability to participate in the development of Estonian society. Representatives of Estonia's public and non-profit sectors are trying to debate about the function of the NGOs and look for the resources necessary to perform those functions (Koncz 2005, 198).

Notwithstanding EU integration process and the pressure from above, Estonian people have been more inert to embrace new understandings, namely the function of civil society. One of the indicators of citizen activity is membership in citizen associations. In Estonia, despite the big number of associations (in August 2008, 27 372 organisations, including apartment associations) this indicator is quite poor. Such result originates from two surveys, commissioned by the ministries of Justice and Social Affairs in 2006 and 2007 respectively (Mänd 2008, 14). In 2008, another survey was conducted to review the trustworthiness of non-profit organisations. The outcome shows that 46% of the population trusts NGOs (8% trusts completely, 38% rather trusts them) and 24% does not trust them (18% rather trusts and 6% does not trust). These indicators have not changed much over the years and there is always a large group of people (25-31%) who cannot provide opinion about non-profit organisations. Although there are more people than trust these organisations, it still is a low indicator of trust. Similarly to non-profit organisations, low level trust in the same survey was given to trade unions (50%), Prime Minister (48%), the government (45%) and the parliament (43%). Political parties, however, were the least trusted (22%) (Mänd 2008, 15).

Citizens' participation in political life in Estonia has been reduced to providing mere opinions about legislative acts – there are web portals for this kind of activity. Furthermore, opinions expressed there do not come from average citizens but rather from different interest groups and leaders of organizations. Limited opportunities of citizens to influence politics are considered weakness of participatory democracy. To face the truth, legislation process interests very few people (very small number people also using these abovementioned portals) and people's opportunities to influence politics remain marginal. (Toots 2008, 15).

By 2007, cooperation between the public and nonprofit sectors in policymaking had been steadily improving. Ministries started to appoint officials whose tasks were to include NGOs decision making, supervising the implementation of the Code of Good Practice on Involvement in ministries and help both government officials and NGOs in matters of involvement. Moreover, the government set up the participation portal which can channel the comments and suggestions of civil society organizations and individuals about the ongoing consultation processes, at the same time the ministries make available to public the draft laws, background materials etc. In the long run, the users of the portal will be also able to initiate legislations (Hadzi-Miceva 2007, 37-38). As a positive sign in 2007, the government added a chapter on civil society to their action plan. At the same time, NGOs did not improve their service providing capacity, while the public sector was waiting NGOs to play a more vigorous role in public service delivery.

To encapsulate the core issues that impede the cooperation between the two sectors, the public sector has to pay attention to the following that has come to characterize it. There is insufficient knowledge about potential partners and about the processes of involvement, which makes the consultation process often formal without any real effort to ensure meaningful input from NGOs. Difficulties stem also from poor quality of drafts laws (which tend to be very long and complicated) and poor planning of time and short deadlines. The time given to organizations for sending their feedback to draft laws is usually 2-3 weeks, which is often not sufficient when organizations want to gather their members' or constituencies' options first, especially if they are not informed in advance about forthcoming consultation processes. Thus NGOs are often involved only in consultations about ready-made draft laws instead of involving them in the stages of needs assessment and development of the draft. The public sector is often also not capable to give feedback to organizations who have contributed to the law-making processes with their proposals. Non-governmental organisations, in turn, have to tackle the lack of resources (both human and financial) to make meaningful contributions to policymaking, competence to comment on legal texts, and ability to consult and involve their members and target groups when they formulate the organization's position towards a policy or law (Hadzi-Miceva 2007, 36-37).

Thus, one of the most consistent storylines of implications in the relationship between NGOs and the state is that of distrust and suspicion, the roots of which stem already from early history of NGOs instigation in Estonia. Improvement and betterment of gender equality policies in Estonia have been mostly pushed by women's organisations. However, the state authority and legislators have been rather stubborn to invite these organisations to negotiation or consultation tables and ask for suggestions. The result of such ignoring has deepened also the isolation of non-governmental organisations and the feeling that the state should be the one offering all the solutions.

The plausible outcome of such distrust is the lack or unwillingness for cooperation that has effect on NGOs positioning and ambition in society. It means that the role of civil society has not always being progressive but has contributed, less or more willingly, the maintenance of a social status quo system. Examples of the latter were found in all issues, except general gender equality texts.

'Beyond the 'worlds of compliance': a sociological and discursive approach to the Europeanisation of gender equality policies: women and employment: does France go it alone?' by Julie Jarty

Since the beginning of the 1970s, transnationalisation of gender equality issues via international bodies such as the United Nation (UN), the European Commission (EC) and the European Union (EU) means that it is no longer possible to analyse gender equality policies exclusively at the national level. However, the precise impact of the transnational level is not immediately clear, insofar as it obviously implies more than a straightforward transposition of directives and ready-built models from the transnational to the national level of decision-making. In a critique of the so-called 'convergence theories', recent analyses of the Europeanization process have emphasized the different ways in which different cultures, each more or less resistant to the EU policy framework, share beliefs and norms (Radaelli, 2004). This article will contribute to a reflection on the impact of the EU in the construction of gender equality policies and in the development of new paradigms or frames. The analysis of employment policies constitutes the main focus of this paper.

Various studies already show the complexity of the Europeanization processes, but the French case remains characterized by its below average performance in terms of compliance with EU policy framework and norms. Identified as an example of the "transposition neglect" in the classification by Falkner and Treib (2007), French inertia in transposing EU directives is a recurring component of the existing comparative literature on the Europeanization process (Junter, 2004, Laufer and Silvera, 2004, Mazur, 2004). According to Liebert, France has alternated between a 'stubborn refusal' to adopt EU paradigms on the one hand, and a minimal level of transposition on the other hand. In both cases, existing national reference frame have been left largely unchallenged and unchanged (Liebert 2003). Nevertheless, the gender equality objectives of the EU have undoubtedly produced a growing awareness of the importance of equality between men and women in France, particularly as far as the labour market is concerned (Le Feuvre & Andriocci, 2002). Gender equality policies at EU level have historically had a labour market focus, notably through the creation of a legal framework to promote equality at work. For instance, Article 141 of the 1957 treaty of Rome adopted the "principle of equal pay for male and female workers for equal work of equal value". It is thus particularly interesting to see how one of the founding members of the EU has been affected by European-level policy initiatives in this field.

The analytical approach to 'non-employment' adopted in the Quing project leads us to analyze employment and employment-related policies in order to understand how these policies construct and legitimate the presence (and the absence) of certain categories of citizens on the labour market (Lombardo, Sangiuliano & Longo, 2007). In line with this perspective, this paper will analyse the impact of the EU in the (de)construction of categories of 'non-employed' citizens in France, from a gender perspective. It is now accepted at the EU level that non-employment is a source of women's economic dependency, particularly on a spouse or a partner and that this contributes to gender inequalities. In the context of globalization, this paper attempts to analyse the role of supra-national bodies in regulating the daily lives of citizens, and more precisely in shaping the evolution of gender relations in the field of employment. However, our interest in the Europeanization process leads us to extend our focus to a broader gender equality and/or anti-discrimination policy framework. Although such areas are not explicitly connected to employment issues, they constitute a clear indicator of the evolution of French paradigms on gender equality, which also have clear consequences for women's employment patterns. Hence, beyond the issue of political transfer, this paper seeks to apprehend the EU influence or change the perception and the legitimating process of non-employment for certain categories of citizens. How are incorporated EU policy paradigms within the French national context? And how does the EU contribute to the construction of a new paradigm adopted in the logic of French domestic discourses and policies? In other words, if feminist ideal of gender equality has to be now translated into structural change (Fraser, 2009), in what extend could the EU contribute to make thrive this new social mainstream? Hence, another attempt is to make out the social ideal promoted in a specific national setting and by different social actors, and to apprehend its connotation in matters of gender norms. In other words, this paper would like to shed light on the different vision of gender equality invoked by French policies in comparison with the EU ones, whether they are drawn on notions of sameness (or inclusion), differences (or) and transformation (Walby, 2005: 321-322).

With this perspective in mind, the first part of the paper defines the institutional aspects of the Europeanization and the corresponding evolution of the French legislative framework. Specific attention will be given to the ways in which the Europeanization of gender equality came into conflict with the specific characteristic of the French context, particularly as far as positive action is concerned. This section will draw on the main policies adopted by the EU since the end of the 1970s particularly those measures aimed at influencing women's employment patterns, i.e. equal treatment, positive discrimination and gender mainstreaming. Secondly, we will assess the impact of the EU at the local level, through a representative case study. Far from attempting to give a detailed overview of the Europeanization process at the regional level in France, (see the Spanish contribution to this call for paper), the aim here is to consider the integration (or not) of the emerging EU policy paradigms in a given national context.

Finally we analyze how the new EU anti-discrimination paradigm, introduced by the end of the 1990s, has been incorporated in the French context. By analysing the ways in which gender has been incorporated (or not) into policy measure aimed at reducing all forms of discrimination in the labour market, special attention will be paid to the problem of multiple discrimination and intersectional inequalities. We would like to stress the relationship between French gender equality policies with other complex inequalities and their potential intersectionality. Thus, in addition to measuring the effects of those policies on gender categories, we also explore the extent to which they construct categories at the intersection of gender and other social markers, in particular those associated with class and ethnicity.

In this paper we have explored the Europeanization process of gender equality policies in the area of non-employment since 1995. We have showed that, in spite of the relatively high, full-time employment rates of French women, non-employment in France remains a gendered issue, where the EU plays an important but complex role. Thus, the French gender equality and anti-discrimination legislations as well as their implementation process have directly benefited from EU recommendations and directives.

The analysis of the Europeanization process in French gender equality policies has raised the difficulties for France of transposing EU strategies and policy instruments. The French conception of equality, deeply embedded in the tradition of republican universalism, appears to be somewhat incompatible with the Positive Action principles promoted by the EU throughout the 1980s and the 1990s. Nonetheless, our analysis underline that the so-called French specificity resides more probably in the resistance of French political actors to include the gender issue than in an 'abstract republicanism'. Indeed, gender inequalities are often perceived as a practice that has been successfully eliminated in the past, through an arsenal of laws increasing women's rights (Crompton and Le Feuvre 2000, Mazur, 2004, Le Feuvre, 2009), or as the simple problem of women gaining access to male-dominated spheres of society. The introduction of gender mainstreaming in the EU agenda has been favourable to the development of a more effective gender equality policies. Hence, from 2000 onwards, an increasing number of measures aimed at facilitating the working status of women on the labour market have been adopted in France. However, we have stressed that the lack of political will to adopt effective measures (for instance, to combat the gender pay gap) and the absence of transformative policies to challenge the gendered division of labour, conduce to mitigated effects in terms of women's employment experiences. In a parallel manner, the persistence of the very French family policy, following the ongoing demographic preoccupation, particularly contrasts with a transformative vision of equality between women and men.

The weight of the '(full-time) employment for women' frame identified in this analysis of French equality policies merely shows the aim of integrating women in the paid economy without challenging norms in other spheres. The (relatively) low degree of political initiative in favour of flexible forms of employment (in comparison with other European countries) does not have been followed by policy about sharing family responsibilities. This paper has also explored the use of EU funds at the local level. We have shown that the implementation of time-management policies in the city of Rennes has contributed to changing the dominant vision of gender equality in French public policies. First, care responsibilities began to be seen as something that has to be shared between men and women and the traditional gender stereotypes are slowly challenged by local initiatives based on EU funds, and, subsequently on EU norms. Secondly, the issue of work/life balance has progressively been introduced into private companies, which are also involved in facilitating the combination of the multiple time constraints of their employees. This example shows the dynamic aspect of the Europeanization processes, whose paradigms can be introduced and integrated at different levels of society and by different actors.

Lastly, this paper has examined the introduction of a new paradigm at EU level based on anti-discrimination. We have observed a discursive shift whereby the concept of 'diversity' tends to replace the concept of 'discrimination' and 'equality' (Metso & Le Feuvre, 2009). We have shown how the concept of 'diversity' has been surprisingly easily introduced in France, in a context of a crisis of the traditional French universalism model. However, French AD policies do not seem to question the multiple discriminations that women face. The different anti-discrimination measures are mainly disconnected from gender inequalities. Indeed, we have highlighted that non-employment is strongly related to categories of class and race/ethnicity together with gender and it seems necessary to take this intersectional reality into account in the treatment of discriminations on the labour market. Certainly, this way of framing non-employment is one of the most important challenges for the Europeanization process in France.

'Intimate citizenship policies in Greece and the impact of religion and the Church' by Manina Kakepani

This paper will explore the relationship between religion and politics in Greece, focusing specifically in the way intimate citizenship issues are addressed and contested by the Church. In many cases these issues have appeared on the political agenda of as a result of pressure for change from the outside (usually related to compliance with EU norms and standards). The key hypothesis that we will try to verify is that the Church, despite its institutional relationship with the state, and the high degree of declared religiosity of the people, has limited impact on the formation of such policies, even more so whenever the party in office has a certain political orientation that opposes the Church's official position.

This apparently contradictory hypothesis (a dominant religion with minimal impact in everyday life issues) can be traced to the specific characteristics of the Greek Church: a) its identification with the nation and with people's national identity has led to an anti-western stance which frames the Church's rhetoric not in terms of a battle between feminist and anti-feminist positions, but rather as a battle between national identity and 'Greekness' on the one hand, and the West on the other; b) the fact that the Orthodox Church puts more emphasis in ceremonial rather than in faith issues, resulting in a certain degree of freedom in everyday life issues, such as those belonging to the intimate citizenship policy area.

The discussion in Greece about new family arrangements that will include same-sex partners is very recent and limited to a handful of initiatives, either from Gay and Lesbian groups, or from the parties of the Centre-Left. The 'first generation' of the Gay and Lesbian movement in Greece appeared in the late seventies and until the mid-to-late eighties had a small but dynamic presence in the public discourse mainly through AKOE (Free Homosexual Movement of Greece). Its major aim was to make Greek homosexuals visible and fight against an overtly sexist and traditional society.

In 1976, the Coordination Committee of Women's organisations for the reform of Family Law was established whose activities led to the 1329/83 Act and the modernisation of Family Law. Immediately afterwards, the fight for the decriminalization of abortion began, which resulted in the passing of the 1609/86 Act for the "artificial interruption of pregnancy and the protection of women's health." It was at that time that Greece liberalized its abortion law, removing most restrictions on abortion during the first 12 weeks of pregnancy.

The legal issue of abortion (and reproduction) has since remained settled and largely unchallenged, although the official stance of the Greek Orthodox Church, as anticipated, opposes abortion. Lately, the rhetoric that accompanies anti-abortion voices is also directly related to declining birth rates of Greece (e.g. as opposed to those of neighbouring countries) and the dangers stemming from large flow of immigrants (with higher birth-rates) that in the long term might endanger Greece's identity. In the last years some conservative anti-abortion NGO's have made their appearance, with a quite altered discourse (i.e. more "scientific") as opposed to past anti-abortion supporters.

As it has been said, the secularizing ontology of the Enlightenment which put religion in the private sphere (see Pollis, 1999:167) did not apply in the Greek case, where, during the period of nation building the state emphasized a single cultural and religious tradition. Orthodoxy gradually became a central element of national identity, almost inherent in the notion of state and nation. As a fundamental element of Greekness, Orthodoxy is deeply embedded in the conscience of the Greek people. At the same time, the “nationalization” of the Orthodox church, which can be attributed to specific historic reasons, contributed to the formation of an inextricable and almost not-negotiable relation with the State, which in time, through mutual clientelistic dependencies and commitments, took the form of an interrelated state-religious power net that opposes tolerance and religious otherness. This privileged relationship between the Greek Orthodox Church and the State explains the power and appeal that it has within society where, without limiting itself in its spiritual domain, becomes a powerful intermediating institution between believer and citizen⁸, believer and the polity, contesting its position in the public sphere. At the same time, by putting more emphasis on ceremonial issues rather than the belief system, it fails to instil deeper religious sentiments at its followers. This can probably account for the weak religiosity and lack of theological spirituality that seems to characterize the Greek people.

Regarding the Reproduction Rights sub-issue, one common pattern in the governmental texts (two parliamentary debates and two laws/explanatory reports) is the way reproductive rights are viewed: most of the times the argument in favour of the adopted legalisation stresses the need to protect the rights of the (unborn) children, conceived through artificial insemination, more than the need to protect the rights of women getting this treatment. Protection of children and family are seen as top priorities, together with the concept of ‘motherhood’. Even where there is argumentation in favour of the right of single women to have access to fertility treatment (parliamentary debate by Th. Askitis) the speaker defends his position by claiming that eventually single women that will have children will seek a (male) partner and therefore form the desired family. It is interesting that in the text by the Greek Holy Synod, which is fiercely against the proposed legislation on assisted reproduction, on the grounds that it goes against natural laws, one can detect some common patterns with a text defending the legislation (the Askitis text). Natural laws are accepted in both texts, and family and motherhood are idealized.

The dominant frame that cuts across all the sub-issues is the follow social reality frame. This frame usually appears in combination with the equal rights for same-sex couples frame in the sexual orientation discrimination sub-issue and mostly with the well-being of children frame in the reproduction rights sub-issue. The Europeanization frame also cuts across all issues albeit in a marginal way. As for issue specific frames, in the sexual orientation discrimination sub-issue this is the Equal rights for same-sex couples frame; in the reproduction rights sub-issue these are the well-being of children; the demographic crisis; the children for all and the children need classic parents frames.

'Family policy debates in post-state socialist Hungary: from maternalism to gender equality' by Erika Kispeter

The post-state socialist transformations have led to the re-structuring of the welfare systems in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe amid intense debates. The paper analyzes how the discursive framing of Hungarian debates on family policies has changed since the early 1990s, paying special attention to the influence of the country's European Union accession, and the process of women's organizations gaining voice in the debates. The paper makes three related arguments. First, I argue that the 'maternalist' tradition of state socialist policymaking continues to shape the policy debates on family provisions even today. Second, there has been a clear shift in Hungarian policy debates, signalled by the appearance of the women's inclusion frame and the norm of gender equality, proving the influence of the European Union on national level policy debates. Finally, I argue that women's organizations strategically use the old 'maternalist' frames together with the new, EU-inspired frames in order to mobilize against the plans for reducing state spending on family provisions.

One of the most often discussed processes of the post-state socialist transformations in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe is the re-structuring, or rather, the reducing of the state socialist welfare systems. While an extensive body of research concentrates on the newly emerging post-state socialist welfare and family policies themselves (Deacon 1992; Fodor et al 2002; Gedeon 1995; Lukács and Frey 2003), others focus on the discursive framing of the debates around the restructuring of welfare policies (Goven 2000; Gal and Kligman 2000; Haney 2002, 2003; non employment issue of the QUING project). This paper contributes to the second set of literature by answering the following research question: How has the conceptualization of parental leave policies been changing in Hungarian policy debates since the beginning of the post-state socialist period? In particular, I examine how the framing of parental leaves has been influenced by Hungary's EU accession, how women's civil society organizations contributed to the debates. By focusing on the discursive frames used by women's organizations to formulate redistributive claims, I aim to contribute to the literature which links welfare regime research to theories of social movements (Hobson 2003, 2006; Szalai 2003).

In order to answer the questions outlined above, I examine a variety of policy texts about family provisions: laws, policy plans, transcripts of parliamentary debates and civil society documents. This paper also draws on the results of the FP6 comparative project Quality in Gender+ Equality Policies in Europe (QUING), in particular the results in the field of Non-Employment. The method of critical frame analysis, used in the QUING project, defines a policy frame as the “organizing principle that transforms fragmentary or incidental information into a structured and meaningful problem, in which the solution is implicitly or explicitly included” (Verloo 2005: 20). An important methodological note is in order here: in the QUING project policy frames are identified following the rigorous coding of policy texts and with the use of an elaborate database. The majority of the texts analyzed for this paper are not included in the database of the QUING project, thus they have not been coded, my analysis is based on the close reading of the texts.

The paper gives a brief overview of Hungarian family provisions, followed by an analysis of family policy debates from the early 1990s to the present. The latest episode in the history of family policy debates started in the spring of 2009, when the government proposed major changes to the existing system of parental leave policies. I do not give a comprehensive list of the proposed changes, only of those that had the strongest impact on the ensuing debates. The most contested plan is shortening flat-rated parental leave until the 2nd birthday of the child, instead of the 3rd birthday. As for the earnings related maternity and parental leave, the insurance period required for eligibility is planned to be raised to 365 days from the current 180-day period. In addition, the amount of the family allowance will not be raised for at least two years.

The main explanation for the proposed changes, similarly to the 1995 austerity package is the dire financial state of the country. In particular, the Hungarian government negotiated and received a substantial loan from the International Monetary Fund in late 2008 on the condition that the country will reduce the expenditure of the budget. Although the economic crisis is often referred to in the government’s justification for the proposed changes, the Minister for Social and Labour affairs claims that the main motivation is not to save money, but to increase women’s employment. His statement fits into the emerging trend that started in the early 2000s: mothers on parental leave are discussed not only as mothers, but also as potential employees, who are now ‘encouraged’ to return to the labour market. This trend is particularly clear in the speech made by the state secretary for social and labour affairs in the Parliamentary debate, which was framed around increasing women’s employment and employability. Although he did not quote the EU employment targets, his references to reconciliation of work and family life and to women’s human capital show a clear influence of the EU discourse. The most novel element of his argument was the claim that the Hungarian policies should move towards the Scandinavian model, where fathers are actively encouraged to take a share of the parental leave – although this is not included in the proposal (Korózs, Secretary of the State for Social and Labour Affairs, Parliamentary debate, May 11, 2009). In response to the predictable demographic, and maternalist framing used by the right-wing opposition in the Parliamentary debate, the state secretary quoted research data which questions the direct link between the birth rate and the length of parental leave or the amount of family allowance. In sum, the government’s justification for the proposed changes strongly resembled the arguments of expert working for feminist women’s NGOs.

It may come as a surprise then, that in the few weeks that elapsed between the government's announcement about the proposed changes and the Parliamentary debate, a coalition of women's organization worded a petition to the government, demanding that the plans to be withdrawn. I now turn to the analyzing the framing of the petition: again, only the most relevant elements will be discussed. The petition claims that after the proposed changes the parental leave system "continues to be discriminative against women and contributes to the poverty of women and children". Much of the petition concentrates only on proposed changes to the earnings related parental leave, the only comment about the flat-rated parental leave, which is used by the majority of parents, is that the amount of the payment is low. While there are two references made to EU norms, to gender mainstreaming and to the Parental Leave Directive. At the same time frames which are characteristic of right-wing, conservative voices can also be found. First, the petition claims that the proposed shortening of the paid parental leave is against the Hungarian constitution which states that all children have the right to the protection and care necessary for their adequate physical, mental and moral development. Second, the demography frame is used to claim that the government's proposal will lead to further decline of the birthrate. The unusual combination of the EU antidiscrimination frame with the demographic framing can be understood better, if we examine the organizations forming the coalition. All three Hungarian women's umbrella organizations have signed the petition: the Hungarian Women's Lobby, the Association of Hungarian Women and the conservative women's association. It is likely that the conservative frames were included in order to achieve the joined action of all Hungarian women's umbrella organizations, thus, the combination of the frames described above is likely to be an example of strategic framing from the point of view of all the organizations involved.

A few days after the petition was published, the Ministry of Social and Labour Affairs initiated a meeting with the organizations signing the petition, and asked for concrete recommendations from the petitioners. Expert members of the HWL continued to work on the issue, prepared, signed and presented a document to the Ministry which is completely free of the strategic framing. Although it states that the organization does not agree with the government's proposal, they take part in the negotiation process to minimize the damage the changes may cause, and because they agree with the government that there is a need for a restructuring of the parental leave system.

Based on my analysis of the latest family policy debate I have found that the government's justification of changes to family policies is framed around women's employment – this is a major shift compared to earlier debates. Although the government's proposal presented a political opportunity for feminist organizations to gain a voice and act as the representatives of women in the debate, women's NGOs cannot use the same frame to mobilize against the government's proposal. Thus, in the process of mobilization and coalition building women's organizations strategically use the maternalist frame, proving that the framing of state socialist family policies is effective in uniting women's organizations even two decades after the end of state socialism. This finding is consistent with Hobson's argument (2003) that gender distinctive frames make it easier for women's groups to formulate claims as 'women'. Using the demographic frame was necessary to get the support the conservative women's organization in the mobilization.

In this paper I have traced the history and framings of family policy debates in post-state socialist Hungary looking through the lens of gendered frames. I have found that in the 1990s policy debates were characterized by distinct, yet, unchanging framings of both left- and right-wing political parties. These framings bear the influence of the maternalist framing expressed in state socialist family policies as well as the conservative, nationalist arguments formulated in opposition to the former. Parallel to the EU accession process the frame of women's employment and the norm of gender equality have gradually appeared in the policy documents, however, there are characteristic differences between the Hungarian and the EU policy frames. These differences prove that the Hungarian policy debates continue to be influenced by both the 'old', maternalist framings as well as by the 'new' EU initiated framings.

The most important development in the history of debates is that women's organizations has recently formed a coalition and mobilized against the proposed changes in family policies. The composition of the coalition (right wing/catholic organizations, feminist organizations, self-help groups of mothers) and the nature of the frames present in the texts produced by the coalition is consistent with Haney's argument (2002) that the maternalist discourse of state socialist family policies enables women to mobilize as 'mothers'. The framing used in the petition issued by the coalition of women's NGOs supports Hobson's argument (2003) that gender distinctive frames are more likely to enable women to stage recognition/redistributive struggles as 'women' than frames formulated on the vision of men and women's similarity.

'Stretching EU conditionality: mechanisms of Europeanization in making domestic violence policies in Central and Eastern Europe' by Andrea Krizsan & Raluca Popa

This article analyzes how Europe matters in the development of domestic violence policies, a gender equality field outside the core European Union conditionality criteria. It process-traces the development of domestic violence policies in five Central and Eastern European countries and identifies three mechanisms of influence in the field: EU conditionality, financial incentives and discursive mechanisms used by internal actors to strategically frame the role of the EU. The analysis shows that Europeanization of policies against domestic violence is not a unidirectional EU-defined process, but rather one of norm construction and social learning through the interaction of EU institutions, governments and civil society.

Policy debates in the European Union (EU) frame domestic violence as a component of gender inequality (Kantola 2006). A major difference between gender inequality in economic fields and domestic violence as a form of gender inequality nevertheless remains. The EU has no strong competence with respect to domestic violence (Kantola 2006; Kelly 2005; European Women's Lobby 2007, 5). Policy responses to domestic violence, while increasingly present in the last decade or so, remain restricted to soft law (Kantola 2006; Montoya 2008). In its soft law documents, the EC explicitly uses the standards set by the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), the Beijing Platform for Action, and Council of Europe documents, and encourages member states to do so as well. By contrast, policy responses to gender inequality in employment and related fields are formulated in hard legislation. Whereas a specific policy response to domestic violence is not a formal criterion for EU membership, since the late 1990s, responding to the issue has become part of the fundamental norms and beliefs that shape the collective identity of the European Union. In this framework, what impact did Europeanization have in bringing about policies against domestic violence? Is the problem of domestic violence a component in the major Europeanization exercise that took place in the last decade: the eastern enlargement?

Between 2003 and 2005, amid EU accession processes, Central and East European Countries (CEECs) witnessed major reforms in the realm of domestic violence policy, in which they moved from an absence of the issue of domestic violence from policy agendas to the adoption of laws and policies that specifically aim to end it. While these changes were the outcome of a complex process of interaction between state and non-state, national, international, and transnational actors (Krizsan and Popa 2007), the timing of reforms indicates that the influence of the EU cannot be disregarded. Europeanization has impacted the development of domestic violence policies, as demonstrated by the remarkable simultaneity of reforms in Central and East Europe during the EU accession process. This paper assesses the specific impact of Europeanization on domestic violence policy reform in five countries: two first-round accession countries (Hungary and Poland), two second-round accession countries (Bulgaria and Romania), and one candidate country (Croatia). This sample was chosen from a pool of ten new EU member states and three candidate countries where reforms to address domestic violence were passed around the same time. Our findings come from a larger joint research project that aims to explain outcomes in domestic violence policies by comparing actors and processes in the same five countries at the interface of Europeanization, women's movements action, and the diffusion of transnational human rights norms. In this context, the present paper focuses primarily on the impact of Europeanization, and not on United Nations (UN) processes, transnational activism, and the impact of non-governmental organization (NGO) mobilization.

The paper argues that contrary to gender equality policy in employment and related fields, where a rational model driven by "external incentives" (Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier 2005a) explains to a great extent the Europeanization process, in the field of domestic violence, Europeanization mechanisms follow different models. With respect to policies against domestic violence, although we can identify some external incentives for change, such as incidental elements of hard accession conditionality and EU's pressure for change through funding and capacity building, Europeanization during the eastern enlargement can better be explained by a logic of socialization and collective learning (Börzel and Risse 2003, 59). Through such mechanisms, Europeanization is stretched to the domain of domestic violence. Since domestic violence is a policy field in which EU standards are (still) soft, the constructivist aspects of Europeanization become especially visible. European norms are constructed through interactions between the European Commission (EC), civil society, and other policy stakeholders at the national level. In the absence of clearly articulated EU norms for action against domestic violence, Europeanization is mainly driven by the identification of national policy-making environments with an abstract norm of "Europeanness." The norm of "being European" is widely understood to include, beyond formal EU regulations, norms in members states and norms related to Council of Europe (COE) processes. As such, it also has come to include action against domestic violence. The desire to align with a perceived Europeanness contributes to policy change either because it directly motivates policy makers to act against domestic violence or because it is used strategically by NGOs to induce such action.

This paper has examined Europeanization mechanisms in a policy field that is not part of formal membership criteria of the EU enlargement, but nevertheless falls within the scope of what is seen as norms defining the collective identity of the European Union. In particular, actions to address domestic violence are seen as part of a wider commitment of the European Union to secure that women rights are observed and that women can thrive as equals in all Member States (Kantola 2006).

We found that Europeanization stretches to domains, in this case, domestic violence, that are not part of the hard criteria of EU accession. We have also described three different mechanisms that account for how Europeanization enables domestic change. First, EU conditionality is somewhat open for negotiation during accession processes. Apart from the core criteria contained in the *acquis communautaire*, the EC can also take a stance on softer criteria. In this paper, we have shown that the engagement of the EC with the issue of domestic violence as part of EU enlargement processes was up for negotiation in the different national environments. The Commission did put pressure on Poland and Romania to adopt domestic violence regulations, but not on Hungary and Bulgaria. This widening of the regular conditionality criteria happened where domestic violence could be linked to one of the core criteria.

The second mechanism for extending the domain of Europeanization to policy fields that are not part of the main accession criteria is the facilitation of social learning for change. Through Daphne, the EU supports transnational networking among organizations working to end domestic violence. Daphne is an example of a social learning mechanism operating on grounds of external incentives (funding), which has indirectly impacted the development of domestic violence policies and legislation in Central and East Europe.

The third mechanism that accounts for the stretching of EU requirements to include policy reforms in domains outside the main accession criteria is strategic discursive action by women's movements actors and their allies. In some countries activists used the idea of a shared and desired Europeanness as an advocacy tool in their efforts to pass a specific law on domestic violence. While the idea of Europe as a shared set of norms is present among civil society activists, as well as pro-reform decision makers, in all countries that we analyzed, we have seen significant differences with respect to whether and how this "discursive opportunity" is used as an advocacy tool. Activists' choice of whether or not to use this type of rhetorical action depended on the stage of accession that the country was in at the time when debates about regulations against domestic violence took place and on how advanced the local approach to domestic violence was as compared to EU norms.

All three analyzed mechanisms pointed in one way or another to processes of norm construction in the European accession process. First, in the case of regular reporting and monitoring, the conditionality criteria were constructed by the EC in conjunction with civil society voices from the country in different ways for the different countries, so that domestic violence norms had different place in the reports. Second, the Daphne mechanism can be seen as an open call for transnational action to develop substantive content behind the narrowly defined set of European norms for action against domestic violence. Finally, the analysis of discursive action has shown how civil society actors and their allies strategically construct and frame European norms to include the need for action against domestic violence, as well.

By exploring a domain of policy making outside the formal accession criteria, and thus outside the logic of hard conditionality, this paper pointed to several less explored ways in which “Europe matters.” We also showed that Europe has mattered differently across time. In particular, the influence of EU accession/Europeanization was strongest in CEECs as accession neared.

'Intersectionality: who's concern? Institutionalizing equality policy in new Central and Eastern European Members States of the EU' by Andrea Krizsan, Raluca Popa, Viola Zentai

The recent Europe-wide trend to move from equality policy and institutions focused on separate inequality grounds towards multi-ground equality policy approaches and related institutions was accompanied by hopes as to the potential of integrated approaches to give more attention to intersectionality. This paper analyzes the equality institutional setup in the ten new EU member states in CEE in order to understand to what extent these hopes are confirmed in their specific context. The paper starts from showing how in the framework of the EU accession process these countries used the multi-ground approach conveyed to them by the EU to shift their equality thinking away from a primarily ground-specific regulatory approach towards an individual complaints driven approach, and thus complementing or redrawing their institutional frameworks. Against this background, the paper argues, first, that the new institutions, with some exceptions, have failed to bring the expected benefits and largely missed to deal with intersectionality both at the statutory and the practical level. Intersectionality seems to occur rather from within established inequality grounds, particularly gender, and most often is brought to the agenda where there is a strong civil society or international involvement. But it is rarely discussed in merits in the multi-ground equality policy context and by the multi-ground equality institutions. These institutions facilitate parallel thinking about inequality grounds, but rarely address the meeting points between inequality grounds. Second, the paper also argues that where intersectionality reaches the agenda of policy thinking, it comes from within specific inequality grounds or, most often, from the specific structural issues faced by groups at points of intersection of different inequality grounds.

One of the most important changes that the last decade brought to equality policy in Europe, both at the level of the European Union and in many of its member states, is the steady move away from policy approaches that deal with the different inequality grounds separately towards approaches that attempt to address inequality grounds in integrated ways (Lombardo&Verloo 2008, Squires 2008, EC 2007). This has been especially manifest in institutional terms, where equality bodies dealing with multiple inequalities came to replace or to complement previously existent ground specific bodies. The shift from single to multiple ground approaches is accompanied on the one hand by hopes that an integrated approach would be able to cover more inequality grounds than the separate approach, and would level the varying scope of protection given to the different recognized inequality grounds. On the other hand, scholars and policy makers alike express expectations that an integrated equality policy and institutional approach would be more favorable to deal with multiple, intersecting inequalities and thus would better capture the complexity of inequalities and disadvantages (Fredman 2005, Squires 2008, EC 2007). While the recency of changes makes the validation of these expectations quite problematic, the limited evidence available (EC 2007) seems to show that despite the increasing number of equality bodies covering multiple inequality grounds, often in open ended lists, engagement with intersectional inequality remains marginal across Europe.

Europe-wide processes of institutionalization in the equality policy field have also spilled over to the new CEE member states of the EU; however, the context of Europeanization that took place in this region was somewhat different. In the 1990s, the majority of Central and Eastern European New Member States (CEECs) had fragmented, unenforceable equality policies that focused on a few inequality grounds, including in most places gender, sometimes ethnicity or, from the end of the 90s onwards, disability. These policies had some constitutional backing but largely remained weak or dead letters in the absence of related enforcement and implementation mechanisms. From the early 2000s, the EU accession processes coupled with increased NGO mobilization have generated a cascading of norms and the increasing institutionalization in the field of equality policy. This implied a rushed process, during which in just about 10 years CEECs moved from socialist women's policy that largely reinforced notions of women's 'difference' from men (Fodor 2004) to acknowledging complex transformative equality policy strategies, such as gender mainstreaming. Therefore, one may argue that these countries formally joined in European equality policy processes. But does this mean that they can by now respond to the most novel challenges that equality policies face across Europe and globally, such as intersectionality, or otherwise termed diversity (Kantola Outshoorn 2008, Squires 2008)?

The aim of this paper is to analyze what the Europe-wide policy shift described above means for equality institutions in the specific context of CEECs and what are the implications of this shift for the level of engagement of these institutions with intersectional inequality. Has the concept of intersectionality come along with equality policy changes? Have the newly established integrated equality bodies fulfilled the expectations attached to them in terms of intersectionality, or are they at least equipped to do so in the future?

The paper will proceed in two steps. First, it will analyze the nature of the institutional shift that Europeanization brought to countries of the region. Second, it will look at whether the new institutional setup proves favorable to engaging with intersectionality, and if not, what other policy actors come to play in placing the concept on the equality policy agenda, and within this context will consider occurring forms of framing intersectionality, thus reflecting on arguments about the inherent difficulties policies and laws have in engaging with intersectionality (Hannett 2003, Fredman 2005).

Engagement of equality institutional structures with intersectionality has not come a long way in CEECs. We have been able to identify isolated examples of institutionalizing intersectionality, such as the special panel on multiple discrimination of intersectional groups in the Council for Gender Equality in Hungary. The few good examples that come through are located at the crossroads of institutions and specific international influences or NGO voices, respectively.

These examples do not amount to a trend yet and at this point we are only able to formulate some hypotheses about how the institutionalization of intersectionality may move forward in the coming years. The research has identified NGOs and international influence as the main voices that in parallel to equality institutions or in partnership might prompt intersectional thinking about inequality grounds. Following from these findings those bodies that have a strong NGO component like council type consultative bodies, seem to be the best candidates for institutional sites that would advance intersectionality. The statutory complaint bodies that are mandated to address multiple discrimination would be in a stronger position to develop the concept and the practice of intersectionality, but the development of litigation on multiple discrimination seems to be meeting with the tendency of adjudication to reduce complexity and uniqueness to thinking that most easily fits given categories. Findings on cases dealt with by these bodies seem to confirm earlier findings on the tendency of adjudication practices to reduce multiple disadvantage to easy cases (EC 2007, Fredman 2005). The reluctance to open the Pandora's box of intersecting inequalities (Fredman 2005) is quite strong for the moment in most of these bodies. Lastly, women's policy machineries, as they developed in CEECs seem to be least equipped to integrate and develop intersectionality in their institutional frameworks.

'In the background of non-discrimination discourse: from the rights of same-sex partners to the rights of children. The use of the Europeanization frame in non-heterosexual intimacy policies in Europe' by Roman Kuhar

The project explores various dimensions of policy problems, using the Critical Frame Analysis approach (Verloo, 2005). Methodologically Critical Frame Analysis offers critical reflection over ways in which certain policy problems are defined and constructed and which solutions are proposed in the framing of the problems themselves in the specific political sites. For that reason the Quing project looks into four types of documents in four topics: general gender equality issues, domestic violence, non-employment and intimate citizenship. The four types of documents include laws, governmental reports or action plans, parliamentary debates and civil society texts. The analysis of policy problems takes a look at how the problem is defined (the diagnosis), what solutions are offered (the prognosis), where the problem and its solution are located (for example in the realms of polity, intimacy, economy etc.), who causes the problem (active actor, responsible actor) and who is affected by it (passive actor, target group), what is the cause of the problem (causality), which ways should be employed to solve the identified problems (mechanisms), what are the underlying norms of the text, whose voice is heard in framing the issue at stake, what references are used in the text etc. The coding of the texts selected for the critical frame analysis produced the so called "super-texts". These are coded versions of the original texts, including variety of different "markers". Through the combination of different markers (such as "active actor", "passive actor", "underlying norm", "location", "causality", etc.) the frame is constructed. The time span of the analysis is 1995-2007. The general rule was to include the latest documents possible.

In this paper an analysis of the frames, identified in one of the sub-issues within the intimate citizenship issue – that of sexual orientation discrimination and same-sex partnership – is presented. The paper has two sections: in the first part of the paper general overview of frames identified on the European level for the same-sex partnership policy debates are presented. The frames were further codified into “index values” for each frame, which represent the frequency of the occurrence of each frame in the policy texts analyzed combined with its strength (major, significant, minor, marginal etc. frames). The grouping of countries is conducted on the basis of mean index values of frames and through hierarchical cluster analysis. The second part of the paper focuses on one particular frame – the Europeanization frame – and attempts to present how and where this frame occurs in same-sex partnership related texts and what is the content of this frame.

Out of all the four issues analyzed in Quing project intimate citizenship issues proved to be the most de-gendered issue of all, particularly this holds true for same-sex partnership sub-issue. Even when gendered terms are used in policy texts – such as gays and lesbians – the terminology is often meant in a de-gendered way (gays and lesbians belonging to a unified group of same-sex oriented individuals). How is same-sex partnership sub-issue therefore related to gender equality, the key concept of the Quing project? In this particular sub-issue gender figures as a background “personal circumstance”, which emerges in intersection with sexuality. One of the core problems, addressed in same-sex partnership policy texts – the definition of who can get married or whose partnership can be legally recognized and rewarded as socially desirable and acceptable union – is not directly or primarily related to the issue of sexual orientation but rather to the issue of gender. The initial state of the problem is in the fact that legislation recognizes only two people of different genders to be legally allowed to get married. Although this is implicitly related also to one’s sexual orientation, is it the definition of gender (the opposition of genders) which lays at the core of the problem. Gender equality is understood here in intersection with sexuality (sexual orientation) – gender equality will be achieved – in legal terms – when matrimony legislation will become degendered. In other words: when gender will become a »non-issue«. De-gendering the matrimony union laws is therefore the way to gender+ equality.

Howell, differentiating between vertical and horizontal policy transfers, writes that horizontal policy transfer “may never include Europeanization”. It means that policies are not transferred through downloading process. However, when such transfer takes place from one country to another, “this fashion may become the norm throughout the EU and are consequently macro or micro up-loaded into the EU domain” (Howell, 2004:6). The critical frame analysis of policy documents in intimate citizenship issue shows that the latter is taking place in the context of same-sex partnership legislation. The policies, regulating these issues, are not downloaded from EU, as EU binding competences are very weak in this field. Rather such policies are transmitted from one country to another and backed up with “strategic detouring” of Europeanization frames in the sense that anti-discrimination requirements are used both for putting the issue of same-sex partnership on agenda and as a context in which most of the EU countries address it. Furthermore the downloading process, which refers to anti-discrimination directives, came in place also by the process of up-loading national standard to EU level (for example the “Nordic norms”).

While the vertical transmission is informed primarily through non-discrimination and human rights discourse, the horizontal transfer occurs in a context of role model countries (which corresponds with Olsen's concept of experiential learning), self-perceptions on how progressive one country is (country to country comparison, corresponding to Olsen's competitive selection), expectations for improvement of country's position during the accession process and similar.

The transmission, however, has specific "policy noises", which accommodate policies to national settings. These usually result in limited recognition of rights and duties for same-sex couples, already causing infringements of other EU values – such as the right to free movement. While it can be claimed that horizontal policy transfer has already affected EU policies in a fashion of a micro up-load (for example in anti-discrimination context), a strong macro up-load from countries such as Spain, the Netherlands, Belgium, Norway and Sweden is needed in the context of policies of non-heterosexual intimacy in Europe.

'Norms and silences in gender equality policies: an analysis of policy debates on domestic services in Spain and Sweden' by Elin Kvist and Elin Peterson

The aim of this article is to compare ways of framing 'paid domestic work' in policy debates in Sweden and Spain, aspiring to reveal normative assumptions and silences surrounding gender (in)equality. The comparison between Swedish and Spanish policy debates on paid domestic work serves to shed light on some problems embedded in the theorization of gender and welfare states as well as in gender equality policies. The analysis situates the debates on paid domestic work in relation to feminist welfare state studies and compares the articulation of paid domestic work within two very different welfare state models. The comparison is helpful, on the one hand, in pointing at hegemonic gender discourses that reinforce certain privileges at the expense of 'other' women and, on the other hand, in indicating what is not getting problematized in each context. We aspire to contest uniform notions of "women" and "gender". Through applying a comparative frame analysis and an intersectional perspective on state policies on domestic services, it is possible to visualize the gender, class and race privileges that these policies reinforce. Within this vein, we also intend to contextualize and problematize some normative assumptions on gender often embedded in feminist welfare state studies.

The article will first briefly examine how feminists have framed domestic work as an issue of gender inequality. Secondly, we situate the analysis of domestic service within feminist welfare state studies, arguing that the analysis of state discourses surrounding domestic service can help us to reveal some of the challenges of gender and welfare state studies in a globalized world by means of an examination of the way certain groups are privileged and/or excluded. Thirdly, we present the methodological approach adopted in this article, a comparative policy frame analysis paying attention to 'intersectionality'. Then we present the frames found surrounding the issue of domestic service in each of the two case studies. Finally we discuss and compare the frames in the two case studies in terms of normative assumptions and silences.

To conclude, we will address especially the dimensions of normative assumptions and silences, gender and intersectionality. When it comes to normative assumptions, in both Sweden and Spain the debates operated within the premise of women's labor market participation as the key to gender equality. Consequently, gender inequality was strongly linked to the problem of 'reconciliation of work and family life'. Women's place was then considered to be in the labor market. The policy debates tended to enhance the 'dual earner family' as norm, emphasizing that today both men and women work outside of home. In this sense, the policy debates indicated a shift away from the norm of the 'male breadwinner model' in the Spanish case. The main vision of gender equality was thus a liberal vision of inclusion; women should participate in the labor market in the same way as men do. When women's subordinate role in paid labor markets appeared it was most often seen as due to women's primary role in unpaid care and domestic work. Hence the shift of decreasing unpaid work in the home and to increase paid work in the formal labor market was considered a good thing, both in terms of economic rationality and in terms of gender equality.

The context of the Swedish and Spanish welfare state is important in order to understand the policy debates. In Sweden the controversy that the suggestion of a tax deduction on domestic services raised could be interpreted in relation to the changes within the welfare sector. Sweden has had a tradition of extended public care provision, but since the recession in the 1990s the public care sector has declined and more care responsibilities have been redirected toward private households (Szebehely 2005). For many left wing debaters the expansion of a private domestic service sector and other private care providers is viewed as an acceptance of these welfare transitions and the dismantling of the Swedish welfare model. The refusal to accept private care solutions had interesting consequences in terms of the debate on workers' rights. Left wing voices pay little or no attention to the already existing often female workers performing low paid mostly unregulated domestic work in "the world's most gender equal country". In this particular policy debate an ideologically interesting situation is created where the right wing debater's emphasizes the importance of domestic workers to be included in the labor laws, and the left wing debaters ignoring the rights of those already working in

this area. The norm behind this view is that this kind of work should not exist. On the other hand, the left wing debaters claim that the social problems of an increasing unregulated labor market in Sweden will not be solved through tax deduction on domestic services. In Spain, the welfare state has been extended and developed in some issues during the last decade; for instance in the issues of elderly care and maternity and paternity leaves. However, 'private' and individual solutions for care and domestic work remained generally unquestioned, in a sense reinforcing the legitimacy of limited social policies. For both left and right wing parties, domestic (care) service was taken for granted work sector and source of welfare. Recognizing Spanish families' right to have access to (cheap female migrant) domestic workers can be seen as justifying limited state responsibility in care for children and elderly. Nevertheless, left wing voices raised the issue of class inequalities, in the sense of 'not all women can afford domestic services', in their call for more resources to invest in the welfare state and especially in public childcare. Additionally, the Left party and some nationalist parties underline the importance of improved workers' rights.

There are clearly different views on how, and to what extent, domestic service is linked to gender (in)equality. In Sweden, the right wing parties argued that domestic service increase women's equality since women are then able to participate in the labor market in an equal foot with men. The Left wing parties argued that domestic service decreases women's equality due to precarious work in domestic service sector. In Spain, there was less controversy over this issue; the general argument was that domestic service is necessary to make family and work life feasible, since women are increasingly participating in the formal labor market. And since the general idea, promoted by both Socialists and Conservatives, was that women's labor market participation increases gender equality it can be argued that the dominating vision was that domestic service contributes to gender equality, both in terms of helping women reconcile the different spheres of life and by providing job opportunities for women in the particular sector of domestic work. Critical voices from the Left Party questioned this view, emphasizing that the precarious working conditions effects especially migrant women.

The frame analysis attributes importance to the silences in the agenda. The above presented normative assumptions can be examined in terms of what they do not problematize. As Carol Bacchi (1999) argues, the association of paid work with success and emancipation can be seen as overshadowing problems of precarious working conditions among women workers as well as devaluing unpaid domestic and care work. In the case of Spain, the dominant policy frames on economic rationality and reconciliation of work and family life take the working mother/parent combining care and formal employment as a norm in a way that overshadows the way the system, due to lack of public services, often rely on precarious paid work of (mainly female migrant) domestic workers. These categories are not included in the vision of gender equality. Domestic service was generally not debates as a policy problem but as a solution to families care and domestic work responsibilities. The perpetuation of the sexual division of labor, along divisions of class, race and nationality, by transferring care and domestic work from one woman to another was not at all questioned, as was the case in Swedish debates. Within the controversial debate on domestic services in Sweden a deafening silence appeared. While the right wing debaters consequently ignored gender, class and race relations involvement in paid domestic work. They claimed similar to the Spanish policy debate that women's labor market participation is the key to gender equality, for both women as buyers and as sellers of domestic services. The left wing debaters on the other hand recognized the asymmetric power relations involved in paid domestic work in the homes, and calls on gender, class, education and marital status as to be considered when introducing a tax deduction on domestic services. As mentioned above, and in contrast to Spain, there was a striking silence among left wing voices about how to improve the work conditions for those already working unregulated within the domestic service sector in Swedish homes. The silences obscure the work conditions of those working within domestic services. Workers that are covering up for the shortcomings of the welfare state, the dismantling of which is thereby rendered less inconvenient for white men and women of the privileged classes.

'Domestic services or maid? Discourses on gender equality, work and integration in Nordic policy debate' by Elin Kvist, Maria Carbin and Hannele Harjunen

In contrast with the Nordic welfare state ideology the three Nordic countries Sweden, Finland and Denmark have introduced a tax reform that provides private households tax credit on domestic work. The aim of this article is to study how this political reform was legitimized and criticized in respective country. To what problem is a tax credit for domestic work seen as a solution? How the problem is represented in these Nordic policy debates? What social categories are articulated? What is under discussion and how is consensus constructed? In this paper a post structuralist policy analysis in combination with an intersectional power analysis are used to understand how social categories are articulated in policy debates. The ambition is to contrast the policy processes between the countries and deconstruct what is taken for granted in each policy debate.

In the beginning of the 1990s a proposal to a reform on tax credit on domestic services for private households was introduced in Sweden. It raised an enormous controversy and a debate on domestic work erupted that would surge for more than a decade. The debate that engaged among others parliament members, trade union representatives, employer representatives came to divide feminists into different stands. The debate became referred to as the "Maid debate" and was highly morally and ideologically charged (Platzer, 2007). It took more than 15 years before the proposal passed the Swedish parliament. During the same time similar proposals were put forward in Denmark and Finland. When the Swedish suggestion caused uproar, the same suggestion in Finland and Denmark met relatively little resistance and passed smoothly in respective parliaments. Especially in Finland there were no critical voices to be heard. Another intriguing difference between the three countries is that the initiatives came from different ideological positions; in Sweden the proposal was put forward by the liberal conservative party, whereas in Denmark and Finland the initiative came from Social democratic parties.

Through analyzing particularly the Swedish debate and contrast it with the policy debates in Finland and Denmark, we aim to understand how such similar reforms could cause such different reactions in the three Nordic countries. This analysis is particularly interesting as the Nordic countries often are described as similar and with similar welfare models (Bergqvist et al., 1999; Esping-Andersen, 1990). In this article the ambition is to use a post structuralist policy analysis in order to challenge what is taken for granted and to reveal silences in each policy debate. What kind of problem representations around domestic services is it possible to discern in these Nordic policies? What social categories are articulated? What is under discussion and how is consensus constructed within this specific political debate? What inclusions and exclusions can be found in each country?

The introduction of a tax credit on domestic services could be seen as a contrast to the Nordic welfare ideology. An ideology based on the idea that women and men are entitled to be both carers and earners. Thus, policies are structured to enable women to become workers and men to become caregivers. There is also a strong state involvement in the care of children, the sick, elderly and disabled through provisions of services and payment to carers (Sainsbury, 2000).

When approaching the policy process on tax credits on domestic services within the chosen countries we were intrigued by that a debate on a policy reform could differ so much between the countries. In Sweden it was clearly articulated as a gender equality question, but in Finland and Denmark gender equality was not mentioned. To be able to understand the complexities of the power relations that are involved in the articulations around domestic services we use the concept of intersectionality. A notion that sprung out of the need to take a more complex approach to the experience of women, as a way of 'decentering' the 'normative subject' of feminism (Brah & Phoenix, 2004). Crenshaw coined the concept of intersectionality in a classical article claiming an inclusionary approach was needed to capture the multiple dimensions of Black women's experiences (Crenshaw, 1991). In this article intersectionality is viewed as a way of understanding the variety of structured divisions that constitutes the everyday life and its power relations (Phoenix & Pattynama, 2006). From this point of view race, class and gender are looked upon as mutually constitutive, interrelated and multifaceted (Williams, 1995). People are considered to be more than the sum of their class, race and gender, which denotes that there can be no race without gender and no gender without race (Carbin & Tornhill, 2004). When understanding the social relations that emerge from societies structured divisions we believe that they ought to be contextualized due to changes over time, in relations to each other and within given situations and contexts. Essential to the understanding of these structured divisions are that they are mutually constructing one another (Collins, 2000).

Similar tax reforms were suggested and debated in the three Nordic countries, Sweden, Finland and Denmark in approximately the same time. All three countries were in a major recession and unemployment figures were high. The initiative of the reform sprung out of the need to create new jobs within a new employment sector, domestic work performed within the homes and paid by the household. The reforms were similar but the articulation of the social problem the reform was supposed to solve differed between the countries. In Finland it was solely argued as a reform that would create work opportunities. Gender, class or race was never articulated as a part of the social problem that the reform was aiming to solve. In Denmark proponents of the reform articulated it as a question about reconciliation of work and family but without gender and as a way of protecting work opportunities for immigrants and low educated. The Danish liberal party argued for the credit in the reform from a class perspective, arguing that high income earners could pay themselves for domestic services they were not in need of tax credits. In Denmark class and ethnicity is articulated but not gender. In Sweden a major argument for the reform was that it would create new jobs, but the issue that came to dominate the policy debate surrounding the reform was how the reform would affect gender equality. The proponents of the debate argued that this tax reform would reduce women's double burden of unpaid domestic work and paid work, enabling them to perform more paid work. The opponents of the suggestion claim that instead of using tax money on domestic services, men should be encouraged to take their part of responsibility of the household chores instead. Another argument against the tax reform was workers rights. The work that would be created within the sector of domestic services would be low paid, with few career and skill development opportunities. The opponents also claim that the reform mainly meets the needs of the privileged classes on behalf of the working classes. The articulation of the reforms unequal consequences were multifaceted and brought to the agenda different inequalities mutually constitutive, such as class, gender and education.

To conclude there is contesting Nordic articulations of the domestic service tax reform. In this article we can conclude that it is not only the reform in itself that creates the debate, it is how the meaning of the reform is negotiated that is decisive on how the reform will be interpreted and articulated within the different countries. The representations of the problem are always positioned within its specific context and in relations to dominating interpretations on society and hegemonic understandings of which questions are most important. The policy debates on the tax reform on domestic services could be seen as a clear illustration of this, where job creation, integration and gender equality could be seen as hegemonic understanding that filters all policy debates within respective country.

'Identifying gender transformation in welfare state policies: an analysis of leave regulations and framing in EU member states and the EU' by Sophie Lauwers

Feminists for long have argued that gender is as crucial a social stratification principle in our society as class and that gender can therefore not be neglected in research on the welfare state and its social policies. A sizeable feminist scholarship that sheds light on the gendered dimension of welfare states – a dimension that has all too often been largely ignored in mainstream literature on this subject - has developed (for example Ostner and Lewis 1995). Mainstream work - one of the most cited works being Esping Andersen's 'Three worlds of welfare capitalism' (1990) – tends to regard the settlement between capital and labour as key to the modern welfare state. Class is regarded the main source of stratification in late capitalist societies. The way in which and the extent to which labour is 'decommodified' is regarded as a central characteristic on the basis of which social welfare regimes are to be classified. Feminist scholars have shown that a second key settlement underlies welfare states, that is, a settlement between men and women. Every welfare system has built in assumptions about the family, about gender relations within the family and about the division of paid and unpaid work between men and women (Lewis 2006). The welfare state's functioning in part depends on social reality matching these assumptions. (Assumed) gender relations thus profoundly shape the character and the functioning of welfare states. But this also works the other way around; the specific constellation of social provisions in a welfare state affects and helps shape gender relations and as such can reproduce or counteract existing gender inequalities. Feminist scholarship on the welfare state tried either to 'gender' existing welfare state typologies/theories by adding a gender dimension to it or to create a totally alternative way of theorizing the welfare state (resulting in other typologies) by taking the role of gender relations and the division of labour and care as central departure points (social policy making relates to the dominant gender regime). A central factor that according to feminist scholars perpetuates gender inequality is the unequal gender division of labour: "ultimately women's emancipation demands the dissolution of that division of labour – a utopian dream if ever there was one" (Orloff 2008, 1-2).

EU (legal) competences are limited in the field of welfare/social policies; the member states are the main responsible actors to decide on matters of social welfare. Still, it can be argued that during the EU's existence and as a result of tensions emanating from its economic aims and policies a distinctive, although partial and fragmented European Union welfare dimension has developed (De Burca 2005). In some areas EU law has been adopted, like the (gender) equal treatment Directives and the Directives on parental leave and part-time work, while in other areas a 'European social model' has developed through the use of soft law mechanisms like the Open Method of Coordination. Illustrative in this respect are the European Employment Strategy (EES) and the Lisbon Strategy that contain a social pillar. So, while national member states may still be central actors in explaining national welfare arrangements and the development of European social policy, the European Union's welfare dimension may in turn also exert influence upon the development of national social policies. As Bleijenbergh states; while some feminist researchers have argued that it are the member states' dominant gender regimes and accompanying welfare traditions that will decide in which direction European social policies will move, others have argued that a European social policy can develop that differs from the gender regimes of the national member states and that can as such impact upon gender relations and regimes at the national level (Bleijenbergh 2004).

This paper aims to typify and compare from a gendered perspective welfare state policies of all the 27 EU member states and of the EU itself. Instead of grouping the countries into mainstream welfare state typologies to which a gender dimension has been added (for example into Social Democrat, Liberal, Corporatist and possibly Southern European models), this paper will try to group the EU27 states according to four gender regime ideal types. The ideal types are: the 'dual breadwinner model', the 'equal valuation model', the 'equal sharing model', and the 'male breadwinner model'. While the first three models are all based on another vision of what is gender equality (Fraser 1997) – each of them corresponding as well to one of Squires categories of 'inclusion', 'reversal' and 'displacement' (Squires 2005, 2007) - the male breadwinner model is a gender regime based on a vision of gender inequality. Ideal types are mental constructs that help us to draw out meaning from the infinitely complex reality through the presentation of logical extremes (Heywood 1997, 18). Ideal types are therefore not approximations of reality. Generally spoken, they will hardly be found in pure form in reality.

So, when the paper clusters the EU27 and the EU according to the ideal types, it tries to decide on the basis of their actual welfare provisions which ideal type they approximate most. The clustering is meant to help in: 1) sketching patterns of similarities and differences in gender welfare regimes across all the EU member states and the EU (Is there an East-West split in the clustering? Does the clustering correspond with mainstream welfare state typologies? How does the clustering relate to the Lisbon goal of reaching 60% female labour participation by 2010?); 2) positioning the EU within these patterns (Which of the ideal types is most approximate to the European Union welfare dimension? Do we see any convergence towards the 'EU welfare state model?'); 3) analysing the extent to which the traditional gendered division of labour is challenged or transformed in the EU27 (are fathers/men being incentivized to take part in care work?). An additional question that should be kept in mind and consciously be reflected upon is whether western feminist theorizing about the welfare state is in fact the appropriate theoretical framework for making a meaningful comparison between the gender regimes that underlie the Westerns and Central and Eastern European welfare states. The three gender regime ideal types that are distinguished by Fraser may be useful as an analytical starting point, but we have to ask whether adaptations to (mostly western) feminist theorizing on the welfare state are needed in order to make the theory applicable to West and East alike.

For each of the four above mentioned ideal types the paper describes how the leave regulation would look like if the ideal type would exist in its pure form. Subsequently, the description will be modified according to the existing EU minimum standards. This already provides us with a first idea of where the EU should be positioned. Afterwards, the leave regulations of each EU27 member states and the EU will be surveyed, compared with the ideal type description of leave regulations, and then categorized. Thinking about leave regulations in this ideal-typical sense contributes towards a more refined and pointed normative idea about the relation between leave policies and gender equality. Designing leave policies that promote greater gender equality is not simply a question of making these policies more generous. It depends on the policy particulars whether leave policies promote further gender equality. Policy particulars that receive attention in the paper are, next to the duration and payment of the leave, whether the leave entitlements are an individual or family based entitlement, whether these entitlements are transferable between the parents or not, whether there is the obligation to take up leave (for mother or for father or for both), and whether any extra measures are taken to promote the involvement of fathers in care.

So a first step will be to map the strict content of leave regulations as laid down in the laws of the EU member states and the EU. Next to this it is relevant to also map the broader arguments/reasoning that surround the statutory leave regulations in the member states to get a better view of what the state/policy makers exactly intended with these regulations (we might call this the 'discursive embeddedness' of the leave regulations). This provides valuable additional insight that can tell us something about in the direction of which model countries are moving or from which they came. Also, it enables us to determine whether (flagrant) inconsistencies are visible between what policymakers want and the regulations we find in the legal statutes. The relations between leave regulations and gender equality is quite a complex one and analyzing policy plans can give more information about the reasoning that lies at the basis of the leave regulations as they eventually end up in law. To make such a thing feasible this paper will look at the so-called 'policy frames' that were identified in governmental policy plans that were analysed on the issue of 'non-employment' for each member state and for the EU in the framework of the QUING project. The issue of 'non-employment' is about which groups of women and men are regarded as legitimately being non-employment and when. Nonemployment for men and women is constituted by constraints and pressures for participation in care work, and by differential access to the welfare services that make combining work and family life possible (QUING issue description of non-employment, 2007). Investigating which policy frames on gender (in)equality are dominant in governmental policy texts on nonemployment will provide extra ground for typifying the EU27 welfare states and the EU from a gendered perspective. This may provide us with important insights regarding the practical effects of gender welfare regimes.

'Accommodating multiple discrimination equality bodies in Belgium and the Netherlands analyzed from an intersectional gender perspective' by Sophie Lauwers and Saskia Martens

Recently, the term 'intersectionality' has become a promising buzzword in the academic world (Davis 2008). The popular concept has brought about numerous theoretical discussions (see for example Davis 2008; Hancock 2007; McCall 2005). Shifting the attention to the political practice, the past decade witnessed a broadening of the European Union's equality policies and legislation from covering no longer only gender to also include age, race/ethnicity, belief/religion, sexual orientation and disability, where these grounds have generally been treated as separate, non-intersecting strands. This has given rise to debates about what this new focus on multiple inequalities will mean for gender. Gender equality advocates have expressed worries that gender might 'lose out' on the other inequality grounds resulting in a loss of visibility and resources, and leading to 'competitive' reflexes in debates on the future of equality policies

The EU-shift towards a multiple inequalities framework has also led to discussions about whether addressing multiple inequalities is best done by single or separate equality institutions (Walby, Armstrong and Strid 2009). One common policy practice in promoting gender equality is the establishment of so-called 'equality bodies'. Here, we particularly have in mind national institutions that are in charge of monitoring and promoting the equal treatment of all persons in line with national anti-discrimination legislation regarding the inequality strand(s) that fall under the body's jurisdiction (this can be a single strand but also multiple strands). Equality bodies are part of the larger equality machinery of a country, which usually also includes policy units in central government, consultation bodies, legislation and legal machinery (courts and tribunals) (Walby, Armstrong and Strid 2009). Equality bodies as a rule are easily accessible as one of their tasks is to assist victims of discrimination. Often, victims first bring their discrimination complaint before these bodies and might – if still needed – only later decide to start court procedures.

The European Commission currently stimulates the member states to merge equality bodies that focus on single inequality strands into one integrated institute that covers multiple inequality strands. This has again triggered critical reactions from feminists about the danger of gender losing out, since one can doubt whether such a body in fact is more advantageous seen from a gender perspective than a single gender equality body. For one thing, it is generally accepted among feminists that women cannot be regarded as a homogeneous group. Being a woman is just one aspect of one's life. The way in which women experience their lives and are confronted with discrimination differs according to a range of facets that make up their identity. This does not only include their gender, but also their race, class, sexual orientation, age, religious beliefs and so forth (Dasvarma and Loh 2002). Ideally, equality bodies (whether integrated or single strand) should thus be able to address the complexity of gender intersecting with multiple inequalities. An intersectional dimension should be integrated in the gender perspective. In this way a more encompassing notion of gender equality is followed. This would improve the protection against discrimination of different groups of women including the ones who find themselves on the crossroads of multiple inequalities. Yet, how this is best done is not a straightforward question to answer. While at first glance a single integrated equality body indeed would seem better apt to deal with the overlap between (gender and) multiple inequalities than separate bodies, the institutional design is not the only factor that decides whether gender will fare well or not. This depends on the interplay with other factors, a very important one being the kind of anti-discrimination legislation that the body has to monitor.

In this paper we want to make a contribution to the discussions about the advantages and disadvantages that integrated or single strand equality bodies bring from an intersectional gender perspective. Notwithstanding the fears about gender coming off worst, we depart from the idea that intersectionality is essential for achieving gender equality. The paper takes a closer look at the equality bodies of two countries that know contrasting institutional set-ups as well as divergent legal settings: Belgium and The Netherlands. The basic assumption from which we depart is that consistency between anti-discrimination legislation and equality body – both being integrated – is desirable for dealing with the interplay between gender and multiple inequalities. However, as neither of the two countries have both, they pose challenging cases; to what extent these factors are defining in these ‘mixed’ cases? Looking at other factors in addition to institutional set-up and legal arrangements – like the functions and powers of the bodies, their independence, their broader visions as regards multiple discrimination, their internal organization, and their practical working procedures – might prove particularly useful here.

Irrespective of the differences in institutional set-up and legal context between the Dutch and Belgian equality bodies, these last years the necessity of an intersectional approach in dealing with discrimination complaints surfaces in both countries. The term ‘intersectionality’ is actually used by all three equality bodies: in the 2007 year report the Centre mentions that progress in the battle against discrimination is only possible when an intersectional approach is applied (Centre 2008, 153). Yet at the same time, the Centre keeps on speaking about the ‘double discrimination’ of migrant women. Here it seems that ethnicity and descent are piled on top of gender or vice versa, rather than that interaction between the discrimination grounds is at stake. Currently, the future of an intersectional approach is discussed in an advisory committee, comprising (among others) staff members of the Centre and the Institute. Conversely, intersectionality clearly plays a role in opinion no. 2006-256 of the Equal Treatment Commission. Whereas Belgium shows a first awareness on intersectionality, it is not applied in the practicalities of the complaint procedure yet. The Dutch Commission on the other hand puts its intersectional awareness in practice – even though this rather is an exception to the rule; the ‘standard’ complaint procedure provides little room for recognizing intersectional discrimination in the complaint procedure.

We wondered which setting – the Belgian or the Dutch – resonates best with an intersectional way of dealing with multiple discrimination complaints, where gender is one of the strands involved, by the equality body/bodies? A basic assumption from which we originally departed was that the combination of an integrated equality body and unified legislation provides favourable circumstances for dealing with gender inequality overlapping with other inequalities. Conversely, the combination of separate equality bodies and fragmented legislation is regarded sub-optimal for this end. In general, scholars like Bell, Hannett, Satterthwaite, and O’Cinneide seem to agree that a single equality body combined with unified anti-discrimination legislation is encouraging for an effective cross-strand approach. Still, each in their own way, indicates that the presence of one or both of these factors is neither absolutely necessary nor sufficient, since they are part of a more complex and broader set of aspects that work together in determining any practical outcomes. So, we also need to look beyond these factors and this is especially so in the Belgian and Dutch (mixed) cases, where only one of these advantageous circumstances is present. Whether the disadvantageous circumstances – separate equality bodies in case of Belgium and fragmented legislation in case of the Netherlands – are surmountable will probably depend on other factors, such as agency. Agency by the equality bodies to creatively and flexibly interpret anti-discrimination legislation that is compartmentalized and does not offer explicit protection from intersectional discriminations, and to change the dominant conceptualization of multiple discrimination that fits closely with the prevailing ideology of formal equality that underlies most equal treatment law are underlined respectively by Satterthwaite and Hannett.

We showed that a compartmentalized way of thinking about multiple (in)equalities that is regarded to be prevailing according to Satterthwaite and Hannett, is clearly visible in how the equality bodies deal with complaints where several inequality strands are involved in both the Dutch and the Belgian case. But it applies even stronger to the Belgian case. Moreover, this section reveals that the Belgian equality bodies are hindered by their institutional split. The division in an Institute for gender and a Centre for ‘the other discrimination grounds’, does not incentivize to treat complaints on gender and another inequality ground together – neither additively nor intersectionally. An intersectional discrimination complaint can be filed with both equality bodies, but the case is subsequently being divided in separate parts. In the Dutch case, the fragmented equal treatment legislation which provides uneven legal protection between the grounds complicates an intersectional approach by the Commission.

But the case descriptions also tell that the Dutch Commission as well as the Belgian Centre and Institute, each in their own way, have begun to push for changes based on the vision that if they are to perform their jobs well intersectional dimensions of discrimination cannot be neglected. However, the Dutch case displays a stronger vision and intention towards adding an intersectional dimension than the Belgian case. The Dutch Commission changed its internal organization from strand specific to functional divisions in reaction to the high number of multiple strands complaints that they received, it is open to deviate from its 'standard' procedure of treating the strands separately in handling multiple discrimination complaints (although this is still highly exceptional), it has put pressure on the Dutch government to adapt the proposal for a future Integration Law in such a way as to enable a more effective intersectional vision, and in several of its official publications it expresses that it is aware of the existence of intersectional discrimination. The description of the Belgian case shows that the push for change towards a more intersectional approach – until now – has mainly been limited to the rhetorical level. The Belgian bodies communicate in their official publications that paying attention to intersectionality is needed and that a stronger cooperation between the bodies is important in this respect. But if they cooperate, this happens on a rather ad-hoc basis, because there are no established working methods, tools or instruments to efficiently and consistently deal with intersectional gender complaints. Until now, the most concrete thing that has been initiated is installing an advisory Commission on intersectionality. While this sounds promising, it is too early to tell whether this will give cause to any acting instead of mere talking.

Can we then conclude that it is easier to apply intersectionality – even though there are factors that clearly work against it – when there is only one actor acting, like in the Dutch case? Yes and no. The institutional split in the Belgium might have withheld the bodies from effectively combining their forces. This limits their agency in working towards change with regard to intersectional discrimination. But this is not the whole story. It also comes down to the (lack of) will to seek after change. The fact that even within the Centre keeping official statistics on complaints that are based on multiple grounds has not come off, is illustrative. Such a complaint would be filed within the statistics under the inequality – either disability or ethnicity – that is most prominent.

Although opinion 2006-256 is rather the exception that confirms the rule, it still shows that the Commission has taken some first practical steps in the direction of a conceptual change in thinking about multiple discrimination. Furthermore, the fact that the Commission thinks about relaxing the requirement to select a comparator, might indicate a (future) shift in attention from formal to substantive equality. In Belgium, on the other hand, the theoretic notice that intersectionality is relevant in tackling discrimination has not yet been translated into the everyday practice of complaint procedures.

While some improvements towards the application of an intersectional approach by the equality bodies are visible in both countries – although to a more limited degree in Belgium – for the time being women with intersectional discrimination complaints still face difficulties in Belgium and the Netherlands to find protection. Everyday practice in the neighbouring countries' equality bodies shows that a new manner of looking at and handling discrimination is needed: discrimination in our society is complex and needs more flexible solutions than those that are currently being used. Widening the outlook from a gender perspective to an intersectional gender perspective is a step in the right direction.

'The political treatment of inequalities in Europe: a comparative analysis of Italy, Portugal and Spain' by Emanuela Lombardo and María Bustelo

In this paper we analyse the political treatment of inequality in a selection of South European countries. We firstly aim at studying comparatively the varying ways in which multiple inequalities have been institutionally treated in Italy, Portugal and Spain as a response to the European Union equality policies. Secondly, we wish to typify the political approaches to inequality we have found by translating our empirical data on the institutionalisation of inequality into categories that might summarise the variety of ways in which inequalities are politically treated in the selected contexts. Thirdly, we wish to discuss some of the factors that can help us understand the particular institutionalisation of inequalities that we find in our sample. We believe that the comparison of the institutionalisation of multiple inequalities in Southern Europe will not only inform us on processes of Europeanisation of South European member states with regard to equality, but also help theory progress in the understanding of the political treatment of inequality.

Intersectionality perspectives have flourished in recent theoretical and empirical social studies, while the implementation of intersectional approaches in existing policy practice seems rather embryonic. Yet, paradoxically, policy reality on multiple inequalities might be overtaking theoretical concepts devised to grasp it, particularly when we as researchers attribute a higher normative value to the institutionalisation of intersectionality, neglecting the variety of political treatments of multiple inequalities. If political intersectionality is an 'open empirical question' (Hancock 2007) that is articulated in different ways depending on the specific context considered, then each context will provide a specific configuration not only of intersectional, but also of additive and multiplicative policy practices (Weldon 2008). It seems thus important to give attention to all treatments of inequality, rather than only to the intersectional ones, by exploring the different types of multiple approaches that empirical reality offers, and by being more reflexive about our normative bias in favour of or against one particular approach.

Our analysis of the political treatment of inequalities includes Italy, Portugal and Spain. These cases, which are all part of a research carried out in the QUING European project on which this paper is based, have been selected for comparative analysis due to a similar system design. That is, Southern European countries share a number of similarities which are due to socio-cultural factors such as a common catholic culture, a tendency to familism (central role of the family as provider of social protection, see Saraceno 1994; Tobío 2005), a strong patriarchal culture (González, Jurado and Naldini, 2000). As EU member states, the three countries are all subject to the homogenising influence of the European Union norm-setter. Nonetheless, the institutionalisation of inequalities in the three cases has been different (though similar in some aspects too). A variety of institutional, political, and socio-cultural factors, which a comparative analysis helps to highlight thanks to the possibility of contrasting the findings, have contributed to produce the particular configuration of political approaches to the treatment of inequalities that we find in the selected South European countries.

In the paper we wish to address a number of questions such as the following: How have inequalities been institutionalised through legislation and bodies in the selected South European countries? What has been the influence of the European Union in this institutionalisation process? What evidence there is of legislated and implemented intersectionality? To what extent is intersectionality an accidental or embedded approach? What evidence there is of multiple overlapping inequalities (through alliances and coalitions) or competition among inequalities in our South European countries? We believe that the comparison of the institutionalisation of multiple inequalities in Southern Europe will not only inform us on processes of Europeanisation of South European member states with regard to equality, but also help theory progress in the understanding of the political treatment of inequality. The comparative analysis of the institutionalisation of equality in Italy, Portugal and Spain conducted in this paper has helped us to better understand the type of political approach to the treatment of (gender, race and sexual orientation) inequalities that characterises the three cases. In these conclusions we will discuss some of the institutional, political, cultural and social factors that may help to explain the political approach developed in each case and the differences and similarities found.

The Italian political approach to inequality is a unitary shifting to multiple inequalities one, where inequalities are treated as separate and there is no integrated and coordinated policy approach to organize institutional action on multiple inequalities, despite the fact that equality bodies on gender, race, and, only formally, sexual orientation are placed under the same Ministry for Rights and EO. Gender is the stronger among the other institutionalised inequalities but in the context of a rather weak equality machinery whose implementation capacities are rather limited and which is particularly vulnerable to government changes, a factor that has greatly affected continuity and consistency of equality policy, considered the highly unstable Italian political system. The low state of democracy under the Berlusconi governments can also help to understand the comparatively higher problematic state of the political treatment of inequality in Italy. This limited democracy is testified, among other things, by the monopoly of ideological, economic and political powers into the hands of the cabinet president, the de facto increase in executive powers through the routinised use of legislation by decrees which progressively disempowers the Parliament, a personalistic political style that appears in the approval of laws ad personam, and the limitation of free speech and concentration of media ownership (90% of broadcasting media privately owned by the prime minister) that has moved Italy in 2009 into the 'Partly Free category' of Freedom House rankings.

The Portuguese political approach to the treatment of inequalities is also a unitary shifting to multiple inequalities one, but with different features from the Italian case. Though there are separate bodies for each inequality, Portugal is developing a coordinated approach through the establishment of different coordinating structures to implement policy plans. This might favour the development of both multiple and intersectional ways of dealing with inequalities. Institutionally, Portugal seems to have a tendency to continuity and adaptation rather than rupture. Despite the great number of governments from the beginning of democracy, an aspect of similarity with Italy, Portuguese political polarization is lower and (equality) institutions more stable than the Italian. Equality policies during their more than thirty years of life had little institutional changes, with agencies always located in presidency (with small exceptions). This can explain the fact that rather than creating a new body for addressing sexual orientation, in 2007 they included it within the CIG. It also tells something about the possibility of consolidating equality policies in Portugal, given the institutional stability of equality agencies.

The Spanish political approach is also a unitary shifting to multiple inequalities one. The main feature of the Spanish context compared with the other two is that gender has had a clear hegemonic position in the Spanish institutional framework so far. This could explain existing resistances to a treatment of multiple inequalities and a certain slow development of other inequalities (except, perhaps, for disability). Race is not so developed, but is recently acquiring more institutional relevance. This is mostly due to the phenomenon of immigration that has increased from the 90s as in Italy, though the political response given to race inequalities seems slower than reality would require. Sexual orientation has received some legislative attention but no bodies were created. Yet Spain, unlike the other two Southern countries, has given greater legislative protection to sexual minorities, exemplified by the law on same-sex marriage. This difference could be related to the fact that the socialist Zapatero government in Spain opened a political window of opportunity for LGBT movement to put the issue on the agenda, but also to the fact that familism and the political role of the catholic church are present but not so strong as in Italy, and they are particularly associated with the right and conservatives. Moreover, there is a certain Spanish pride of being a 'modern' country which has achieved a fast transition from an autarchic and backward country to a democratic and advanced one that cares for social and civil rights.

The variety of institutional, political, and socio-cultural factors that characterise each context have generated different types of interaction between the EU and the domestic levels. The EU has a key role in creating discourse and setting norms on equality, and the impact of its political approach to inequality on the Southern member states has shown both potential and pitfalls. Yet, notwithstanding the South-European context similarities and the EU homogenising role, each case develops a particular type of political approach to the treatment of inequalities that reflects a constantly changing and path-dependent spectrum of empirical possibilities between multiple and intersectional practices.

'Framing gender intersections in the European Union: what implications for the quality of intersectionality in policies?' by Emanuela Lombardo and Lise Rolandsen Agustín

The European Union (EU) gender equality policy has experienced important changes in the last decade, due, among other factors, to developments in anti-discrimination policy from Article 13 of the Amsterdam Treaty onwards. The Article sets the EU competence for combating discrimination on grounds of sex, racial and ethnic origin, disability, age, religion and sexual orientation. The anti-discrimination approach is not only changing the EU legal and political framework on equality, with the approval of legally binding directives (2000/43/EC and 2000/78/EC) and the proposal of new ones. It is also provoking debates on the intersection of gender with other inequalities. This paper aims at grasping how such developments have been reflected in the Union's gender equality policies by exploring the framing of intersectionality in EU gender equality policy documents from 1995 to 2007. It analyses documents produced by institutional and civil society actors in the areas of 'gender based violence', 'intimate citizenship' and 'non employment', all issues that were researched within the European QUING project.

Our interest in exploring the concept of intersectionality in the EU is connected to our main question, namely: what are the implications of the framing of intersectionality in the EU for the quality of gender equality policies? By quality, we are referring to the formulation of policies, rather than the quality of the implementation of these since our analysis is based on empirical policy documents. The criteria for assessing the quality of intersectionality in policies will be developed in the following sections of the paper. Our initial hypothesis is that, if EU policies have changed to respond to the requirements of anti-discrimination, this should change the quality of gender equality policies as well by making them more inclusive of other inequalities that intersect with gender. In this sense, we assume that a strengthened focus on intersectional relations and their implications can further the quality of the policies. Frame analysis of EU policy discourses can inform us on the extent to which EU gender equality policies have moved towards some kind of intersectional approach to the treatment of inequalities. This analysis will enable us to assess the main trends in the framing of intersectionality in EU gender equality policies. It will also provide us with insights that may contribute to improving the quality of EU policymaking within this area and to the further development of intersectionality theory. Thus, we distinguish between the quality of the policies themselves and the quality of the intersectional relations potentially included in the policies.

In general, the EU policy documents show a tendency to use intersectional dimensions in an implicit way, mainly using a separate or inarticulate approach to the relation between the categories. Structural and transformative understandings of intersectionality do not seem to be very present and, overall, the EU addresses the intersecting categories in a rather weak way, not being at the forefront of the discussions. The documents do not clearly stigmatise any groups nor do they consider processes of privileging or potential biases. The civil society documents analysed are in general more advanced in terms of including intersectionality perspectives in a more explicit and elaborate manner. Regarding the gender aspects, the policy issues were rather gendered though there seems to be a tendency towards degendering when a wider range of inequalities is considered in the individual documents, causing the gender dimension to disappear or become blurred. Similarly, references to consultation of civil society actors and social partners were made, but few policy documents referred explicitly to women's organisations.

However, even though the framing of intersectionality in the sample of EU documents does not show particular deep articulation or structural understanding of the problem, there is an increasing presence of discourses that deal with other inequalities than gender and give visibility to the problem, sometimes in explicit ways. The trends we identified through the frame analysis of EU policy documents, together with theoretical works on intersectionality, have offered us some ideas on possible quality criteria to assess the quality of intersectionality in EU gender equality policies. These are explicitness/visibility of intersectionality, inclusiveness of multiple inequality categories, genderedness, the extent of articulation of intersectionality, transformative intersectionality, structural understanding of inequalities, awareness/challenging of privileges and internal inequality biases, lack of stigmatization of people at different points of intersection, and consultation of civil society actors. In this sense, our analysis of intersectionality in EU gender equality policy documents, by mixing normative quality criteria with the empirical aspect represented by the frame analysis of policy documents, has different implications for EU policymaking. The quality criteria are suggestions that are open to discussion and further revision. But they could be inputs for improving the design of EU gender equality policies in order to better face the reality of existing mutually constituted inequalities that women and men experience in European societies.

An attention to quality criteria of intersectionality based on the analysis of specific policy texts could help policymakers and civil society actors to question their own presumptions about the way they name the problem, and the inequalities that are privileged or neglected in the policy documents. This can encourage a reflection on the effects that cultural biases, translated into policies, can have on people's lives. For instance, the EU analysed texts offer some evidence of the naming of the problem of multiple discrimination and of different intersecting categories which is an important starting point for discussing and solving problems of inequality. However, the way in which the problem is named in the EU texts has implications for the inequalities that are prioritised or marginalised in the debate. The emphasis on the gender-age intersection, for instance, can steer the focus of the discussion, at the EU and national levels, towards an economic development agenda which overlooks other equally important inequalities and agendas. Therefore, whereas the frame analysis of policy documents and the quality criteria for intersectionality do not directly provide evidence of the presence or absence of an attitude of reflexivity in policymakers, they indirectly show where policymakers put the emphasis, how they frame inequality issues and what or who is missing from their policy design for enhancing the quality of intersectionality. This in turn can reveal the greater or lesser extent to which an attitude of reflexivity was present in policymaking.

Our analysis enters into the debate on intersectionality theory by bringing more elements to Verloo's critique of the Commission's 'one size fits all approach' (Verloo 2006) that supports the need for specific attention to the dynamics of each inequality. In relation to the quality criteria of inclusiveness of multiple inequality categories and articulation, we have assumed in our analysis that the quality of the gender equality policies can be measured according to the more or less comprehensive take on different inequalities. In principle, all potential intersections which are relevant to a given policy issue should be taken into account. The criterion is, however, not uncontroversial in the sense that sometimes articulating only a few inequality dimensions may be more adequate to a given field than taking into consideration all potential dimensions. The 'all inclusive' approach may diffuse the policy content, making it less specific or efficient. A neutralising effect on the intersectionality dimension is produced when (practically) all conventional categories are mentioned, without any articulation of the relationship between them. This occurs, for instance, when a large number of groups are mentioned as 'vulnerable' or 'disproportionately at risk' without any further articulation of the actual effect on the groups at specific intersections or the different ways in which they are or may be affected. Many intersectionality dimensions may be present in these cases, and the approach may be inclusive, but to such an extent that the underlying understanding of intersectionality (as different groups being affected differently) is blurred. On the other hand, there are risks implied in using exclusive intersectionality categories as well since this may privilege the most obvious inequalities over others that are equally relevant.

With regard to the latter, a reflexive attitude on the part of policy actors on how inequalities and their relations are articulated in the policies might help to reduce the already mentioned problems of inarticulate and separate approaches to intersectionality. As concerns the neutralising of intersectionality caused by the 'all inclusive' approach, this could be contrasted by policymakers' consideration both of the concrete situations lived by people at the points of intersection of different inequalities and of the ways in which public policies impact on them. In this sense, the practice of political intersectionality requires from policymakers (as well as from activists and academics) not only a dose of practical understanding of the reality of people's experience of inequalities, i.e. the open empirical question discussed by Hancock (2007), but also a constant attitude of reflexivity regarding the adopted (and proposed) policies (see Bacchi 2009). In the example of the quality criterion of inclusiveness of multiple inequality categories that we are considering here, reflexivity would lead to a reformulation of the criterion so that it is read not only together with the criterion of articulation, but also points both towards the process as well as the result of the policy formulation.

In this sense, the intersectionality quality of the policy lies in the awareness of internal biases and the assessment of potential exclusions which frame analysis helps to identify and quality criteria help to assess: the potential intersections of the policy issue should be taken into account and all dimensions should be assessed for their potential relevance. Each inequality category, thus, serves as a particular lens through which the policy issue can be seen and evaluated and the relevant ones are the ones to be included in the actual policy formulation. This sort of ‘intersectionality impact assessment’ could become a regular practice compatible with the gender impact assessment of EU policies, to be performed before policies are adopted. This requires, however, an institutional setup that is more suited for inter-departmental cooperation. We do not mean to say that there is currently no reflexivity at all concerning intersectionality in the policy-making processes of the EU. Both the mentioned Commission report on multiple discrimination (2007) and our own interview data show that there is some awareness of these issues and their relevance in policy formulations. What we suggest is rather a more institutionalised and systematised approach to the inclusion of intersectional considerations in the policy-making process which could strengthen the quality of intersectionality in the policies as it seems to be deficient in the empirical data we have analysed.

The impact assessment process might be conducted in combination with a more inclusive civil society consultation in which Commission equality units might talk also to NGOs that work on other inequalities than the one which is of their specific competence (e.g. Unit G4 consulting the EWL, and Unit G1 consulting ILGA Europe). A strengthening of the civil dialogue has already been envisaged in the Treaty of Lisbon (Article 8b). We might imagine new policy proposals, for instance in the migration field, being discussed with the relevant civil society stakeholders to a greater extent than now. This could add potential inequality perspectives such as the gender-ethnicity intersection or, possibly, the way in which sexual orientation, disability or age may intersect with both gender and ethnicity in relation to migratory processes.

Formulating qualitative gender equality policies in the EU that incorporate intersectionality is certainly not an easy task, but precisely because of its complexity the endeavour requires collective thinking. For this reason, the exchange of views among different policy actors from institutions, civil society (including women’s organisations), and academia through the setting up of consultation processes as part of the EU policymaking can be extremely fruitful. It can promote practices of ‘gender and intersectionality impact assessment’ which could enhance policy actors’ reflexivity on their respective biased positions, to the benefit of the quality of gender and other equality policies.

**‘Institutionalising intersectionality in the European Union? Policy developments and contestations’
by Emanuela Lombardo and Mieke Verloo**

European Union (EU) policies are a good case to explore the extent to which intersectionality has been institutionalised, as the EU has broadened its equality agenda from the 1997 Amsterdam Treaty onwards, and can be expected to impact on the trajectories of institutionalisation in the Member States. Situated in an analysis of the EU legal framework and machinery on gender and anti-discrimination, this article explores the interface between European institutions and civil society in relation to the treatment of intersectionality by analysing alliances and competition between groups representing different inequalities and the positioning of institutions in the debate, and investigates whether the EU’s current institutionalisation may enclose positive developments in the treatment of previously neglected inequalities and thus promote more inclusive equality policies, or may create barriers and exclusions between different inequalities. The article concludes that the EU legal framework is merely juxtaposing inequalities rather than intersecting them, and is not giving equal importance to the different inequalities. Debates on the creation of recent institutions, such as the European Institute for Gender Equality and the Fundamental Rights Agency, show existing tensions between different positions and groups. Dynamics of interaction within European civil society show evidence of both contestations and alliances.

eminist theorising, particularly since Crenshaw (1989), has highlighted the need to pay attention to the interdependencies between different intersecting inequalities because strategies on one inequality are not neutral towards others. Her concept of political intersectionality urges policymakers and activists to reflect on the dynamics of privileges and exclusions that emerge when attention to people at the intersections of different inequalities is overlooked. It warns us of the risks of policies that, by privileging the treatment of some inequalities and ignoring that inequalities are often mutually constitutive, end up marginalising some people, reproducing power mechanisms among groups, and failing to address the creation of categories that is at the roots of the constitution of inequalities (Marx Ferree 2009). The adoption of a more intersectional approach to the treatment of inequalities could thus promote the development of more inclusive and better quality policies (Lombardo and Verloo 2009).

In this article we wish to understand the extent to which the EU is developing an intersectional approach. The EU legal framework and machinery on gender and antidiscrimination, analysed respectively in sections 1 and 2, has been a step forward in the public promotion of equality. However, it has also generated dynamics of inclusion/exclusion among groups advocating for different equality concerns. In section 3 we will explore the interface between European institutions and civil society in relation to the treatment of intersectionality by analysing alliances and competition between groups representing different inequalities and the positioning of institutions in the debate. Our conclusions will focus on the extent to which the EU's current institutionalisation may enclose positive developments in the treatment of previously neglected inequalities and thus promote more inclusive equality policies, or may create barriers and exclusions between different inequalities (Squires 2005; Verloo 2006). What is the balance of opportunities and constraints?

Changes in machinery and debates on equality at the institutional level do not show practices of intersectionality in the EU. Although recently the Commission shows interest in 'multiple discrimination', we found no evidence of political practices currently incorporating an intersectional approach to the treatment of inequalities. The EU legal framework is merely juxtaposing inequalities rather than intersecting them, and is not giving equal importance to the different inequalities. The use of an 'antidiscrimination approach', moreover, may create some tension with the mainstreaming approach, especially since the latter has not been extended to all inequalities. There are also concerns of possible drawbacks for gender, where mainstreaming has been adopted. An exclusive emphasis on the anti-discrimination approach entails risks of going back to a mere equal opportunities approach which places the emphasis on the individual, of neglecting more structural strategies such as positive actions and mainstreaming, and of giving insufficient means to promote equality.

The list of inequalities covered seems broad as it includes six axes, yet it is unevenly developed through the EU legal framework, creating unfair conditions for the different groups and discouraging intersectional alliances among groups, and it excludes class. The exclusion of class and the reference to 'sex' rather than 'gender' suggests that the EU anti-discrimination approach moves the focus away from structural approaches to inequality. This disregard for the 'politics of redistribution' reveals that the EU competence in social policy, much needed in times of global financial crisis and welfare retrenchment, is still limited. This moves Kantola and Nousiainen (2009) to argue that anti-discrimination is largely a symbolic tool for a Union in search of legitimacy.

The institutional context is evolving from a unitary to a multiple approach to inequalities, but this is no guarantee of a shift towards political intersectionality. There are no official procedures to deal with intersectionality in the Commission Units working on gender and other inequalities, and the occasional ad hoc groups or meeting might not promote the formulation of intersectional policy proposals, since they adopt a bilateral consultation approach where various stakeholders do not meet together. Moreover, if bodies that deal with multiple discrimination, such as Unit 4 and FRA, will not take all inequalities into account because there are other specific bodies dealing with them (e.g. for gender, Unit 1 and 2 and the European Institute for Gender Equality), policies that deal with 'multiple discrimination' could fail to include all axes. This could hinder any future development of attention for intersecting inequalities. Thus, procedures need to be established to systematically coordinate actions among the different EU equality bodies and NGOs to make sure that gender intersections with other inequalities are taken into account in policymaking.

Debates on the creation of recent institutions, such as the European Institute for Gender Equality and the Fundamental Rights Agency, show existing tensions between different positions and groups. Institutional machinery, on the one hand, suffers from the territorial reflexes that are emerging in the EU arena and the perception of gender as 'privileged' or 'downgraded'. On the other hand, though, institutions also trigger territorial reflexes themselves, by giving unfair treatment to inequalities, legitimizing certain claims above others or by limiting resources.

Dynamics of interaction within European civil society show evidence of both contestations and alliances (Tarrow 1998). One hypothesis to understand why ILGA and ENAR seem more open to alliances than the EWL (and the EDF) could be that it is the least powerful who are more open, as they see new chances to achieve their goals through cooperation, and have little to lose, triggering alliance mechanisms. Another hypothesis is that the integrated approach promoted by the Commission resonates better with how they frame their interests and enables them to be more heard. The EWL seemed so far less open to actively creating alliances, and while it does articulate the diversity of women's interests, it has not articulated how best to deal with gender and intersectionality. Yet, the EWL's organisation of a seminar on intersectionality in January 2009 shows that the debate is now on its agenda. In general, there seems to be a need for further articulation of intersectional strategies at the civil society level.

The EU equality context is constantly evolving, with new legislation proposed and new initiatives on the part of civil society. This suggests that, in spite of the aforementioned constraints, the launching of an anti-discrimination approach has opened a political 'moment' which represents an opportunity for institutional and civil society actors to learn how to deal with political intersectionality in the EU. It is an opportunity to understand the reasons and dynamics behind alliances, competition and hostility among groups representing different inequalities and the positioning of EU institutions in the debate. It is also an opportunity to bring the experience of this understanding into policymaking in order to deal with intersecting inequalities in more inclusive and cooperative ways. Contestations bring out the terms of the dispute and enable actors to debate issues related to mechanisms of inclusion and exclusion, issues of privileges, dynamics of competition and cooperation and the role of institutions in them, which are important issues to discuss when dealing with intersecting inequalities. To make the most of this political 'moment', the opening of a debate initiated by the EU to 'struggle' about equality and its multiple intersections within the EU institutions and with the active participation of different inequalities' advocates appears necessary.

'Europeanization of gender equality policies through the needle's eye of Slovakia and the Czech Republic' by Zuzana Ocenasova

The development of gender equality policies in new member states was highly influenced by the EU accession. As some gender equality issues were directly incorporated into accession conditionality, the pressure on the adoption of basic standards was significant. According to Sedelmeier (2006) the impact of Europeanization on new member countries has been the most explicit and comprehensive because the Europeanization of candidate countries was based on conditionality of accession. As he pointed out, the status of candidate countries had implications on instruments used by EU in the adjustment process and states "did not participate in making of rules". The last statement is especially valid for the area of gender equality that might lead to clashes with national systems and challenge existing gender norms. It has been argued that the adoption of EU gender equality policies is hampered by domestic level "needle's eye" – the welfare regime of each member state and the gender order underlying it. "Member states... are likely to resist new policies that challenge existing national patterns" (Ostner & Lewis, 1995). The national "needle's eye" is even more challenging in case of new member states as they are expected to implement policies in which creation they did not participate. Therefore, the effect of Europeanization process and the sustainability of changes generated during the pre-accession process can be assessed only in the post-accession period when an external incentive structure has changed to internal ones. This paper will focus on sustainability and development of gender equality policies in two country cases – Slovakia and the Czech Republic.

There is an agreement that EU gender equality policies were formally transformed to national level in post-socialist new member states. At the same time, it is confirmed that the implementation of policies and their enforcement lack behind and most of new member states belong to the "world of dead letters" (Falkner and Treib, 2008). Both, Slovakia and the Czech Republic are usually associated with this group. However, the compliance of these two national policies with EU gender equality policies has varied across pre-accession, accession and post-accession period as well as in country by country. These changes can be attributed to a modification of incentive structures only to a certain level. Also other factors, such as understanding of concept of (gender) equality on national level, active/passive approach from responsible actors, attitudes towards EU, involvement of other social actors (in the countries' context women's organizations) or a role of traditional gender roles' division. Dynamics of influence of all of these factors has varied over time and has caused oscillation of quality of gender equality policies.

This paper will focus on development of gender equality policies and usage of Europeanization mechanisms in their adoption. According to Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier (2005), adoption of EU norms represents itself at three levels – formal, behavioural and discursive. As the formal level of adoption was already accomplished in the pre-accession process and other studies have focused on behavioural level of implementation into practice (i.e. Sloat, 2004, Pavlik et al., 2008, Butorova and Filadelfiova, 2006), attention will be paid mostly to a discursive level in pre-accession and post-accession stage. Although the main focus of the paper will be put on post-accession stage, for understanding of discursive level an overview of pre-accession period is necessary as gender equality policies were formulated in this period. Firstly, I will briefly summarize and compare development of gender equality policies in the pre-accession period focusing on framing of policies and institutional mechanisms rather than mere transposition of EU directives. Secondly, frame analysis carried out within the scope of QUING project will be presented for issue of general gender equality, non-employment and family policies. Finally, the opposition to gender equality concept arriving from clashes with national regimes will be analyzed. As Liebert (2003) has developed Ostner and Lewis' concept (1995), gender equality may be hampered either by deeply rooted inegalitarian beliefs or prevailing ignorance of persisting gender inequalities. Both of these factors can be visible in case of Slovakia and the Czech Republic and as such they contribute to fragility of national gender equality policies mainly in post-accession stage when several significant changes have happened in both countries signifying shifts in conceptualization of gender equality policies.

The comparison of two new member states – Slovakia and the Czech Republic has shown that Europeanization of gender equality policies happened not only on a formal level as it is generally accepted, but that also some shifts on a discursive level took place. However, these shifts are demonstrated occasionally rather than in a complex way and often they did not manage to be translated into policies outside of general gender equality (Slovakia) or they remain rhetorical formula due to clashes with existent national regime (Czech Republic). The lack of internalization of gender equality norms by national states causes fragility of policy developments in the field that can be reversible as the example of the Czech Republic has shown. The Europeanization of gender equality policies depends more significantly on national context than on Europeanization mechanisms used. Although the Czech Republic has used social learning mechanisms during the pre-accession stage to a greater extent than Slovakia, their effect remained only short-termed. The sustainability of gender equality policies is influenced by national politics context that is clearly visible in both country cases. In the Czech Republic in the post-accession period, the right-wing oriented government allowed for a higher presence of neoliberal “needle’s eye” to an extent that has threatened even the formal adoption of EU (gender) equality policies. In Slovakia, this tendency has diminished with the change of the government in 2006 from right wing into social democrats. Nevertheless, the other constraint – traditional patriarchal understanding of gender roles has remained and has been leading to limited formulation of gender equality policies. Although the left wing government seems to continue developing gender equality policies further, it does not manifest itself outside of the scope of general gender equality. Furthermore, this effort is hampered by inadequate capacity structure and lack of knowledge on gender equality issues. The capacity structure in both countries is significantly underdeveloped that makes policies formal and limits their implementation. Civic society, namely women’s organizations that possess necessary expertise are highly influenced by financial resources available to them.

Women's organizations have always been the main voice for promotion of gender equality and present higher understanding on a discursive level that may bring changes also to policy making. Nevertheless, their effect is limited by existing consultation proceedings and institutional set-up that is in both countries perceived as formal and by access to financial resources that got basically limited to European Structural Funds after the EU accession. However, framing of usage of these funds mostly to reconciliation does not allow for a more transformative approach therefore their success in calls competition is questionable. In addition, advocacy space for civic society narrowed down after the EU accession. In the pre-accession stage they could have used Europeanization for promotion of gender equality that was clearly visible in the Czech Republic. (In Slovakia, merge of gender equality into general antidiscrimination had contra-productive effect.) After the change in incentive structure and disappearance of conditionality pressure, further strategic usage of Europeanization got limited though not impossible as usage of EU structures in case of the Treatment with Holy See in Slovakia has proved.

The last factor that influences the sustainability of gender equality policies is national attitude towards EU. While in a country with EU-sceptic policy makers like the Czech Republic, the effect of Europeanization is clearly narrowed; the chances are higher in a pro-EU country as recent development in Slovakia showed, but it remains questionable whether it can over-pass traditional understanding of gender roles' division. Further development of gender equality policies will thus depend on the dynamics of all of the abovementioned factors as well as the attention paid to gender equality by the EU.

'Gender policy as a means of Europeanization: the case of Greece' by Maro Pantelidou Maloutas

This paper will investigate the cultural aspects of the Europeanization process as applied in gender equality policies in Greece. Going beyond what it considers as simplifications and stereotypical views of the country's belonging to a "world of transposition neglect" due to administrative inefficiency, it will duel on the long history of "modernization discourse" in Greek politics, its ideological manifestations and social dynamics at different periods, as well as on its close, but ambiguous, even tense relationship with the idea of Europeanization. While compliance to EU obligations in gender policy often functions as a major legitimating factor for what is considered as gender equality measures, and while undeniably the EU makes a difference in national gender equality policies, especially in periods of government by the Right, different political groups make different strategic uses of the reference to the EU. Thus the Europeanization process can take various ideological flavors, touching at issues referring to identity(ies), which are by definition difficult especially in countries of the European periphery, while at the same time "Europeanization", which also depends on context, is in this case necessarily "Grecised". More importantly, one can often detect a latent framing referring simultaneously to the Europeanization process as a (positive) factor of modernization for Greece, and at the same time, Greece being viewed as the "fountainhead of Europe", as a superfluous route, full of procedural details that one has to go through the motions of, in order to have material gains.

In order to empirically research the hypothesis, according to which Europeanization and modernization are equated today in Greek political culture, we may initially start by a reference to the MAGEEQ findings concerning Greece, where it was noted that Greece was one of the three countries where the European and international pressure to increase women's share in elected bodies was present. The main idea was that the failure to include positive measures for increasing the share of women in elected bodies is a problem due to the pressure to conform with the EU policy prescriptions and other Member states' regulations. Both the EU and other European countries have a legitimating role for pro-quotas discourses. Indeed, in Greece, pro-quotas discourse sought legitimacy in EU countries regulations and especially wanted to distance Greece from third-world countries, where women's percentages were very low. Almost all speakers on quotas in the Greek Parliament felt the need to legitimise their pro-quota attitude with reference to other, mainly EU countries, while the small number of women in political decision making in Greece was explicitly compared to third world countries. Insecure attitudes of the speakers who wanted to stress the need to prove that Greece, is a western country, belongs to Europe and thus must, at all costs not be behind third world countries in this issue. Comparisons of women's percentages with other countries was thus framed in terms of the ever present and always successful modernisation argument, i.e. alignment with more developed countries and distance from less developed ones as a sign of modernisation, while at the same time the implementation of quotas presented as according the spirit of EU policy, gained one extra point. But essentially Europeanization and modernisation appeared explicitly as one and the same.

We must add to the above, that the MAGEEQ country study for Greece also showed that while gender equality is not perceived as an issue in which power relations are at stake, nor as a controversial project and as a target to struggle for. It is mainly perceived in a positive sense, as something that we all agree upon, because common sense tells as to, while gender equality appears also as something ill-defined, whose "fuzziness" is precisely the reason why all can agree. The under-conceptualised character of gender equality in Greek political culture seems also to be the reason for the facility with which contradictory views are expressed. Pro-gender equality discourses easily combine views that belong to profoundly traditional narratives, something that is indicative of a dominant (restrictive) equation, in Greek political culture, of gender equality policy to pro-women measures. The whole issue is however always conceptualised as part of a modernisation discourse, "European Greece" wishing to appear more European, a process that seems often inevitable, (if we want to be of sound mind and see what we have to gain) as if "progress" is a matter of course, which we must not obstruct, while the framing is strongly context related.

Furthermore, we have seen in the analysis that the reference to the EU is an important point for the legitimization of any policy proposal in the Greek Parliament, for all supporters of a specific gender measure, regardless of whether the measure is in fact presented as of EU inspiration. This applies to the whole of the Left-Right axis, with the obvious exception of the anti-EU communists. Also, the existence of an emphasis on the need to conform to European and international law and rules, rather than to the need to change actual social structures and gender perceptions in Greek society, which is especially evident in sexuality issues, is a sign of proof concerning the strength and the importance of the modernization/ Europeanization legitimating argument. Also, the many contradictions and inconsistencies that are very often noted in discourses referring to women and to gender equality which are largely due to the prevailing of gender stereotypes that emerge almost automatically, even in the most progressive(?) discourses, as well as the common reference to traditional values presented in a conservative manner (i.e. the importance of family etc.) being paired with progressive attitudes showing an acceptance of gender equality, forms an important testimony as to the duality of the Greek political culture. Within it, the modernization discourse has always had a special position, occupied today by the slightly different Europeanization one.

It was also mentioned above that since the return of the Right to power in 2004, it is more evident in Greek mainstream gender equality discourse that what it refers to, is “gender policy for development” not for equality, justice, democracy etc. It is clearly the “modernisation argument”, resurfacing once more, in this case strongly supported by Europeanization under-tones. The fact that gender policy is perceived as an EU obligation, which is nevertheless positive because it is modernising, is probably the reason why, as we noticed in the LARG Country Study for Greece the analysed texts lack a developed diagnosis, remaining as a rule on a shallow under-problematised level. In general, prognosis is more developed, either in length, depth or in concreteness, showing un-balanced texts leaning more towards ‘what is to be done” EU inspired of course, and less towards “what is the problem”. Often speakers seem just to repeat the EU jargon and to arrive at the simplistic prognosis “we must comply with EU law and directives” Also, in 2004 for the first time, and ever since from the government’s mouth, gender policy is presented as a way to economic development, so is even more “Europeanized”.

In the case of the mainstream discourse on sexual violence the Europeanization approach has a specific weight, since the EU appears even as a normative group as are the international community or “modern countries” in general. The problems of sexual violence are mostly viewed in Greek political culture as human rights issues, and are perceived as related to the harmonization and thus modernization of the Greek legal system and/or Greek social norms and values. Hence, the obvious link of modernisation as a positive process and Europeanization, as an inevitable way in the present situation. It is interesting to note that when dealing with trafficking, the Greek political culture, as attested by the analysis in QUING, seems to see active actors as almost exclusively institutional actors, state actors to be precise. Therefore, the problem of trafficking is seen as generating from the inefficiency of the Greek State or the Greek government to apply laws, or harmonize its legislation to that of the EU, or of the international community or the EU itself, which has an ineffective policy regarding criminal activities. The need for the harmonization of Greek law with European and international directives is indeed very commonly stressed and is most evident in texts on trafficking.

In general, compliance as a *mot d'ordre* is highly legitimised while in the diagnosis of problems related to gender inequality, a variety of norms are referred to such as “equal treatment”, “equal opportunities”, “economic development”, “efficiency”, “cooperation”, “anti-discrimination”, but also, “equality” society with “no exploitation”, “respect of civil rights”. In the problem solution in addition to the above norms, the “Europeanization” of the country appears a value per se. Depending on the provenance of the text we obviously note a different main normative message, but when the minister of the Interior (who supervises gender equality) speaks, we have the impression that the main underlying norm, apart from the expected new reference to economic development is that “Lisbon says so”, but also, “this is good”. In accordance to many official Greek texts, EU directives seem to be perceived as unavoidable natural phenomena, while at the same time it appears that change in attitudes is by definition good, while social problems such as discrimination derive from out-dated social prejudice which is socially detrimental, and which can be overcome by... Europeanization.

If the above cultural aspect of politics, in which the total acceptance of the EU in accordance with the modernisation discourse, is today undeniably dominant, it coexists with, is influenced by and is even politically threatened by the main rival cultural entity, that of the underdog culture, which is introverted, conservative, traditional and xenophobic. In terms of identity formation, while the modernization culture turns to Europe, choosing the latter between the eternal fight between West and East, which has always been a Greek cultural split, and proclaims its wish to be European, thus embracing Europeanization, in spite of its condescending undertones, the underdog culture continues to view Europe as a threat to Greek values and social norms, to Greek sovereignty and to simultaneously promote an identity of by definition European because Greek.

As for gender policy, in spite of the small importance accorded to gender issues in Greek politics and society, its importance is major as a means of modernization under the label of Europeanisation. But is the specific gender policy important as a means of structurally intervening and changing the gender regime in Greece? Probably not, especially since it is framed as if it is economic development which renders gender equality necessary as a means to an end, promoting it as nothing more than a few measures in favour of specific women, but not really intended to create change in the gender relations system. Thus, the basic framing of gender equality policies in Greece does not appear as really transformative, but rather as a way to promote efficiency and development in a modernising way and also to accommodate EU obligations. Human rights, equal opportunities etc are not absent as more or less latent conceptualisations in gender equality discourse, as is a specific vision of structural framing, but these are not the main point in dominant (numerically and from the point of view of power relations) frames.

Comparing Greek and EU discourses in QUING, we noticed that official Greek voices show big similarities with mainstream EU discourse, presenting framings related to efficiency-governance and even discrimination, with references to women's employment, while being less developed and more shallow: Overlooking the structural aspects of gender inequality which are present in EU frames and totally absent in the Greek case (apart from certain references to capitalism as structure), Greek frames present a narrow vision of gender equality as target, which does not permit great expectations for change. Is this surprising? No. The Greek Right, in government, combining neo-liberal EU oriented elements with traditional ones of a century old Greek populist Right, could not possibly present a different image. As for civil society and its spoke-persons, even the more 'progressive' ones, they are still part of a rather traditional society in which gender and gender roles are at best viewed in a human rights perspective. No major changes in the existing gender regime are, nor can they be anticipated. Just interventions to make it less overtly unjust and less obstructing economic "progress". So what about Europeanization? If gender policy is very important in the Greek political culture for the Europeanization of polity, as I tried to argue above, will Europeanization be very important for the eventual changes in the reality of gender in Greek society? The answer obviously refers to what was mentioned before: Which Europe are we talking about? If it is today's EU, with the specific prevalent values and instrumental perception of human life, then the answer has to be negative.

'Limits of Europeanization: marriage, family and reproduction policies in Lithuania' by Vilana Pilinkaite-Sotirovic

This paper will address the resonance of EU frames with Lithuanian ones in the field of intimate citizenship in order to analyze the limits of Europeanization as a process of adoption and internalization of the EU rules and shared norms in the domestic context. Family and marriage issues and reproduction matters are considered to be strictly "private" and under national legislation. The national policy makers converge the traditional family ideals, heteronormativity and patriarchal power relations to the unique value system of Lithuanian national identity, and therefore strongly opposes to gender and equality policies. Though leading women's NGOs employed number of mechanisms to mobilize public opinion and transnational advocacy voices, including the EU, to change the traditional family policy agenda, the policy outcomes have not demonstrated the effects of Europeanization in terms of process of adoption of enhanced gender equality norms, rules and beliefs.

The research on Europeanization in old member states suggests a number of strategies to explore the effects of Europeanization in the member state's national arena and controversies of domestic implementation that follows the formal adoption of the EU directives (Schmidt and Radaelli, 2004). Ulrike Liebert (2003) pointed out that the studies on Europeanization shifted from the legal approach that explored the EU's judicial politics as the only legal tool to harmonize national legal system. Rather they focused on economic structures, political institutions, societal patterns and cultural values. The state can follow five different devices such as "stubborn resistance", "compliance", "domestication" transformation" and "innovation" as different ways of responding to EU norms. (Liebert, 2003). Some researchers particularly focus on the role of actors in the concrete translation of the Europeanization and the motives of action in order to highlight the mechanisms that induce the change in the domestic context (Jacquot and Woll, 2003). In the areas where the EU's influence is indirect, Europeanization could be achieved through the pressures that domestic groups bring to bear on their government. Studies on policy responses to domestic violence, for example, show the impact of Europeanization processes on this policy field where the EU has limited influence but has a common set of norms established for the EU through soft laws (Krizsan and Popa, 2008, Kantola 2006, Montoya 2008). Schmidt and Radaelli (2004) added the pluralistic discourse analysis in the research on Europeanization which help to identify the process of "policy learning", explain the policy adjustment process and show the institutional obstacles and cultural barriers to change.

Emerging research on Eastern enlargement has shown the top-down development to analyze the Europeanization in terms of positive impacts and results on adjusting EU legislation (acquis) and institutional frames to domestic policies (Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier 2005) Ulrich Sedelmeier (2006) has argued that academic research assesses the Europeanization of candidate countries either by measuring the EU's impact at the domestic policy level or by focusing on different EU strategies and its impact on domestic factors policies (Sedelmeier 2006). New EU members have been expected to fully incorporate the EU directives in their legal systems. Europeanization of candidate countries was based on conditionality of accession and the candidate countries had to adopt the instruments provided by the EU in the integration process. In fact, the candidate countries were preoccupied with complying to the rules rather than in making of rules Falkner and Treib 2008). This highlights the pressures of the EU on the candidate countries to adopt the rules and obtain the membership promises if these rules were successfully transposed to the domestic context. The failure in this process might significantly slow down or even stop the progress of integration process (Falkner and Treib 2008, Sedelmeier, 2006, Maniokas 2004).

However, research on the Europeanization of new member states after accession is limited and particularly in the field that usually falls outside the boundaries of hard legislation or normative rules. Falkner and Treib (2008) argued that the findings that conditionality as an external incentive was the key mechanism that led to the adoption of the EU rules by the candidates makes the question of post-accession compliance more salient. The EU as an external actor performed the control during the negotiation phase, but after accession different dynamics might be expected (Sedelmeier 2006, Falkner and Treib, 2008). According to Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier (2005), adoption of EU rules and norms employs three major mechanisms, namely external, behavioral and discursive. While in the pre-accession process the external and behavioral mechanism most often are employed, the discursive approach suggests the analysis of conflicting and resonating aspects of internationalization of EU norms in the domestic context. What happens after a state accepts and institutionalizes international agreements with norms intended to improve gender equality? How do domestic actors interpret the meanings of the norms identified in the documents? To gain insight into these questions, research traces on how European norms were integrated into the body politics and how they entered related public debates. This paper analysis the emerging discourses, sources of resistance, and social practices related to these norms in Lithuanian context and shows the resonance between national member state's beliefs values and norms on safeguarding traditional family and national culture and the EU's norms and values on gender equality and equal opportunities .

In Lithuania it is hard to demonstrate that Europeanization as a process of adoption and internalization of EU rules and shared norms on gender equality and equal opportunities has been adjusted in the field of intimate citizenship after EU accession. Norms prohibiting discrimination based on gender, age, disability, ethnicity, race, religion, and sexual orientation were introduced and incorporated into legislation during the process of Lithuania's accession to the EU (1995-2004). Nevertheless, this formal adoption of EU rules has not been followed by the adoption of similar norms at discursive level. EU values on gender equality and equal opportunity policies in local interpretation by Lithuanian national policy actors shifted towards traditional family values and heterosexual normativity after the joining the EU in 2004. The traditional national cultural values and norms have received official state backing since 2006. The situation only worsened after Parliamentary elections in 2008, when the political block composed of the Conservative Party and Christian-Democrats won the majority votes in the Parliament and articulated the social policy agenda in terms of the support of the traditional family, institute of heterosexual marriage and protection of prenatal life values.

This paper deals with the domestic impact of European rules on family and reproductive policies in Lithuania and shows only limited impact from EU rules since accession. In academic research, the Europeanization of candidate countries usually examines the EU's impact on domestic policy, assesses the extent to which the EU has a domestic impact, and focuses on the pressures of the EU on the candidate countries to adopt the rules and obtain the membership promises if these rules were successfully transposed to the domestic context (Falkner and Treib, 2008, Sedelmeir 2006). As Falkner and Treib (2008) have argued the EU as an external actor performed the control during the negotiation phase but after accession different dynamics might be expected. Suggested discursive approach to policy processes by Schmidt and Radaelli shows that analysis of the policy discourses on gender equality and equal opportunities in the post-accession Lithuania demonstrates the formal adoption of the EU institutional mechanisms rather than their transformation to the social practices, and as such produces resonating effects in Lithuanian context.

Lithuania enacted gender equality and equal opportunity legislation, as required by the EU (Racial Equality Directive (2000/43/EC) and Employment Directive (2000/78/EC), but the policy discourses about traditional gender roles in family and heteronormativity remained problematic and sexual minorities became an additional target. The EU directives are only applicable in the spheres of employment, education, and the provision of goods and services. Neither directive is applicable in the family sphere. The examined policy discourses about family, marriage, and reproduction, which fall outside of the EU's remit, show that local interpretation of European gender equality and antidiscrimination norms have shifted to preserving the traditional family based on wedlock, heteronormative norms, and uniqueness of the national culture. Conservative Lithuanian politicians, who strengthened their voices after accession to the EU in 2004, privilege the classic heterosexual family model and discriminate against unmarried heterosexual and homosexual couples, stigmatize single mothers, and limit women's rights to reproductive health. Diversity of family forms and women's reproductive rights are interpreted as threats to the Lithuanian nation and statehood.

The voices of women's NGOs, who raised against the rhetoric of the traditional family model, have been ignored by the policy makers, and European norms and values have been cast aside. Conservative voices in the policy-making process in Lithuania have involved the Catholic Church, which its unparalleled ability to organize and influence. Nevertheless, in the post-accession period, the EU did not mediate through intergovernmental or civil society channels. Rather as Vladimir Spidla emphasized, the EU exercises competences that the member state have conferred on it under different treaties. This suggests the validation of the division of EU competences into public (labor market, economic growth, competitiveness) and private (family status and reproductive rights) spheres and, thus, shows limits of Europeanization as process of adoption and internalization of EU rules and shared norms in the domestic context of the member state.

**'Gender+ equality policies as Europeanisation of old and new member states? An ongoing process'
by Ingrid Röder**

Gender equality and anti-discrimination are important issues for the European and the international community. As much as they are normatively desirable, it is apparent that gender equality and no discrimination are difficult to achieve. Due to difficulties in determining and understanding gender+ equality and discrimination, there is large variance among countries in the treatment of these issues.

This paper is based on research done within the QUING-project, focusing on the quality of gender+ equality policies. Within the project four main issues are defined as being part of gender+ equality: general gender equality, non-employment, intimate citizenship and gender-based violence. This paper will focus on the issue of general gender equality, mainly concentrating on anti-discrimination legislation. Anti-Discrimination is understood as an important part of European legislation resulting in many changes on the national level.

The process of Europeanisation in the case of anti-discrimination legislation is analysed comparatively in two countries, the Czech Republic and Germany, one new and one old EU member state, one from Eastern one from Western Europe. After 1989 and the transformation of the Central and Eastern European countries (CEECs) it can be expected that there is a difference in the process of the introduction of gender equality and anti-discrimination between the CEECs and the Western European countries because of their different history and their different political systems. That is why they are treated as two most different cases in this paper.

Both the Europeanisation and the adoption of gender+ equality policies are dynamic processes. One reason why the adoption and implementation of gender+ equality policies are so problematic is the fact that changes in this field usually have to do with power. One group, usually the male group was and is dominant in certain areas; to achieve equality they have to give up certain rights or share cherished positions and privileges which is often seen as difficult. Endeavours for gender equality and anti-discrimination are also linked with culture, traditions and manners and they concern – more than other processes – every single person. This makes these processes so cumbersome and lengthy.

This paper looks at efforts to reach gender+ equality as a process of Europeanisation in new and old member states. It will discuss the following three questions:

1. In what way does the EU offer a window of opportunity for putting gender equality on the domestic political agenda?
2. How do domestic institutional and civil society actors react to EU norms on gender and other inequalities?
3. To what extent does it make sense to make country clusters while looking at gender+ equality policies, and should those clusters perpetuate the East-West divide?

First the paper offers a brief overview of the understanding of Europeanisation and summarises how it applies to the two cases. Furthermore, differences and similarities between old and new member countries are being outlined. Moreover, the EU as a window of opportunity for Germany and the Czech Republic is discussed. In the end, links are made to the existing Europeanisation literature and conclusions are drawn about the use of country clusters.

Does it make sense to make country clusters and should those clusters perpetuate the East-West divide? Comprehensive anti-discrimination legislation is an initiative coming from the side of the EU. After the Nordic enlargement in 1995, the same years as the Beijing platform for Action, gender+ equality became more prominent on the EU-level. This also broadens the focus of gender equality towards several inequalities to maybe eventually intersectionality. Since the comprehensive Anti-discrimination Act is an initiative by the EU its transposition can be seen as a case of Europeanisation regarding Germany; since the Czech Republic also managed to pass the bill this can be seen as a successful case of Europeanisation. In both countries similar processes and actors were important in passing this legislation:

1. In both countries the Green party was responsible for introducing the anti-discrimination bill and pushing it.
2. In both countries the conservative parties stated that the existing legislation was already sufficient and that there was no need for a new law.
3. Both countries refer to EU in their frames in the debates and use it as a reason for the transposition of this legislation. In both countries the law was a compromise and it is being lobbied to introduce changes.

4. In both countries the process took a long time: from 1986/1998 until 2006 in Germany, from 1995 until 2009 in the Czech Republic. This shows that norms in the area of gender+ equality are not necessarily inherent norms, neither in old nor in new member states. There were several steps to be taken and players involved where the bill has been vetoed or dismissed. In Germany it failed originally at several steps in the adoption process; in the Czech Republic the bill failed at every hurdle, even the last one, the signing by the president before it finally got passed in June 2009.
5. NGOs lobbied for the bill in both countries. Yet, there was also opposition from the civil society in both countries.
6. In both countries infringement procedures were started by the European Commission and the ECJ. Therefore the urgency of passing this legislation increased. However, in Germany there was never a two years' lack of Anti-Discrimination legislation like in the Czech Republic between 2007 and 2009.

Therefore, the process of Europeanisation was very similar in both countries concerning the issue of Anti-Discrimination. Despite the different history and experience with gender+ equality the Czech Republic was even faster in passing this legislation than Germany. Since the process was so similar in both countries it does not make sense to make East-West clusters, at least not for this issue. This confirms the argument made by Liebert (2003) that rigid country clusters do not make much sense for gender equality policies.

To conclude, the comparison of Germany and the Czech Republic, an old and a new EU member state, focusing on the introduction of Anti-Discrimination legislation shows that similar processes were at place for the transposition of gender+ equality policies. Influential Agency Factors like political actors and NGOs were crucial in shaping gender+ equality policies and to facilitate their implementation. Therefore this analysis shows that for the purpose of comparative research, it does not make sense to divide the countries according to the east and west axis or to form rigid country clusters. Processes can take a long time in both old and new member states. This shows again that Europe is striving for unity in diversity.

A very influential fact in both cases was the pressure by the ECJ. However, also domestic actors were involved, both on the national and on the European level. Furthermore, even though the Czech Republic was grouped in a lower world of compliance than Germany in transposing legislation concerning social policies it was in the end faster in the process of transposition of EU-legislation in the area of Anti-discrimination.

The Czech Republic and Germany both face elections, Germany on 27 September 2009 and the Czech Republic in spring 2010. It will be interesting to follow the effects of the elections on the process of Europeanisation and gender+ equality policies, especially anti-discrimination.

The special quality of bridging the gap between the old and the candidate countries/new member states is a process of transformation which made Europeanisation possible. Yet, the impact of the transformation and the developing relevant domestic structures vary from country to country. In general, Europeanisation is different across countries and issues.

Separation in East and West is no longer a useful concept; in order to recognise and evaluate European developments to divide according to issues. Different issues have different demands for the individual countries. Europeanisation consists of exchange and equalisation as well as the clarification of points and discussions; it is not a melting pot of all differences to form one uniform policy but instead more of a mixed salad bowl where every different ingredient contributes to the flavour.

Furthermore, it is important to point out that also the conflicts on the European level are not necessarily occurring because of an over-hasty Eastern-enlargement, but because of different interpretations of what it means to belong to Europe (Müller 2008, p. 138). The constitution for the EU did not fail because of Warsaw or Prague but because of French nationalism. This shows that there is no unified world of compliance but varieties exist among issues and countries. The EU-member states have to try incessantly to find compromises to continue the process of Europeanisation.

'Going international? Civil society voices and the role of international actors in Austrian and German gender equality policies' by Karin Tertinegg

In recent years, there has been growing interest in theorizing the way national gender equality policies come about. Such processes have been analysed especially in connection to international levels of policy making, as the vast range of Europeanisation literature (e.g. Liebert 2003) shows. The main focus of these studies lies on the relationship between national and international actors – and to a lesser extent, civil society actors – trying to offer models of how policies become effective, usually assessed by changes in laws. Another point of fairly constant interest, especially in feminist literature, has been the question whether growing internationalisation and globalisation opened up spaces for the women's movement to get their claims into the policy process or rather contributed to a backlash (see e.g. Marx- Ferree/Tripp 2006, Snyder 2006, Holland-Cunz/Ruppert 2000).

The focus of this article is on civil society voices – representing gender and other inequalities than gender – articulating positions in policies of crucial relevance for gender as inequality structure. A main question is whether civil society actors actually refer to international actors in gender equality processes, especially when literature suggests that reference to the international level is particularly strong in countries and for policy fields where social movements do not systematically participate in the policy process. Both Austria and Germany have been steadily characterised as neocorporatist states with historically little participation of civil society into policy making. Looking at civil society voices in these two countries and the way they refer to international actors (or don't) seems to offer promising insights regarding the role that international actors actually play for civil society voices in exclusionary policy settings.

The aim of this paper is threefold: first, it aims to identify and compare how the EU and other international actors (e.g. the UN) are referred to by civil society voices in Austrian and German gender equality policies. Second, it aims to establish whether there are differences in referring to international actors depending on the inequality that is represented by a civil society voice – such as women's movement voices as compared to voices representing other inequalities. A third aim is to examine whether reference to international actors is connected to articulating transformative gender equality goals and claims to participation in the policy process. Following the third step, these findings will feed back into debates on the relevance of international actors for civil society voices in gender equality policy processes, both regarding content of gender equality goals articulated, and regarding the claim to democratic participation of civil society in policy making.

Strategies of civil society voices do not seem to have consistent patterns in the two countries regarding reference to international actors – except for General Gender Equality Policies – while there are different patterns regarding transformative gender equality goals, especially in Non-Employment.

The EU serves as a 'space of reference' for civil society voices in General Gender Equality Policies, but gender equality goals articulated in this context are decidedly not transformative. Non-Employment policies see transformative gender equality goals connected to the EU especially in Germany, in Austria only in Pay Gap (and only as part of the Shadow report to CEDAW). Non-Employment is characterised by transformative gender equality goals throughout all policies in Germany, but only in Reconciliation and Pay-Gap in Austria. Care-work policies and Reconciliation policies do not show any reference to the international level in both countries.

The UN, notably CEDAW, is referred to in some Gender-based Violence policies by women's movement voices, and transformative gender equality goals are connected to this reference. However, in Austria Gender-based Violence policies without reference to the international level also see transformative gender equality goals articulated by civil society voices. In Intimate Citizenship policies, transformative gender equality goals are not articulated with reference to the international level.

Whenever reference to international actors is made and transformative gender equality goals are articulated, this is done by women's movement voices, not by civil society voices representing another or no particular inequality. This seems to indicate that civil society voices from the women's movement see the international level as a 'space' to articulate gender equality goals which are somewhat challenging to their respective governments. At the same time, however, transformative gender equality goals are sometimes also expressed by institutionalised women's movement voices without reference to the international level.

Lastly, civil society voices in both countries hardly ever express explicit ideas on the (lacking) quality of democracy by exclusion of civil society in policy making, and hardly use international actors as a 'space' to articulate their claims regarding inclusion and representation in policy making. If this is done, it does not correlate with transformative gender equality goals. This is a finding which can be seen as both surprising and unsurprising: surprising, because one might expect civil society voices to draw much more attention to their exclusion in policy making in general. Unsurprising, however, given the history of neo-corporatism and the conditions of the policy-processes at the time, which was marked by reluctance to implement EU anti-discrimination regulations in both countries and, at least in Austria, a distinct governmental hostility towards civil society.

When linking the results to the theoretical puzzles discussed earlier, the assumptions regarding civil society actors in the 'Spiral-model' in bringing about policy change of the respective governments do not seem to be supported by the findings of the present study, since the pattern of support assessed by reference to the international level varies significantly across issues and the two countries, despite the equal status of Austria and Germany as members of the EU and as state-parties to CEDAW and the European Convention on Human Rights.

Regarding the 'Pincers and Prestige' model by VanderVleuten, some of these findings seem to support the assumptions: according to them, it is not so surprising that civil society voices will refer to the EU in General Gender Equality policies, when the policies analysed were informed by infringement procedures against both countries for the lack of transposition of EU anti-discrimination directives. Also, the respective lack of reference to the EU in Gender-based Violence policies is not surprising in this respect given the fact that the EU has no competence in the field of gender-based violence as such, whereas it does have competency in the field of gender equality. However, the findings do not support the 'Pincers and Prestige' model in the case of the General Gender Equality sub-issue Machinery in Austria, where infringement proceedings by the EU were not met with reference to the EU by the civil society voice in the policy process. Neither does the model apply for Reconciliation policies in both countries, where there is no reference to the international level despite EU-competency regarding employment. Similarly, civil society actors' reference to the EU and to the Council of Europe in Intimate Citizenship (sub-issue Same-sex Partnership) occurs despite the fact that the called upon international actors do not have competency to sanction non-existence of a family law institution for same-sex partnership. These findings indicate that further research regarding the interaction between civil society and international actors is necessary.

'Towards a processual intersectional policy analysis' by Doris Urbanek

The concern with intersectionality has a long history in feminist activism and research, while not calling it as such. Even before notions of 'multiple discrimination' reached the political agenda, feminist activism and scholarship had already dealt with social divisions such as 'race', ethnicity, class, disability or sexuality intersecting with gender. Currently, the topic of multiple inequalities and diversity policies stir up traditional fields of (gender) equality policies, not at least influenced by EU Anti-Discrimination Directives. The term 'political intersectionality' is now increasingly established in feminist research and expresses the interest in how social categories are evoked and re/produced by the policy process (Crenshaw 1991).

Due to the popularity the concept of intersectionality faces in current international scholarship (Davis 2008), methodological questions of how to conduct intersectional analyses are also hotly debated. At an international conference at the Goethe-University Frankfurt I had the impression that some feminist researchers were constructing a methodological dilemma. Scholars across disciplines discussed whether an intersectional analysis should aim at the micro or the macro level, should explore identities at intersections or larger societal constellations. Despite the optimistic statement by Ange-Marie Hancock (2007) that intersectionality would bridge locational and structural approaches, it seems that intersectional research has not quite lived up to its promises. This debate is mostly, but not only, led by sociologists with different research interests. While some emphasise empirical work that seems to imply a locational, also called intracategorical approach, others stress the importance of social theory that addresses structural dimensions by means of an intercategory approach. Even though some theorists consider locational and structural approaches as complementary, research seems to be confined to adding rather than synthesising approaches.

From the perspective of a political scientist these debates are interesting in several respects. Not only these discussions, but already the studying of interdisciplinary literature on intersectionality raised the question why it is mostly sociologists discussing theoretical and methodological concerns and why political scientists are so silent on this issue. Is this due to different research interests? Currently, political science seems busy to explore political processes dealing with multiple inequalities such as merged anti-discrimination legislation and equality bodies, but it is far less concentrated on the question of how to operationalise intersectionality for a policy analysis. While there is a growing body of literature on 'institutionalising intersectionality', the development of an intersectional policy analysis is still under-theorised. It would be exceeding the scope of this paper to analyse why this is the case, but it might be interesting to explore whether there are useful sociological contributions a methodologically interested political scientist can draw from.

While the debate about locational and structural approaches might make sense for a sociological audience, neither approach seems to be exclusively suitable for conceptualising a policy analysis. Hence, the research question is which parts of either approaches could inform the development of a discursive policy analysis with an intersectional focus.

My interest in making a contribution to intersectional methodologies was not only sparked by the identified methodological lack in political science, but also triggered by my work with the empirical material gathered in the frame of the QUING project (Quality in gender+ equality policies). The analysed (policy) texts seemed to tell something about the subject positions of target groups addressed by certain policies as well as to give a bigger picture about how political intersectionality was being practised in the field of gender equality and diversity policies in Germany. The methodological conceptualisations developed in the course of this article are thus theoretically and empirically informed.

This first part of the paper will be structured as following: Some elements of locational and structural approaches to intersectionality are outlined, followed by a discussion of the different logics of intersectionality which underpin them. I argue that the point of departure of structural approaches is problematic, at least for conceptualising empirical research. Moving on to the conceptualisation of an intersectional policy analysis, I will spell out which input can be taken from locational and structural approaches to then identify three essential pillars which will make up a processual intersectional policy analysis. Inspired by recent publications of Ferree (2009) and Lenz (2007), it is the pillars of sites, processes and subject positions that such an analysis is based on.

The research question of the second part of the paper was again born out of the empirical work with the QUING Country Study Germany and can be considered a minor part of the above conceptualised policy analysis: How can we describe whether and how (many) intersections are applied in policy debates? What kind of policy strategies regarding 'intersectional target groups' can be classified? A preliminary typology of (intersectional) policy strategies will introduce necessary terminologies and categorisations. While identified policy strategies such as gender and intersectionality mainstreaming or equality policy making only give limited information about how subject positions are constructed and about the content of (intersectional) discourses, the typology still gives an overview of which and how many intersections are considered in the policy debates.

One of the major interests of the QUING project is to assess the quality of gender equality policies. If we depart from the understanding that quality in gender equality policies is not only a matter of numerical, but also substantive 'intersectional representation', looking at whether intersections 'are there at all' seems to be a very weak indicator. However, as indicators for the quality of gender equality policies still need to be developed, this article is confined to some preliminary statements about the application of intersections.

The second part of the paper asking if intersections are present in policy debates differs from the first part whose aim is the development of an analysis that should spell out how intersections are there and which kind of intersectional subject positions are created by dominant policy discourses. As a whole, the paper will contribute to address one of the methodological research gaps in current political science literature on intersectionality.

All policy strategies except for intersectional inequality and intersectional blind policies aim at 'equality' – whatever meaning it might be given - or at least have some equality oriented underlying rationale. The degree to which they recognise intersectional dimensions within their target groups of course varies. An analysis of policy strategies in Germany over time shows a development towards intersectionality; however, not linear. The policy fields that have been traditionally part of gender equality policies such as (non-)employment related policies and anti-violence policies now increasingly include other inequalities and some even intersectional dimensions. However, recent policy debates such as the one on the Care Time Act (2007) – under a Christian democratic and Social democratic coalition - have mostly been led in an intersectionality blind way, while even earlier policy texts such as the National Action Plan to Combat Violence against Women (1999) – under a Social democratic and Green coalition - have known already many intersectional dimensions and point towards intersectionality mainstreaming. Thus, there is a simultaneity of strategies. Government seems to matter as much as European developments; but it might also be due to interventions from CSOs and experts that 'intersectionality' – although not in the term itself – comes onto the policy agenda.

As we have seen, there might be an increasing awareness of intersectional dimensions especially with regards to gender-based violence, e.g. in the debates on forced marriage. Also EU Anti-Discrimination Directives have triggered multiple equality policies that talk about lists of markers of discrimination that formally acknowledge that something like multiple discrimination exists. There are already examples for intersectionality mainstreaming and also equality mainstreaming that could serve as best practice examples, especially in the field of gender-based violence. While CSO texts play an important role in addressing the situation of women (and also men) at intersections, there are also governmental policy plans that are inclusive of intersectionality, like shown above. Also, some traditional gender equality policies related to employment already acknowledge intersectional dimensions such as the texts around the Federal Equal Treatment Act (2001) where a sensitisation for women with disabilities could be observed. At the same time, and on more negative note, there is a strong tendency towards intersectional inequality, especially in relation to migration, e.g. in the debates on family reunion and paternity acknowledgment.

These identified policy strategies do not reveal much about the problem definitions, solutions and discursive constructions of subject positions and their intersectional dimensions. However, what they tell us is that intersectionality has already, if not to say always, been practised. It will be subject to further research to assess whether these policy strategies are useful for my envisaged policy analysis or whether this has rather been an ordering exercise for the purpose of getting an overview of the empirical material.

'Linking demographic balance and gender equality: analysing reconciliation and reproductive rights in gender equality policies' by Mieke Verloo

The current presence of demographic arguments in European societies is starting to link several debates that have been more separate before. The lack of children in European societies is problematised in view of the economy or because of the financing of the welfare state, generating debates, initiatives and research on the causes of the decline in child births, changing compositions and roles of families, the consequences for society and the best strategies for the future. As women are given attention (be it sometimes implicitly) as the obvious 'producers' of children in the emerging debates, it is time to take a closer look at what happens in policy making in Europe, how gender equality is seen to be related to fertility, demographic decline or growth, and whether the link between gender and fertility is made in ways that are excluding or privileging certain categories of women. This chapter will first briefly recapitulate how feminism has framed fertility in the first and second wave, and then present research on European family policies as these policies are one of the obvious locations of interventions and understandings of gender, family and fertility. Earlier comparative research and recent data on gender equality policies in all countries of the European Union will be used to show how the goals of demographic balance and gender equality are often interwoven, implicitly or strategically, and some reflections on the implications of this for gender equality will end in more questions than answers.

Reproductive rights were at the heart of the second wave of the women's movement in Europe, focusing on the right of women to choose whether or not and when to have babies. The demand was especially for the right not to have babies, and to have access to safe and affordable anti-conception and abortion methods. In this sense, the relationship of the second wave of the women's movement to fertility and motherhood had a predominantly 'negative' accent: it framed fertility and motherhood as one of the capabilities of (most) women that was closely linked to patriarchy, oppression and exploitation and that transferred sexual and gender inequalities in child bearing and rearing to other domains such as education, labour market and political participation.

Recent analyses of European Union family policies by Stratigaki and Duncan have produced interesting insights on the development of issues connecting gender equality and family policy. They differ in what they consider important accents and shifts in framing. In an impressive overview and analysis, Maria Stratigaki shows how a concept introduced to encourage gender equality in the labour market – what is known mostly under the label of ‘reconciliation of work and family life’ – gradually shifted meaning as it became incorporated in the European Employment Strategy of the 1990s. From an objective with a feminist potential it became purely a market-oriented objective. What her analysis shows is that, first of all, the concept of reconciling work and family has been addressing mainly the gendered division of labour, and not so much the gendered organisation of intimacy. The original goal was ‘sharing’, shifting later to the policy objective of ‘reconciliation of work and family life’. “Sharing is a term associated with equality of women and men, defining a policy objective in the area of gender relations, whereas reconciliation is derived from labour market analysis and has a more economic orientation” (Stratigaki 2004: 2). This main accent on the organisation of labour is a shift that has allowed accommodating a growing policy priority on the creation of employment.

In this chapter I have shown that explicit feminist positions on fertility have often been negative ones, but that explicit feminist positions of the first and second wave of the feminist movement differ(ed) widely in articulating the meaning of motherhood for gender equality. Moreover, for the level of the European Union, I have shown that European family policies to some extent have buried gender equality goals ‘under’ goals to strengthen the economy or the demographic balance. Research on the rulings of the European court showed that the background to understand reconciliation policies and their material impact is the dominant classic patriarchal understanding of what constitutes a family and what are the proper/normal/existing roles in families that are in need of protection or facilitation. I have used Austria to highlight that conservative and nationalistic tendencies can be very close to family policies that accentuate higher fertility rates.

Using data from the QUING project, I have tried to show how policies on reconciliation or reproductive rights include a differentiation between categories of women that are deemed worthy of reproducing, and that are privileged in the policies that are put forward, and categories of women that are seen as rather having too many children, and who are therefore excluded from benefits or policy rhetoric. In the Bulgarian, Estonian or Romanian case it is clear that women having the correct nationality are seen as worthy to have children. Similarly, highly qualified women in Germany and Romania are benefiting more from the policies presented than women who are less qualified. Moreover, the policies presented also distinguish categories of women that are not so welcome to have children. Among those are Roma women in Romania, low qualified women in Germany, women with the wrong nationality in Bulgaria, Estonia and Romania.

Policies on reconciliation or reproductive rights are also a very ambiguous field of policies in terms of their underlying norms and reasoning: they mix goals on economy, demography and gender equality. Looking at policies of the European Union and of European countries, I am wondering what kind of Trojan horse is reconciliation policies and reproductive rights: are policies on reconciliation and reproductive rights presented as a way to protect 'family values' but de facto hiding feminist demands on the ability to have children and on childcare in their interior? Or are policies on reconciliation and reproductive rights presented to be about on gender equality, but hiding a strengthening of conventional family roles and an instrumentalization of women for the economy (much like the old Soviet model that resonates with Kollontai's ideas)? Or do they do both things at the same time, implying that the proof of the pudding will be in the eating – that is in the specific implementation of measures proposed in specific contexts.

After having looked at some of the literature on fertility, gender equality and demographic issues, I am also wondering about the absence or lack of visibility of feminist voices on this issue. There seems to be an urgent need to articulate some feminist positions. More individualist feminist positions could accentuate the need for women to have a real choice whether or not to have children. A recent article by Hobson and Olah sees the 'lack' of fertility as an expression of a lack of 'capabilities' that women have to raise children and have paid work. Implicitly this seems to be a demand for 'the right of all women to have children'. Their concept of a 'birth strike' as a social phenomenon that reflects the disjuncture between aspirations and expectations and capabilities, is a good example of this. They see economic uncertainty, inequality in families and different risk assessment by women and men when it comes to family formation (Hobson/Olah 2006). But what about more structural feminist positions? Would these imply that 'sharing' is a way to improve the demographic balance? Would these have any positions on what the role and rights of men would be? How would a cyborg think about gender equality and the demographic 'problem'? Is there any articulated feminist position on whether the demographic time bomb exists at all? Whether it is really a serious problem? Whether it needs governmental action? How to deal with it in a gender equal way?

'Religion, church, intimate citizenship and gender equality: an analysis of differences in gender equality policies in European Catholic countries' by Femke van der Wal and Mieke Verloo

During the past decades, processes of (post)modernization have raised the importance of quality-of-life issues and related policies, resulting in a higher salience of intimate citizenship issues on the political agenda. Growing support for and activities of feminist, gay and lesbian movements have resulted in new political demands and in changes in family laws and legal arrangements about sexuality and reproduction at national levels in Europe. Several of these quality-of-life issues, such as family relations, freedom of sexual behaviour or reproductive rights, historically have been of strong concern (at least in the West) to churches and religious ideologies (Minkenbergh: 223, 224).

The Catholic Church as an institution especially has been articulating strong positions on issues considered to be about personal and family morality, actively opposing liberalization of abortion or even contraception, assisted reproduction for nonmarried couples, and the extension of marriage rights to homosexual people (Trujillo and Romer 2006). In the context of the European Union, the strengthening and harmonization of fundamental citizen rights (as in the Treaty of Amsterdam and the Charter of Fundamental Rights) has been mostly responsive to social changes and the pressure of feminist, LGBTQ, antiracism movements or pressure groups for the rights of disabled, young or old people.

Scholars vary in their understanding of the positioning of the Catholic Church as part of European societies and politics. Walby (2009) considers the Church to be part of the polity, because of its ongoing power as an organized religion, and its formal links with the state in still many European countries. The Vatican also exerts direct political power as a state, holding institutional representation at various UN and EU levels. In contrast, authors such as Steven (2009) consider the Catholic Church to resemble an interest group, especially in the last decades when it has lost some of its previous autonomy and power. Sjørup, obviously reasoning from a similar perspective considers the Catholic Church a powerful opponent to sexual and reproductive health and rights, being the only religion with a highly institutionalized lobbying structure (European Parliament 2006).

As a religion, Catholicism still has strong support in many European countries too. Some argue that its support could still be strengthened by the accession of strongly Catholic countries such as Poland to the European Union (Casanova 2003). While ongoing secularization has been a part of (post)modernization processes, it seems that Catholicism is more resistant to secularization compared to other Christian denominations (Höllinger et al. 2007), resulting in visible support for the positions taken by the Catholic Church as an institution. The European Women's Lobby observes that a more conservative political climate over the past decade has led to a possible growth in the influence of religion in Europe (position paper EWL, 2006).

Given the clash between certain human rights and Catholic values, the dynamics of further developing fundamental rights issues at European level, the changes in the social and political positioning of the Catholic Church and processes of secularization, a closer look at the relationship between Catholic religion and public policy on intimate citizenship issues seems highly relevant. As a first step, this paper will investigate to what extent the framing of a number of intimate citizenship issues (reproductive rights, abortion, same-sex marriage and divorce) by the Catholic Church resonates with the framing of these issues in Catholic countries that are members or candidate to the European Union, and whether the presence or absence of resonance is linked to the degree of religiosity of the population, the support for Catholic religious values or to the institutional strength of the Catholic Church.

We will first present a short overview of theoretical and empirical studies linking Catholic religion, church, (gender) equality policy and intimate citizenship. In the data section, we use existing data on religiosity, support for Catholic religious values and the institutional strength of the Catholic Church for the countries that we study, to show the variety in 'Catholicness' across the countries studied, followed by a short analysis of the Vatican positions on intimate citizenship issues, using texts of bishops from Hungary, Italy and Spain and a text from the Pontifical Council for the Family. The last part of the data section presents new data, gathered in the context of the QUING project, using Critical Frame Analysis to expose the content of gender equality policies (laws, policy plans and parliamentary debates) on a number of intimate citizenship issues. The analysis will show to what extent we find 'Catholic' frames in the various countries and how that is connected to the level of religiosity, the support for Catholic religious values or the institutional strength of the Catholic Church. We will end with a discussion section.

The conclusions are:

- Cultural factors can explain presence of 'Catholic' frames in policy better than institutional factors.
- Of the two cultural factors, religiosity can best explain the presence of 'Catholic' views in policy.
- High cultural factors are found in countries where high/ medium high 'Catholic' views are found in policy. Most of the low cultural factors are also found in countries where low 'Catholic' views are found. Only Spain is an exception, with rather high amount of 'Catholic' views in policy, but low cultural value.
- The medium low and medium high values are a bit more mixed, although medium high values seem to be more present in countries some 'Catholic' views and medium low values seem to be more present in countries with low or no amount of 'Catholic' views in policy.
- Within institutional factors the official state-church relationship can better explain the presence of 'Catholic' views in policy, even if this relationship is very weak. In countries where religions are acknowledged as state/civic religion, more often 'Catholic' views are found in policy than in countries where the state is only cooperative towards a religion or where a state has a separationist attitude towards religion. Therefore there is an indication that the more church and state are connected, the more 'Catholic' views are found in policy.
- The mere presence of Catholic parties in government is not related to the occurrence of 'Catholic' frames in policies.

‘Intersectionality and the quality of equality architecture in Britain’ by Sylvia Walby, Jo Armstrong and Sofia Strid

The merger of the equality Commissions in Britain into the Equality and Human Rights Commission has the potential to either develop a more effective set of interventions against inequalities or to dilute the expertise and capacity to act in relation to specific ones such as gender. The outcome depends in part on the nature of the intersection of the inequalities in practice and in the equality policy architecture.

Does the inclusion of multiple inequalities in the same policy institutions in the UK reduce or enhance the efficacy of the equality architecture in addressing gender inequality? Are the new institutional arrangements better or worse for the quality of gender equality policies? What is meant by better or worse gender and equality policies? What is the equality architecture: what are the implications of revising how the equality architecture is described and conceptualised?

How should the relationship between multiple inequalities be conceptualised and theorised? Are the changes best understood using the conceptualisation of intersectionality as mutually constitutive, or are there better ways of conceptualising the relations between multiple inequalities that allow better understanding of the most important issues at stake? What is the best way of conceptualising and theorising the relationship between multiple inequalities: going beyond the dichotomy of additive vs. mutually constitutive to include additional variations in practice of singular, parallel, hegemonic and mutually adaptive. What are the implications for theorising intersectionality of the implications of the restructuring of the equality architecture in the UK to encompass a wider range of inequalities within the Equality and Human Rights Commission set up in 2007?

The paper will address these questions by: reviewing and rethinking what counts as the equality architecture and its quality as well as the conceptualisation of the relationship between multiple inequalities; identifying and assessing the implications of the changes in Britain for the quality of gender and equality architecture; and finally assessing the implications of the British changes for conceptualising and theorising intersectionality.

The changes in the equality architecture would appear to confirm the view that prior to 2007 each inequality was treated as separate, since there are separate institutions for each equality strand for policy development (governmental unit), implementation (Commissions) and consultation (e.g. WNC). However, there are two major challenges to this assumption of separation of strand activity: first, some institutions were shared between the equality strands; second, the practice of the institutions sometimes included engagement with intersectionalised groups.

First, the implementation of the anti-discrimination law in employment, a key policy instrument for equalities, was contained within a system that had an overarching class logic, since all inequalities shared the same class-led system of specialised employment tribunals where all employment discrimination cases were heard. While the employer-side was always represented, the worker-side representation did not require a specific representation of relevant gender, ethnic or disability interests.

Second, the pre-2007 Commissions did not ignore either the additive multiplication of inequalities or intersectionalised groups. In particular, the EOC had specific projects that addressed women in minoritised ethnic groups. The consultation machineries did not ignore intersectionalised groups either. For example, the WNC had several of its sub-groups and working groups that addressed women in minoritised groups, especially Islamic women.

So, while the most visible part of the architecture of the equalities system that developed between 1965 and 2007 appeared to develop on the basis of addressing separate and increasing numbers of inequalities, this was not the only model utilised; various alternative models were used. There was an element in which class was treated as the overarching inequality, in the employment tribunal system through which all legal claims about discrimination in employment would pass. There were elements of additive inequality and of mutual adaptation or constitution in the approach of the separate equality Commissions and consultation machineries, when they addressed the additional inequalities and vulnerabilities of specific groups of women at the intersection of gender and ethnicity, and gender and religion.

It is important to broaden the range of institutions usually included in discussions of equality architecture; these include not only the implementation Commissions, but also specialised legal courts, governmental policy units and institutions for consultation with civil society. There have been significant changes in the equality architecture, in particular the merger of the equality Commissions, but some types of institutions, such as the governmental policy units remain separate. The broadening of the range of institutions shows stability as well as change in the equality architecture in relation to multiple inequalities.

The changes in the equality architecture have implications for the outcomes of particular equality goals. However, these outcomes are also shaped by the wider environment, of civil society, polity and economy; they are not uniquely determined by the equality institutions themselves. Civil society pressure on the EHRC may well represent the separate interests of strands since many civil societal equality organisations are organised by strand; although far from all. Exceptions include the Equality and Diversity Forum, which deliberately tries to include all strands in a deliberative forum, and Southall Black Sisters, which is linked to an intersectional group. Trade unions are perhaps hybrid, in that while primarily organised around class interests, they usually have an internal committee structure that separately represents the interests of major strands. The organisations are often constructed around communities of perceived interest; though some significant entities take a deliberately coalitional form, including the Equality and Diversity Forum, the Women's Budget Group and End Violence against Women. Despite the merger of strand specific Commissions, and the expressed interests of the business community, the new single Commission has not narrowed its focus to the shared policy arena of discrimination in employment. This might be at least partially attributed to the pressure from a diverse and active range of civil societal organisations that have engaged with and pressured the new Commission.

The usual typology of distinctions in the way in which multiple inequalities and intersectionality are treated needs to be broadened to include different forms. Not only is it useful to make a distinction between additive and mutually constitutive forms of multiple inequalities; it is important to include the reduction to a single overarching inequality, especially class or social exclusion, as well as the separate treatment of multiple inequalities.

Where there is a model of mutual adaptive relations between multiple inequalities, there is a tendency for the potential to be lost since it is used in a static way with a focus on particular small groups. The conceptualisation of each of the multiple inequalities as a social relationship of inequality tends to be obscured or lost.

Mutual constitution is only one of several ways in which the relationship between multiple inequalities occurs in the context of policy development. There are other important models including: parallel; additive; mutually adaptive; hegemony; new project. A wider spectrum of possible relationships between equality strands needs to be included in analyses of multiple inequalities. The new gold standard of 'intersectionality as mutual constitution' needs to be re-thought in the light of practical experience of equality architecture development.

The WHY papers and the QUING objectives

In the WHY activity, QUING seeks to understand and explain differences in the strength and quality of gender equality+ policies, including differences in the framing of gender+ equality policies, across the European Union and its Member States (and two candidate states). In doing this, the aim is to give specific attention to citizenship, in particular to civil society – state interfaces, and to focus on gender in a multicultural context, in particular to how gender equality policies pay attention to other inequalities than gender.

The four Objectives that are on conceptualization were not only intended to provide a sound foundation for the further analysis, but were also planned as a major contribution to theory, in view of the many gaps identified on the understanding of the relationship between multiple inequalities and the nature and dynamics of the interplay between policy making and civil society.

OBJECTIVE 1. CONCEPTUALIZING THE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN DIFFERENT INEQUALITIES, ESPECIALLY BETWEEN GENDER, RACE/ETHNICITY, RELIGION, CLASS AND SEXUALITY

In its first Objective, QUING sets out to conceptualize the relationships between different inequalities, especially between gender, race/ethnicity, religion, class and sexuality. For this, very extensive and innovative work had been done by Sylvia Walby already in the context of the STRIQ activity (see also D12 and the final STRIQ report). In this previous work, the major conceptual contributions were the identification of five main theoretical dilemmas. Building on the work by a large set of authors, the report concludes that both the ontology and the relationship between different ‘strands’ needs to be taken into account. The report argues that focusing on relationships prevents the powerful from fading from view, while taking on board the full ontological depth can show variety in presence or absence of different strands in various political projects or policies. The tendency to obscure class should be countered, and the question of which inequality is the most important one should be an empirical not a normative issue. Similarly, the question of the relationship between different inequalities is best understood as an empirical question, within the overall conceptualization of this relationship as mutual shaping: the recognition that they are not independent yet can have a continued distinctive existence as well. Different categories related to inequalities should be only temporarily stabilised for analysis, while keeping in mind their fluid and dynamic character.

In the analytical phase, 17 of the WHY papers address the dimension of intersectionality, and in doing so also further develop the conceptualization of the relationships between different inequalities.

The main contributions to the conceptualizations in these papers are the following:

- For the UK, Walby, Armstrong and Strid show that the common distinction between additive and mutually constitutive forms of multiple inequalities does not fit the empirical reality in which a wider range of forms is found, notably a range that includes the reduction to a single overarching inequality (especially class and social exclusion) as well as the separate treatment of multiple inequalities. Such reductions have also been noted in other papers (e.g. on Spain).

- Lombardo and Verloo argue - in the context of EU policy - that the exclusion of class, as well as the reduction of gender to sex moves the focus away from structural approaches to gender+ equality policy. They argue that the need for including attention for other inequalities than gender should also be understood at the level of structures.
- Urbanek, in a more conceptual paper, reflects on the possibilities of an intersectional policy analysis, based on her empirical analysis of Germany. She identifies three pillars for such an analysis: sites, processes and subject positions. Her specific contribution is her conclusion that there is not a linear development towards more attention for intersectionality in gender+ equality policies, but that strategies are rather simultaneous or present in one field and absent in another.
- Lauwers and Martens conclude that not only institutional arrangements matter for intersectional practice, but also agency (the actions of the practitioners involved), but that agency is facilitated by and impacts on institutional arrangements, adding a further dynamic element to the analysis.
- Del Giorgio and Lombardo propose to distinguish situations where inequalities are overlapping versus intersecting: overlapping is where inequalities come together for specific strategic reasons. In a parallel way, Alonso distinguishes a third way of dealing with multiple inequalities that combines separate pillars with (strategic and facilitated) cooperation.

Three Objectives centre on the conceptualization of civil society in gender+ equality policies: on the interface with policy making (number 2), on participatory forms of mainstreaming (number 3) and on the actual texts that civil society produces (number 4).

OBJECTIVE 2. CONCEPTUALIZING AND MAPPING THE INTERFACES BETWEEN CIVIL SOCIETY AND POLICY MAKING

The literature review written as part of the WHY activity (Walby 2007) sees civil society as a broad concept, including NGO's social movement type organization, trade unions and some other organizations. Whether the civil society- state interface permits and deploys civil society engagement with policy development and implementation is seen as crucial in this review. The review also notes that both EU and UN have been influential actors in shaping some characteristics of this interface.

There are four major conceptual conclusions that can be drawn from the papers that focus on the interface between civil society and the state. The first concerns *alliances between women and women's organisations* and argues that these alliances are constructed by and impact on political structures and opportunities. The second concerns the *empowerment of civil society in general and feminist civil society in particular* and shows how this empowerment is conditioned by the actions and policy frames at national and supranational level. The third one is the specific role of *civil society organisations that act politically against gender equality policies or strategies*, and the importance of including them in an analysis of the content and quality of gender+ equality policies. The last conclusion is that in the field of employment the class logic is so strong that there is *a need to broaden the perspective to policymaking and include class based institutions* and other institutions for consultation with civil society.

Six papers address the issue of *alliances*, both as constructed by political structures and opportunities, and as impacting on movement strategies and success chances. Acar and Altunok

show very clearly for the case of Turkey how there has been a growing cooperation of women's groups across identity barriers such as ethnicity and religion, and how this has been facilitated by the development of a shared language rooted in references to universal rights and international standards. Internationally oriented platforms have led the way, they say, towards successful examples of coalition platforms. While the 'identity politics trap' is still a serious danger for alliances, and the ongoing competition for resources works against cooperation, their analysis shows how a stronger and more experienced movement, combined with active and persistent individuals brings hope for a (coalition) politics of equality. Frank, in her comparison of Turkey and Croatia, confirms this analysis, showing how there is greater reference to international obligations and Europeanization by both state and civil society in Turkey than in Croatia. Her analysis further finds that in both countries civil society texts express more gendered and transformational aspects of gender equality than governmental texts. Kispeter's analysis is very important in that she shows how civil society coalition politics in Hungary impacts on the framing and therefore on the quality of gender equality demands. While the umbrella alliance between two more feminist and one more conservative women's association in Hungary increased the voice that women's organisations had in the debates, the alliance also led to framing that strategically used old 'maternalist', 'difference' frames originating in state socialism. Lombardo and Verloo explore the potential reasons for differences in the willingness of civil society organisations to engage in alliances and suggest that institutional arrangements at times trigger territorial reflexes that hinder cooperation, as is the case when there is mainly bilateral consultation with different organisations. Del Giorgio and Lombardo analyse interactions between political actors that were crucial in the failed institutionalisation of intersectionality in Italy. They show the importance of the interplay between governments and civil society, specifically the ability of civil society organisations to make use of the windows of opportunity that at times arise in the volatile Italian political context. They see the potential for alliances between state and movements as (negatively) constructed not only by weak equality agencies and a lack of institutionalised consultation channels, but also by characteristics of women's movements such as a sceptical attitude towards the state and a vision of gender equality as 'difference'. Alonso's analysis of the newly emerging third model of institutionalising intersectionality in Portugal presents a new, potentially promising interface between civil society and policymaking based on cooperation between separately organised organisations representing different inequalities.

These six papers lead us to the conclusion that separate organizing of civil society is not a problem in itself for alliances across different strands, and that cooperation results from the balance between negative factors such as lack of resources or consultational arrangements and positive incentives such as a shared language based on international discourse.

Two papers address more specifically the issue of *the empowerment of civil society in general and feminist civil society in particular*. Jajma shows for Estonia how civil society was empowered strongly by pressure for more democracy during the process of joining the European Union. As a result, there has been a development of interfaces for consultation of the state with civil society such as web portals and officials whose task it is to include NGOs in decision making. There are however, still core issues that impede the cooperation between state and civil society. There is still a lack of willingness of the state to consult civil society, and a lack of resources (money, time, human capital) in the cases when they do consult. There is a lack of knowledge, and a general mistrust between the state and

civil society. The slow and weak development of state-civil society interfaces is an important background feature for women's organisations that have been pushing for the improvement of gender equality policies. The analysis of Tertinegg focuses on the ways that civil society actors invoke reference to international actors in their texts in order to improve their claims and chances for success. For Austria and Germany, she shows that civil society actors do not seem to have consistent patterns regarding reference to international actors. There is more reference in policy texts on general gender equality and to some extent non-employment, but hardly any for Gender Based Violence (except reference to UN) and for Intimate Citizenship. As the EU has no competence in Gender Based Violence, this is not that surprising. Remarkably, not all references to EU do run parallel to the fields of competence of the EU: there is no reference to EU when the issue at stake is reconciliation for instance, and there is a reference on same sex partnership where the EU has little competence, except in fields such as equal treatment of survivors in pensions. More importantly, civil society voices in both countries rarely use international actors as a space to articulate demands for inclusion and representation in policy making. In this sense, an opportunity for empowerment of civil society seems to be missed. Acar and Altunok's paper on Turkey shows that in some countries reference to international actors and frames is used in an empowering way. These papers lead to the conclusion that empowerment can be strengthened using international policy frames, but also give evidence that this does not always happen.

Two papers analyse a specific actor that is usually seen as part of civil society: the Church. The Church is an interesting actor in relation to gender equality policies because many churches have a very patriarchal history and ideology, and are actors that *act politically against gender equality policies* or strategies. In these two papers, by Kakepaki and by Van der Wal and Verloo, the Church is seen as both a part of a polity (in line with Walby 2009), to the extent that a particular Church is intertwined with state power or has quasi state powers. The Church is also seen to be part of civil society to the extent that it is an actor that organises religious meetings and activities, and is actively disseminating values.

Another contribution to this Objective can be found in the analysis of the new equality architecture in the UK, where Walby, Armstrong and Strid demonstrate how important it is to take a *broader perspective to policymaking that includes class based institutions and other institutions for consultation with civil society*. Because the overarching system for dealing with equalities in the context of employment is contained within a system that has a strong class logic, this inequality is well represented and the absence of a specific representation of relevant gender, ethnic or disability interests within that system hinders positive outcomes for gender+ equality. It also becomes clear from their analysis that civil society is not always divided by 'strand', but in practice also includes organisations that embrace several, all or specific intersectional inequalities.

OBJECTIVE 3. CONCEPTUALIZING PARTICIPATORY FORMS OF GENDER AND DIVERSITY MAINSTREAMING BY ACCENTUATING VOICE AND CIVIL SOCIETY INTERFACES

This Objective will be addressed mainly through the recommendations that will be made at the end of the project.

OBJECTIVE 4. CONCEPTUALIZING AND MAPPING OF CIVIL SOCIETY TEXTS ON GENDER + EQUALITY

All in all, 351 texts originating in civil society have been selected and analysed in LARG, STRIQ and WHY. Among those, 190 were texts from organisations linked to gender, 12 from organisations linked to race-ethnicity, 30 from organisations linked to class, 37 from organisations linked to sexual orientation. In total 76 texts were from general civil society organisations (charities, human rights, academic), and 16 from organisations that mobilise against gender equality.

To enable a broader understanding, the Country Context studies (D41) mapped for each country and for the European Union:

- The degree to which social partners are integrated in policy decisions
- The presence of national organisations on gender, on class and on other intersecting social inequalities, as well as some of their characteristics
- The presence or absence of hotspots and alliances at national level

The two Objectives that are on QUING's contribution to theory (numbers 8 and 9) are strongly linked to those on conceptualization. They focus on both citizenship and gender regimes.

OBJECTIVE 8. DEVELOPING AN INSTITUTIONAL APPROACH TO PRACTICES OF CITIZENSHIP

The main contribution towards this Objective has been made by the three manuals written for the WHY activity (D20, D23 and D24). These manuals map out what should be the data for the analysis (policy frames and institutional resources such as law, gender machinery and engagement with civil society), and what are the main explanatory factors (the nature of the civil society interface, the structure of political opportunities, the nature and activities of coalitions and opponents and the wider context of the gender regime'. The papers confirm the importance of these factors. An example: Based on their empirical analysis of the UK, Walby, Armstrong and Strid argue convincingly that outcomes of equality policy are not solely shaped by the equality institutions themselves and stress that the wider context of economy, polity and civil society always has to be taken into account. Additionally, several papers point to the importance of discursive institutional factors such as a shared language (Acar and Altunok), values on Europeanness or modernity discourses.

OBJECTIVE 9. DEVELOPING A TYPOLOGY OF GENDER REGIMES IN EUROPE

Next to the typology of gender+ equality frames that has been presented in the LARG report, one of the papers also engages in a contribution to combining theory and empirical results towards a typology of gender regimes in Europe.

Lauwers maps out and compares the leave regulations in all the Member States of the European Union based on a theoretical framework using the work of Fraser and Robeyns. In doing so, she categorizes all countries referring to four ideal types (male breadwinner, dual breadwinner, equal valuation of different contributions and equal sharing), thereby linking to different visions of gender equality. She shows that none of these ideal type models exist in practice, that a large number of countries combine elements of equal valuation of different contributions with elements of the other

types, that elements of the male breadwinner model can be found in many countries, that the European Union can best be characterised as dual breadwinner model, and that countries that are based on equal sharing elements are a minority.

The two Objectives that are on the gathering and presentation of material (numbers 5 and 6) were addressed substantially in the context of the LARG activity, especially the ones on assessing the content and quality of current gender+ equality policies and assessing the standing and voice of civil society. Still, the papers contribute to these Objectives too with more detail and links to theory. The Objective on explaining these policies is at the heart of the WHY activity, as well as linking conceptualizations to empirical analysis.

OBJECTIVE 5. ASSESSING THE CONTENT AND QUALITY OF GENDER+ EQUALITY POLICIES IN THE EU'S MULTICULTURAL CONTEXT

The papers that engage in assessing the content and quality of gender equality policies in the EU's multicultural context address a variety of dimensions. In line with QUING's ambition to focus on the way in which gender equality policies pay attention to and deal with other inequalities than gender, a number of papers assesses the gender equality policies along the lines of the *presence, absence or specific nature of dealing with other inequalities*. They assess the quality through a lens that acknowledges the need to incorporate attention for other inequalities that intersect with gender while avoiding intersectional bias such as stigmatization or exclusion of intersectional categories.

- Two papers analyse the level of the European Union, and the content and equality of its gender+ equality policies. They both focus on the way intersectionality is positioned within these policies. Lombardo and Verloo focus on institutionalization processes and outcomes, while Lombardo and Rolandsen Agustín analyse how gender intersections are framed. Concerning policy developments on institutionalizing intersectionality, Lombardo and Verloo address the question of the balance of opportunities and constraints in these developments. They conclude that so far, the European Union is moving from a unitary to a multiple approach, but does so mainly by juxtaposing inequalities rather than by treating them as somehow related to each other. Moreover, the overall level of protection of various inequalities is not equal, hindering the quality of gender+ equality policies. Lombardo and Rolandsen Agustín ask more specifically how the quality of gender equality policies at EU level is affected by its framing of intersectionality: have these policies become more inclusive of other inequalities that intersect with gender? They answer that EU policy documents show a tendency to use intersectional dimensions in an implicit way, mainly using a separate or inarticulate approach to the relation between categories linked to inequalities, resulting in a weak framing of intersectionality: no bias or stigmatizing, but no attention for structural levels or privilege either. This inarticulateness could be a starting point for further elaboration, but it could also neutralize and diffuse policy content to the extent even that the gender dimension is blurred. More recent texts are giving more visibility to the problem of intersecting inequalities, although the strongest attention is for the intersection of age and

gender, mostly linked to an economic development agenda which could hinder a broader understanding of gender equality.

- For the UK, Walby, Armstrong and Strid show clearly that the changes in the official equality architecture – the merger of the Equality Commissions into the Equality and Human Rights Commission – show stability as well as change in how inequalities are conceptualized, and that the implications of these changes challenge theory in two ways. Firstly, because previous Commissions did not completely ignore multiple inequalities in the past and especially class was powerfully represented at many points. Secondly, because the empirical analysis shows a wider range of models in how multiple inequalities are addressed. Armstrong, Walby and Strid directly address the question whether recognition of differences between women such as class and ethnicity improves policy quality in the field of non-employment, defining quality as the extent to which a policy promotes transformation of gender relations in paid work and care. For the UK, they show that the overall gender equality policy suffers from some inconsistencies (such as a mix of a transformation agenda with an acceptance of women's difference), and that there is uneven attention for differences within the category of women resulting in double or triple standards seeing paid work as good for certain categories of women while 'choice' is accepted for other women. This differentiation runs the risk of stigmatising the groups that are made visible as in need to engage in paid work. Moreover, on closer examination in terms of the quality of the policies, the policy is stronger on accepting the primary role of women as carers than on transformation of gender relations, which also impacts negatively on the quality.
- Dedić shows how attention for a specific ethnic minority – Roma – in gender equality policies has led to a feminization of the Roma community in the European context. The exclusive focus on Roma women in dealing with the exclusion and stigmatization of these communities hinders structural and transformative policies.
- Lombardo and Verloo stress the current absence of institutional encouragement for cooperation across bureaucratic units, agencies or movement organisations that are linked to specific inequalities as a hindrance to the quality of gender+ equality policies.
- Verloo analyzes how the goals of demographic balance and gender equality are often interwoven and reflects on the implications of this for gender+ equality. She concludes that some of the gender+ equality policies on reconciliation or on reproductive rights differentiate between women that are deemed worthy of reproducing and that are privileged in the policies, and women that are seen as having rather too many children already, and who are therefore excluded from policy rhetoric, or worse, from benefits. Among the last category are Roma women (Romania), low qualified women (Germany), and women with the wrong nationality (Bulgaria, Estonia and Romania). This analysis shows an intersectional bias that is detrimental to the quality of gender+ equality policies.
- For Italy, del Giorgio and Lombardo characterise the institutionalisation of intersectionality as basically failed and at best accidental, but also point out that there are discriminatory biases in the form of institutional racism and homophobia, thereby negatively affecting the quality of gender equality policies.
- On another note, Pilinkaite-Sotorivic shows that the quality of Lithuanian gender+ equality policies on intimate citizenship is hindered by a strong defence of national culture that is seen by dominant conservative forces as essentially heterosexual and as threatened by EU norms.

OBJECTIVE 6. ASSESSING THE STANDING AND VOICE OF CIVIL SOCIETY IN GENDER+ EQUALITY POLICIES

Next to the LARG report which had shown some basic patterns in the standing and voice of civil society in gender+ equality policies, a number of papers focused more specifically on the role of this set of actors in one country or in a set of countries. Questions answered are: when and why are civil society organisations that push for gender equality weak or strong? What is the contribution of these organisations to better quality policies? What is the nature and impact of civil society organisations working against gender equality? In line with the contributions discussed under Objective 2, the answer to the first question is that the strength of civil society organizations is partly conditioned by access to resources and available consultational interfaces as well as possibilities for alliances. Partly also women's movements are stronger in presence in and articulation of some policy fields than in others which impacts on the potential strength of their influence and power. In answer to the second question, the papers mostly see that active engagement of civil society organizations that work towards gender equality with policy making positively impacts on the degree of transformativity and inclusion of these policies. Related to the last question, some papers have shown the negative influence of the Catholic Church on gender equality policies, especially in the field of intimate citizenship.

- Focusing specifically on the interface between civil society and policymaking, Ocnasova shows that the effect of women's organizations in both Czech Republic and Slovakia is limited not only because of the formality of consultation procedures, but also because funding is limited in practice to links through the European Structural Funds. This hinders the use of their expertise in policymaking.
- In her analysis of the implications of the interwoven goals of demographic balance and gender equality, Verloo also shows that feminist voices on the issue of demographic balance are rather weak, and that there is not really a strong debate about this issue in the countries she compares.
- For the UK, Walby, Armstrong and Strid argue that the pressure of a diverse and active range of civil societal organisations at least partly explains why the focus of the newly merged EHRC has not been narrowed too much to only discrimination in employment.
- For Germany, Urbanek finds that texts originating in civil society play an important role in addressing the situation of women at intersections. Similarly, Krizsan, Popa and Zentai attribute the few examples of intersectional institutionalization in ten CEECs to NGO voices and activities supported by international influence. Also at the level of the European Union, civil society texts are stronger than policy texts when it comes to intersectionality, in the sense that they are more explicit and elaborate, as Lombardo and Rolandsen Agustín show.
- Krizsan and Popa show the crucial impact of strategic discursive action by women's movement actors in bringing about policies on domestic violence in five Central and eastern European states.
- Two papers take up the challenge to focus more specifically on the Church as an active actor in policymaking that can explain the specific character that gender+ equality policies have in certain countries. Kakepaki analyses for Greece how the Orthodox Church - characterised

more by ceremonial than faith issues – results in a certain degree of freedom on intimate citizenship issues that becomes apparent in frames that stress the need for policies to be adapted to a changing reality, yet also idealizes family and motherhood. Van der Wal and Verloo set out to ask whether the extent to which we find frames resonating with Vatican frames ('Catholic' frames) in sixteen European countries where the Roman Catholic religion is the strongest religion is connected to the level of religiosity, the support for Catholic religious values or the institutional strength of the Catholic Church in the country. Their findings are in line with some literature that sees cultural factors to explain the presence of 'Catholic' frames in gender+ equality policy better than institutional factors. Within institutional factors the official state-church relationship can better explain the presence of Catholic views in policy, even if this relationship is very weak, than factors such as the presence of Catholic parties in government. All in all, this shows that more research is needed to fully understand the relationship between Catholic religion and the quality of gender equality policies, as all the frames that are labelled 'Catholic' in this paper run against gender equality.

- Within a broader analysis, Pilinkaite-Sotorivic describes the role of the Catholic Church in Lithuania as an important force strengthening conservative voices against gender+ equality, especially in the areas where the EU's remit is limited or absent (mostly areas seen as belonging to the private sphere, such as family policy, reproductive rights and to some extent also gender based violence). In Lithuania, the voices of women NGOs that argued in favour of gender equality in the private sphere, and against the rhetoric of the traditional family model, have been largely ignored by policy makers.

OBJECTIVE 7. EXPLAINING DEFICIENCIES, DEVIATIONS AND INCONSISTENCIES IN EU AND MEMBER STATE'S GENDER+ EQUALITY POLICIES

The literature review in the WHY activity (Walby 2007) stated that the best explanation of policy and political projects is one that is multi-layered, drawing on economic, political and civil societal processes, and this is what can be found in most of the papers.

A large set of papers centre on the *actual incorporation of attention for other inequalities than gender in gender equality policies*, more specifically on institutionalization. They also give attention to explaining why the incorporation of other inequalities than gender is rather weak, or why particular forms of dealing with multiple inequalities are found. Factors mentioned are pressure from civil society or from international actors, path dependency and historical legacies of national equality policies, overall framing of policy issues, and agency.

Krizsan, Popa and Zentai compare ten new Central and Eastern EU Member States in their different patterns of institutionalization of multiple inequalities. They show that, while in just about 10 years CEECs moved from socialist women's policy to largely reinforced notions of women's difference and acknowledging complex transformative equality policy strategies, engagement of equality institutional structures with intersectionality has not come a long way in these countries. The few isolated examples resulted from activities of NGOs and are linked to international influence.

Comparing Spain, Italy and Portugal, three Southern European countries that share many characteristics, Lombardo and Bustelo show that under apparent similarities, such as an approach to

inequalities that is characterized by a unitary approach shifting to multiple inequalities, these three countries are developing in different ways, reflecting a constantly changing and path dependent spectrum of empirical possibilities: Portugal shows stability and a gradual inclusion of other inequalities, Italy is hindered by a lack of democracy and coordination in dealing with multiple inequalities, while Spain – driven by a Left government that has been very active - gives a hegemonic position to gender while at the same time having strong policies on sexuality equality and a lagging attention to race/ethnicity. This comparative paper shows the importance of national contexts in shaping policies that are also deeply influenced by EU policy.

Zooming in on Spain, Bustelo and Forest characterize the country as still having a unitary approach to the treatment of multiple inequalities in policymaking, consisting of separate institutions and giving primary attention and priority to gender. They analyse this specific character as resulting from path dependent features of the politics of antidiscrimination. Recent developments however have resulted in a more inclusive understanding of gender equality, pointing out the role of other inequality dimensions such as age and ethnicity. The multi-level polity that Spain is also generates potentially innovative contributions from the regional to the national level.

Zooming in on Portugal, Alonso uses its gradual process from a unitary to a multiple approach that mentions additions and interactions, to focus on the specific Portuguese institutional arrangement, consisting of a third way of dealing with intersectionality. Neither separated nor integrated, this third model is based on establishing strong cooperation between existing separate bodies. The emerging presence of a net of equality bodies could lead to strengthening alliances and lead to rainbow triangles.

Comparing three Nordic countries, Kvist, Carbin and Harjunen analyze the different debates and consequences of tax reform for domestic services. They conclude that the various ways that this issue has been framed in the countries impacted on the intensity and character of the debates. In Denmark, class and ethnicity are central in the debate while gender is almost absent. In Finland, the issue was not seen as about inequalities, but about job creation. The stronger and longer debate and contestation in Sweden is linked to a framing in terms of gender equality (how it was seen to impact on women's labour market participation and on equal sharing of domestic work between men and women) and less in terms of job creation and integration. A comparison of such debates in two very different welfare states (Sweden and Spain) by Kvist and Peterson reveals similarities in terms of framing centred around gender equality and women's labour market participation, and as such a more liberal model of inclusion, but crucial differences that are connected to differences in welfare state regimes: in the context of welfare state retrenchment in Sweden, the debate was highly polarized between right and left parties, but none of them focused on the rights of domestic care workers; in the context of an existing private domestic care sector in Spain, precariousness of work conditions was more firmly on the agenda.

In another comparison of the three Nordic countries, Carbin, Harjunen and Kvist analyse differences in intersectional reproductive rights: fertility treatment policies for lesbian mothers. They show not only how these policies are very different in these three similar countries but also construct exclusions for different citizens. While Sweden is based on coupledness and excludes all single (lesbian) mothers, in Finland the co-mother is not recognized and in Denmark the existence of a known biological father excludes co/motherhood. The countries are similar in their absence of

attention for heteronormativity and for fatherhood by homosexual men. The absences and exclusions are negatively impacting on the quality of these policies for gender+ equality policy.

Comparing the Netherlands and Belgium, Lauwers and Martens focus on the political practice of dealing with multiple, intersecting inequalities. Belgium and the Netherlands have contrasting institutional setups for equality bodies: while Belgium has an integrated legislation and separated bodies, the Netherlands has an integrated body and separate legislation. In current practice, there are discussions about an intersectional approach in both countries, but Belgium has not yet applied an intersectional approach while the Netherlands have (even if this is an exception to the rule). They conclude that this indicates that not only the institutional setup is important for intersectional practice, but also agency, the degree to which people working in these institutions are willing and able to adapt. Such agency in turn can lead to institutional changes as well, as was shown in the Netherlands where the internal organization of the integrated Equality Body was adapted to fit better with multiple strand complaints. Possibly agency is facilitated more by an integrated body than by an integrated legislation.

Some papers point to the phenomenon that *civil society voices and actions are not only a positive factor explaining the presence or success of gender+ equality policies*. Under the broader label of civil society there are also actors that lobby or act against gender+ equality policy, as became clear in the papers of Kakepaki and Pilinkaite-Sotorivic discussed above.

Van der Wal and Verloo, comparing the degree to which official positions of the Vatican are found in gender+ equality policy texts in Catholic countries, attempt to show the impact of institutional linkages between the Catholic Church and the state, but conclude that cultural factors seem to explain the variance better than institutional factors. They interpret this however also as the result of weak data on institutional variables.

Röder, in a comparison between antidiscrimination legislation in Germany and Czech Republic, attributes the slowness of passing this Bill in both countries (inter alia) to the presence of both pro and anti-groups in civil society.

A large number of papers use the framework of **Europeanization** to understand deficiencies, deviations and inconsistencies in EU and Member State's gender+ equality policies. An important question in this is whether there are 'classic' *differences among East-West or North-South countries*. As there is limited research on the Europeanization of the new Member States after Accession, the QUING papers present crucial new material. Another important feature of the papers is a focus on *policy issues where the EU has limited or no competence* (gender based violence and intimate citizenship). These issues that have at best soft policy measures installed around them, and show more clearly the constructivist aspects of Europeanization, contributing to theories on norm construction. All papers that address the influence of the European Union stress the interplay of EU and domestic factors. Forest and Lombardo have elaborated more theoretically on Europeanization theory moving away from rigid convergence - divergence models to approaches that stress

institutional, discursive and interactional factors, thereby contributing to a more pluralistic and discursive approach to Europeanization.

Concerning the existence of patterns across groups of countries, comparing countries across common divisions gives crucial information. Röder shows strong similarities between Germany and Czech Republic in both the process and the outcome of their antidiscrimination legislation. These similarities defy any easy East-West divide. She identifies the role of the ECJ, but also the positive actions of the Green parties in both countries as crucial for the passing of this legislation. Lauwers' assessment of leave regulations in all European Union Member States similarly defies East-West divisions.

Kuhar analyzes Europeanization on an issue where national competences are still primary: same sex partnership regulations. While top down Europeanization therefore cannot be expected, he shows that there is a form of Europeanization where transfer of practices takes place between countries, strengthened by links made in the framing to anti-discrimination legislation. This horizontal transfer takes place through the use of role model countries and the positioning of countries vis-à-vis these countries.

In a comparison between Czech Republic and Slovakia, Ocnasova focuses on differences in discursive adoption of EU's gender equality norms. These differences and the overall fragility of gender+ equality policies in these countries are caused by differences in the national context. Next to classic differences such as differences in the dominant political parties - where, as often, the Right wing parties have less to offer for the development of gender equality policies than the social democratic or progressive ones – one important difference concerns attitudes towards the European Union – positive in Slovakia, sceptical in Czech Republic.

Pilinkaite-Sotorivic focuses on whether Lithuania, as a new Member State has adopted the discursive norms of the EU on gender equality and antidiscrimination by zooming in on issues of intimate citizenship where the competence of the EU is low or absent. Is there a common set of norms that also works through soft law or discursive norm setting? She shows that, while Lithuania has transposed the EU Directives on gender equality and antidiscrimination, there is no indirect influence of the EU outside of this. While there is formal transposition of EU Directives and institutional mechanisms, there is no transformation into social or political practices. On the contrary, family policy is very strongly articulated in terms of a unique national culture as based on wedlock and heteronormativity, and diversity of family forms and women's reproductive rights are seen as treats to the Lithuanian nation and statehood.

Krizsan and Popa's analysis of the framing of domestic violence policies – another policy issue with limited competence for the EU - in five Central and Eastern European countries uses process tracing to identify three mechanisms of influence: EU conditionality, financial incentives of social learning for change (Daphne) and discursive mechanisms used by internal actors to frame the role of the EU.

Focusing on an area with strong EU competences, Jarty analyzes the impact of the EU on the (de)construction of categories of 'non-employed' citizens in France, a country notorious for its 'transposition neglect. She shows a more nuanced picture, where some influence of EU framing of gender equality can be found, through a focus on several levels and actors in France.

For Greece, Pantelidou Maloutas argues that there is a dual political culture that embraces European values on gender equality mainly as positive modernizing values that can and should bring economic development by itself and through compliance with European Directives, while at the same time maintaining its introverted, conservative, traditional and xenophobic elements. In this dual culture, the European Union and its demands for gender equality are often presented as ‘an unavoidable natural phenomenon’ that are taken on board in a narrow sense, not connected to changes in actual social structures and gender perceptions in Greek society, limiting the impact of the European Union on transformative change in gender relations. A similar tension between European culture (framed as linked to gender equality goals and seen as secular) and national culture (identified as linked to traditional gender order, and seen as Christian) is found to exist in Poland. Dabrowska shows that this tensions occurs predominantly when issues are connected to the private sphere (as is the case for gender based violence, same sex partnerships, reproductive rights), asking whether we should distinguish between ‘public’ and ‘private’ Europeanization.

Alonso and Forest use the case of Spain to analyse processes of norm diffusion in gender equality policies at the regional level, showing that Europeanization processes can also be found at the regional level in influencing shifts towards mainstreaming instruments and from implementation oriented measures to hard antidiscrimination provisions. In focusing on the regional level, they unveil peer learning processes as well as institutional isomorphism (between national and regional level). They also show how gender equality policies are shaped by political contention around self-governance, nationalist discourses or the importance of EU/funding for the regional level.

While the last Objective is specifically linked to the OPERA activity, in its focus on defining more inclusive standards for gender+ expertise, the focus on conceptualizing and assessing the quality of gender+ equality policies is an integral part of it.

OBJECTIVE 10. DEFINING MORE INCLUSIVE STANDARDS FOR GENDER+ EQUALITY POLICIES

This Objective is addressed predominantly through the OPERA activity in QUING. One of the papers explicitly aims at bridging the knowledge generated in the other activities by asking how intersectionality can be and should be dealt with in gender+ training. Baer, Keim and Nowotnick analysed contemporary training manuals to show that, although there is an awareness of a complexity of inequalities, intersectionality or any related term are rarely used concepts. They develop recommendations of how intersectionality should be included, in which they recommend a conceptualization of intersectionality as multilevel and dynamic.

There are a few recommendations on inclusive standards in other papers:

- For the EU Lombardo and Lise Rolandsen suggest that a more inclusive civil society consultation, in line with the strengthening of the civil dialogue envisaged in the Lisbon treaty, might be combined with a process of intersectionality impact assessment.
- Based on the analysis of differentiation of women in non/employment policies in the UK, Armstrong, Walby and Strid recommend that if particular groups are targeted this needs to be in the context of a wider concern for gender equality in a transformative sense and inclusive of women in general.

Bibliography

Bacchi, Carol (1999), *Women, Policy and Politics. The Construction of Policy Problems*, London: Sage.

_____ (2005), "Discourse, discourse everywhere: Subject "agency" in feminist discourse methodology", *Nordic Journal of Women's Studies*, 13, pp. 198–209.

_____ (2009), „The issue of intentionality in frame theory: The need for reflexive framing“, in Emanuela Lombardo, Petra Meier and Mieke Verloo (eds.), *The Discursive Politics of Gender Equality: Stretching, Bending and Policymaking*, London: Routledge.

Baisnée, Olivier and Romain Pasquier (2007), *L'Europe telle qu'elle se fait. Européanisation et sociétés politiques nationales*, Paris, CNRS Editions.

Bergqvist, Christina et al. (1999), *Equal democracies?: gender and politics in the Nordic countries*. Scandinavian University Press.

Beveridge, Fiona and Sue Nott (2002), "Mainstreaming: a case for optimism and cynicism", *Feminist Legal Studies*, 10, pp. 299-311.

Bleijenbergh, Inge (2004), *Citizens who Care: European Social Citizenship in EU debates on Childcare and Part-time work*, Amsterdam: Dutch University Press.

Börzel, Tanja and Thomas Risse (2003), "Conceptualizing the Domestic Impact of Europe", in Kevin Featherstone and Claudio Radaelli (eds.), *The Politics of Europeanization*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 57-82.

Brah, Avtar and Ann Phoenix (2004), "Ain't I A Woman? Revisiting Intersectionality", *Journal of International Women's Studies*, 5(3), pp. 75-86.

Brewer *et al.* (2002), "The Complexities and Potential of Theorizing Gender, Caste, Race, and Class", *Feminist Economics*, 8(2), pp. 3-18.

Browne, Irene and Joya Misra (2003), "The Intersection of Gender and Race in the Labour Market", *Annual Review of Sociology*, n°28, pp. 487-583.

Bryld, Mette (2001), "The infertility clinic and the birth of the lesbian: The political debate on assisted reproduction in Denmark", *European Journal of Women's studies* 2001/3, p. 299-312.

Bustelo, María (2009), "Intersectionality faces the strong Gender Norm", *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, Volume 11, Issue 4/2009, pp. 530- 546.

Butorova, Zora and Jarmila Filadelfiova (2007), Equality between Women and Men, in Institute for Public Affairs (ed.), *Slovakia 2006: A Global Report on the State of Society*. Bratislava: IVO.

Carbin, Maria and Sofie Tornhill (2004), Intersektionalitet- ett oanvändbart begrepp?, *Kvinnovetenskaplig tidskrift*, (3), pp. 111-114.

Carter, Caitriona and Romain Pasquier (2006), "European Integration and the Transformation of Regional Governance: Testing the Analytical Purchase of 'Europeanisation'", [http://www.qub.ac.uk/schools/SchoolofPoliticsInternationalStudiesandPhilosophy/FileStore/Europe anisationFiles/Filetoupload,38451,en.pdf](http://www.qub.ac.uk/schools/SchoolofPoliticsInternationalStudiesandPhilosophy/FileStore/Europe%20anisationFiles/Filetoupload,38451,en.pdf).

Centrum voor Gelijkheid van Kansen en Racismebestrijding (2009), *Discriminatie en diversiteit. Jaarverslag 2008*. Brussel: Centrum voor Gelijkheid van Kansen en Racismebestrijding.

Collins, Patricia H. (2000), "It's All in the Family: Intersections of Gender, Race, and Nation", in Uma Narayan and Sandra Harding (eds.), *Decentering the Center: Philosophy for a Multicultural, Postcolonial, and Feminist World*, Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, pp. 156-76.

Crenshaw, Kimberlé (1989), "Demarginalising the intersection of Race and Sex: a Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine. Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics", *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, pp.139-167.

_____ (1991), "Mapping the margins: intersectionality, identity politics and violence against women of color", *Stanford Law Review* 43 (6), pp. 1241-1299.

_____ (1993), "Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color", *Stanford Law Review*, vol.43, pp. 1241- 1299.

_____ (2002), "Documento para o encontro de especialistas em aspectos da discriminação racial relativos ao gênero", *Revista de Estudos Feministas*, 10º ano, 3º trimestre, pp. 171-188.

Dale, Angela, Joanne Lindley, and Shirley Dex (2006), "A Life-course Perspective on Ethnic Differences in Women's Economic Activity in Britain", *European Sociological Review* 22 (3), pp. 323-337.

Dasvarma, Amrita and Evelyn Loh (2002), Paper titled 'Intersectional Discrimination' prepared for 'Beyond tolerance National Conference on Racism, by the Australian Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission, 13 March 2002. http://www.hreoc.gov.au/racial_discrimination/conferences/beyond_tolerance/speeches/dasvarma.html

Davis, Kathy (2008), "Intersectionality as buzzword: A sociology of science perspective on what makes feminist theory successful", *Feminist Theory* 9(1), pp. 67-85.

Deacon, Bob et al. (1992), *The New Eastern Europe: Social Policy Past, Present and Future*. Chapter 1 and 7, London: Sage Publications.

De Búrca, Gráinne (2005), "Towards European Welfare?", in Gráinne De Búrca (ed.), *EU Law and the Welfare State. In Search of Solidarity*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 1-9.

Dex, Shirley, Heather Joshi, and Susan Macran (1996), "A widening gulf among Britain's mothers", *Oxford Review of Economic Policy* 12 (1), pp. 65-75.

Dustin, Moira, and Anne Phillips (2008), "Whose agenda Is It?: Abuses of women and abuses of 'culture' in Britain", *Ethnicities* 8 (3), pp. 405-424.

Esping-Andersen, Gosta (1990), *The three worlds of welfare capitalism*. Cambridge: Polity.

European Commission (2007), *Tackling Multiple Discrimination: Practices, Policies and Laws*. Directorate-General for Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities, Unit G4, Brussels.

European Parliament (2006) *Rights or Religion: Can the EP deliver?* Joint meeting of the WG Sexual reproductive health, HIV/Aids and Development & the WG of Separation of Religion and Politics, 10th of October 2006.

European Women's Lobby (2006). *Religion and women's human rights position paper of the European Women's Lobby*, 27 may 2006.

_____ (2007), *Reality Check: When Women's NGOs Map Policies and Legislation on Violence against Women*, Brussels: European Women's Lobby. <http://www.womenlobby.org/SiteResources/data/MediaArchive/Violence%20Centre/documents/Copy%20of%20NAP-final-feb07.pdf>.

Falkner, Gerda and Oliver Treib (2008), "Three Worlds of Compliance of Four? The EU15 compared to New Member States", *Journal of Common Market Studies*, vol. 46, n°2, pp. 293-314.

Ferree, Myra Marx (2006), "Globalization and feminism: opportunities and obstacles for activism in the global arena", in Myra Marx Ferree and Aili Mari Tripp (eds.), *Global Feminism. Transnational women's activism, organising, and human rights*, New York and London: New York University Press, pp. 3-23.

_____ (2009), "Inequality, intersectionality and the politics of discourse: Framing feminist alliances", in Emanuela Lombardo et al. (eds.), *The Discursive Politics of Gender Equality: Stretching, Bending and Policymaking*, New York: Routledge, pp. 84-101.

Ferree, Myra Marx and Aili Mari Tripp (eds.) (2006), *Global Feminism. Transnational women's activism, organising, and human rights*, New York and London: New York University Press.

Fodor, Eva (2004), "The State Socialist Emancipation Project: Gender Inequality in

Workplace Authority in Hungary and Austria." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, Spring, 29 (3), pp. 783-804.

Fodor, Eva, Christy Glass, Janette Kawachi, and Livia Popescu (2002), "Family policies and gender in Hungary, Poland and Romania", *Communist and Post-Communist Studies*, 4, pp. 475- 490.

Forest, Maxime and María Bustelo (2009), "The politics of intersectionality in Spain: Shaping intersectional approaches in a multi-level polity", *Series of QUING Working Papers*.

Forest, Maxime, Silvia Lopez *et alii*, (2009), QUING series of LARG comparative reports, Vienna: IWM.

Forest, Maxime, Raquel Platero *et alii*, (2008), *QUING series of STRIQ country reports: Spain*, Vienna: IWM.

Fraser, Nancy (1997), "After the Family Wage: A Postindustrial Thought Experiment", in Nancy Fraser (ed.), *Justice Interruptus. Critical Reflections on the 'Postsocialist' Condition*, New York and London: Routledge.

- _____ (2009), "Feminism, capitalism and the cunning of history", *New left review* 56, 299, pp. 97-117.
- Fredman, Sandra (2005), "Double trouble: Multiple discrimination and EU Law", *European Anti-discrimination Law Review* 2, pp. 13-19.
- Gal, Susan and Gail Kligman (2000), *The Politics of Gender After Socialism. A comparative-historical essay*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Gallego *et alii.* (2003), "Las políticas sociales de la Unión Europea", in Gallego *et alii.* (ed.), *Estado de Bienestar y Comunidades Autónomas*, Madrid: Tecnos.
- Geddes, Andrew and Virginie Guiraudon (2004), "Britain, France, and the EU Anti-discrimination Policy: The Emergence of an EU Policy Paradigm", *West European Politics*, Vol. 27, no2, pp. 334-353.
- Gedeon, Peter (1995), "Hungary: Social Policy in Transition", *East European Politics and Societies* 9, pp. 433-58.
- González María José, Teresa Jurado and Manuela Naldini (eds.) (2000), *Gender Inequalities in Southern Europe. Women, work and welfare in the 1990s*, London- Portland: Frank Cass.
- Goven, Joanna (2000), "New Parliament, Old Discourse? The Parental Leave Debate in Hungary", in Susan Gal and Gail Kligman (eds.), *Reproducing Gender: Politics, Publics and Everyday Life after Socialism*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Graziano, Paolo and Michael Vink (2008), *Europeanization: New Research Agendas*, Houndmills: Palgrave Mac Millan.
- Hadzi-Miceva, Katerina (2007), Paper developed by Katerina Hadzi-Miceva (Legal Advisor, European Center for Not-for-profit Law – ECNL, www.ecnl.org).
- Hancock, Ange-Marie (2007), "When Multiplication Doesn't Equal Quick Addition: Examining Intersectionality as a Research Paradigm", *Perspectives on Politics*, 5(1), pp. 63-79.
- Haney, Lynne (2002), *Inventing the Needy: Gender and the Politics of Welfare in Hungary*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- _____ (2003), "Welfare Reform with a Familial Face: Reconstituting State and Domestic Relations in Post-Socialist Eastern Europe", in Lynne Haney and Lisa Pollard (eds.), *Families of a New World: Gender, Politics, and State Development in a Global Context*, New York: Routledge.
- Hannett, Sarah (2003), "Equality at the intersections: The Legislative and judicial failure to tackle multiple discrimination", *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies* 23 (1), pp. 65-86.
- Heywood, Andrew (1997), *Politics*. London: MacMillan.
- Hinno, Krista, Mikko Lagerspetz and Tanel Vallimäe (2008), *Kolmas sektor arvupeeglis. Küsitlus- ja statistikaandmed mittetulundusühenduste ja nendes osalejate kohta 2004-2007*. Tallinna Ülikoolis Rahvusvaheliste ja sotsiaaluuringute instituudi Kodanikeühiskonna uurimis- ja arenduskeskus.

Hobson, Barbara (2003), "Recognition struggles in universalistic and gender distinctive frames: Sweden and Ireland", in Barbara Hobson (ed.), *Recognition Struggles and Social Movements. Contested Identities, Agency and Power*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

_____ (2006), "The Evolution of the Women-friendly State: Opportunities and Constraints in the Swedish Welfare State", in Razavi and Hassim (eds.), *Gender and Social Policy in a Global Context: Uncovering the Gendered Structure of 'the Social'*, UNRISD, Palgrave Macmillan.

Hobson, Barbara and Livia Sz. Olah (2006), "Birthstrikes? Agency and Capabilities in the Reconciliation of Employment and Family", *Marriage & Family Review* 39 (3), pp. 197-227.

Holland-Cunz, Barbara and Uta Ruppert (2000), "Globale Politik, politische Verhandlungen, frauenpolitische Chancen", in Barbara Holland-Cunz and Uta Ruppert (eds.), *Frauenpolitische Chancen globaler Politik, Verhandlungsverfahren im internationalen Kontext*. Opladen: Leske und Budrich, pp. 11-17.

Höllinger, Franz, Max Haller and Adriana Valle-Höllinger (2007), "Christian Religion, Society and the State in the modern World", *Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research*, 20:2, pp. 133-157.

Hooghe, Liesbet and Gary Marks (1996), "'Europe with the Regions': Channels of Regional Representation in the European Union", *The Journal of Federalism*, 26 (Winter), pp. 73-92.

Howell, Kerry E. (2004), *Developing Conceptualisations of Europeanization: Synthesising Methodological Approaches*. Queen's Papers on Europeanization No. 3/2004.

Hulko, Wendy (2009), "The Time- and Context-Contingent Nature of Intersectionality and Interlocking Oppressions", *Journal of Women and Social Work* 24(1), pp. 44-55.

Jacquot, Sophie and Cornelia Woll (2003), "Usage of European integration: Europeanisation from a sociological perspective", *European integration online papers*, vol. 7, n 1.

Junter, Annie (2004), "L'égalité professionnelle entre les femmes et les hommes: une exigence politique au coeur du droit du travail", *Travail, genre et sociétés*, N° 12, pp. 191-202.

Kantola, Johanna (2006), "Transnational and National Gender Equality Politics: The European Union's Impact on Domestic Violence Discourses in Finland and Britain", in Sirkku Hellsten, Anne Maria Holli and Krassimira Daskalova (eds.), *Women's Citizenship and Political Rights*, Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, pp.154-178.

Kantola, Johanna and Kevät Nousiainen (2009), "Institutionalising Intersectionality in Europe: Legal and Political Analyses", *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 11(4), pp. 459-477.

Kantola, Johanna and Joyce Outshoorn (eds.) (2007), *Changing State Feminism*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kelly, Liz (2005), "Inside outsiders: Mainstreaming Gender Violence into Human Rights Discourse and Practice", *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 7(4), pp. 471-495.

Koncz E., Katalin (ed.) (2005), *NGO Sustainability in Central Europe: Helping Civil Society Survive*. Open Society Institute. Budapest.

Krizsan, Andrea and Raluca Popa (2007), "A Success for the women's movement? Putting domestic violence on the policy agenda of Central and East European countries", Paper presented at the 4th ECPR General Conference, 6-8 September 2007, Pisa, Italy.

_____ (2008), "The Spillover Effects of Europeanization: EU conditionality, Norms Diffusion and Strategic Discursive Action in Domestic Violence Policies in Central and Eastern Europe", Paper presented at the Garnet PhD School, Kassel, Germany.

Laufer Jaqueline and Rachel Silvera (2004), "L'égalité professionnelle, vingt ans après", *Travail, genre et sociétés*, N° 12, pp. 171-172.

Le Feuvre, Nicky (2009), "The European Year for Equality for All in France", in *The Making of European Women's Studies*, vol. VII. ATHENA, Utrecht, Utrecht University Press, pp. 61-68.

Le Feuvre, Nicky and Muriel Andriocci (2002), "The history of equal opportunities legislation in France", in Gabriele Griffin (ed.), *Women's employment, women's studies, and equal opportunities 1945-2001*, Hull: University of Hull, pp. 231-291.

Le Feuvre, Nicky, and Rosemary Crompton (2000), "Gender, Family and Employment in Comparative Perspective: The Realities and Representations of Equal Opportunities in Britain and France", *European Journal of Social Policy*, vol. 10, n° 4, pp. 334-348.

Lenz, Ilse (2007), "Power People, Working People, Shadow People... Gender, Migration, Class and Practices of (In)Equality", in Ilse Lenz et al. (eds.), *Gender orders unbound*, Opladen & Farmington Hill: Barbara Budrich Publishers, pp. 99-119.

Lewis, Jane (2006), "Gender and Welfare in Modern Europe", *Past and Present*, Vol. 1 (supplement 1), pp. 39-54.

Liebert, Ulrike (ed.) (2003), *Gendering Europeanization*, Brussels: Peter Lang.

Ling, Kristiina (2008), *Kodanikeühiskonna diskursuse areng Riigikogus*, MA thesis, Tallinn University.

Lombardo et al. (eds.) (2009), *The Discursive Politics of Gender Equality. Stretching, Bending and Policy-making*. London: Routledge.

Lombardo, Emanuela and Mieke Verloo (2008), "Institutionalising intersectionality in the European Union? Policy developments and contestations", *ECPR*, Riga, 25-27 September.

_____ (2009), "Stretching gender equality to other inequalities: Political intersectionality in European gender equality policies", in Lombardo et al. (eds.), *The Discursive Politics of Gender Equality. Stretching, Bending and Policy-making*. London: Routledge, first edition, p. 67-83.

Lombardo, Emanuela, Maria Sanguiliano and Valentina Longo (2007), "Gender and employment' in the Italian policy debates 1995-2007: the construction of 'non employed' gendered subjects", unpublished paper presented at 4th ECPR General Conference, Pisa 6-8 September 2007.

Lukács, Erika and Mária Frey (2003), "The Gender Dimensions of Social Security Reform in Hungary", in Fultz, Elaine, Markus Ruck and Silke Steinhilber (eds.), *The Gender Dimensions of Social Security Reform in Central and Eastern Europe: Case Studies of the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland*, Budapest: International Labour Organisation, p. 43-1.

Mänd, Kristina, Urmo Kübar, Riin Kruusenberg, Kaspar Oja, Jon Ender and Martin Huberg (2008), *Protsent tulumaksust kodanikuühendustele. Lõppraport*, Praxis. Center for Policy Studies.

Maniokas, Klaudijus (2004), "The Method of the European union's Enlargement to the East: A critical appraisal", in Dimitrova Antuaneta L. (ed.), *Driven to Change: The European Union's Enlargement Viewed from the East*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, pp. 17-37.

Mazur, Amy (2004), "La France est-elle toujours le pays des réformes symboliques?", *Travail, genre et sociétés* 12, pp. 173-181.

McCall, Leslie (2005), "The complexity of intersectionality", *Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 30, 31, pp. 1771-1800.

Metso, Milka and Nicky Le Feuvre (2009), "Gender Equality and Diversity Policies in France", National Report 2A from Work-package 3 of the FEMCIT Project, Toulouse, SAGESSE-CERTOP-CNRS, June, 50 pages. <http://www.femcit.org>.

Minkenbergh, Michael (2002), "Religion and Public Policy. Institutional, cultural and political impact on the shaping of abortion policies in Western democracies", *Comparative political studies* vol 35, no 2, march 2002, pp. 221-247.

Montoya, Celeste (2008), "The European Union, capacity building, and transnational networks: Combating violence against women through the Daphne Program", *International Organization* 62, pp. 359-72.

Müller, Klaus (2008), "'Europäisierung' - Zur kulturellen Codierung der postkommunistischen Transformation", in Frank Bönker and Jan Wielgohs (eds.), *Postsozialistische Transformation und europäische (Des-)Integration: Bilanz und Perspektiven*. Marburg: Metropolis Verlag. pp. 121-142.

Oprea, Alexandra (2005), "The Arranged Marriage of Ana Maria Cioaba, Intra-Community Oppression and Romani Feminist Ideals: Transcending the 'Primitive Culture' Argument", *European Journal of Women's Studies* 12(2), pp. 133-148.

Orloff, Ann Shola (2008), *Feminism for a Post-Maternalist Era: Gender Equality Projects in Europe and America*, Paper presented at 'Challenging Boundaries' Social Policy Association Conference, June 23 2008.

Osborne, Raquel (2006), "Entre el rosa y el violeta. Lesbianismo, feminismo y movimiento gay: relato de unos amores difíciles", in *Labrys, études féministes/ estudos feministas*. Accessible online:

http://www.unb.br/ih/his/gefem/labrys10/espanha/raquel.htm#_ftnref1.

Ostner, Ilona, and Jane Lewis (1995), "Gender and the Evolution of European Social

Policies," in Stephan Leibfried and Paul Pierson, (eds.), *European Social Policy: Between Fragmentation and Integration*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.

Pavlík, Petr, Michaela Appeltová, Barbara Havelková, Lenka Bennerová, Eva Hejzlarová, Miluš Kotišová, Jana Smiggels kafková, Petra Zářecká, Kateřina Machovcová, Martina Hynková, Adéla Souralová, Irena Smetáčková, Marcela Linková, Hana Tenglerová, Ivana Spoustová and Marie Lienau (2008), *Shadow Report on Equal Opportunities for Women and Men*. Prague: Open Society Fund.

Phoenix, Ann and Pamela Pattynama (2006), "Intersectionality", *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 13(3), pp. 187-192.

Platt, Lucinda (2006), *Pay Gaps: The Position of Ethnic Minority Women and Men*. Manchester: Equal Opportunities Commission.

Platzer, Ellinor (2007), *Från folkhem till karriärhushåll : den nya husliga arbetsdelningen*, Lund: Arkiv.

Pollis, Adamantia (1999), "Greece: A Problematic Secular State", in Dimitris Christopoulos (ed.), *Legal Issues of religious Otherness*, Athens: Kritiki, pp.165-197 [in Greek].

Prins, Baukje (2006), "Narrative Accounts of Origins: A blind spot in the intersectional approach", *European Journal of Women's Studies* 13, pp. 277-290.

Radaelli, Claudio (2000), "Whither Europeanisation? Concept stretching and substantive change," *European Integration online Papers (EIoP)*, 4:7.

_____ (2004), "Europeanisation: Solution or Problem", *European Integration online Papers*, Vol. 8, n°16, <http://eiop.or.at/eiop/texte/2004-016a.thm>.

Reynolds, T. (2001), "Black mothering, paid work and identity", *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 24 (6), pp. 1046-1064.

Rydström, Jens (2005), "Tvåsamhetens brunn", in Don Kulick (ed.), *Queersverige*, Stockholm: Natur och Kultur,.

_____ (2008), "Legalising love in a cold climate: The history, consequences and recent developments of registered partnerships in Scandinavia", I *Sexualities* 2008/1-2.

Sainsbury, Diane (2000), *Gender and Welfare State Regimes*, Oxford University Press, USA.

Saraceno, Chiara (1994), "The Ambivalent Familism of the Italian Welfare State", *Social Politics*, 1(Spring), pp. 60-82.

Schimmelfennig, Frank and Ulrich Sedelmeier (eds.) (2005), *The Europeanization of Central and Eastern Europe*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Schmidt, Vivien A. and Claudio Radaelli (2004), "Policy change and discourse in Europe: Conceptual and Methodological Issues", *West European Politics* 27 (22), pp. 183-210.

Sedelmeier, Ulrich (2006), Europeanization in new member and candidate states. *Living Reviews in European Governance*, n.3.

Snyder, Margaret (2006), "Unlikely godmother: the UN and the global women's movement", in Myra Marx Ferree and Aili Mari Tripp (eds.), *Global Feminism. Transnational women's activism, organising, and human rights*, New York and London: New York University Press, pp. 24-50.

Squires, Judith (2005), "Is Mainstreaming Transformative? Theorizing Mainstreaming in the Context of Diversity and Deliberation", *Social Politics*, vol. 12(3), pp. 366- 388.

_____ (2007), *The New Politics of Gender Equality*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 1-20.

_____ (2008), "Intersecting Inequalities: Reflecting on the Subjects and Objects of Equality", *The Political Quarterly* 79, pp. 53-61.

Steven, Martin (2009), "Religious Lobbies in the European Union: from Dominant Church to Faith-Based Organisation?", *Religion, State and Society*, 37:1, pp. 181-191.

Stratigaki, Maria (2004), "The Co-optation of Gender Concepts in EU Policies: the Case of Reconciliation of Work and Family", *Social Politics* 11 (1), pp. 3-56.

Szalai, Júlia (2003), "Conflicting Struggles for Recognition: Clashing Interests of Gender and Ethnicity in Contemporary Hungary", in Barbara Hobson (ed.), *Recognition Struggles and Social Movements. Contested Identities, Agency and Power*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 188-214.

Szebehely, Marta (2005), "Care as Employment and Welfare Provision-Child Care and Elder Care in Sweden at the Dawn of the 21st Century", in Hanne Marlene Dahl and Tine Rask Eriksen (eds.), *Dilemmas Of Care In The Nordic Welfare State: Continuity And Change*, Aldershot: Ashgate, pp. 80-100.

Tarrow, Sidney (1998), *Power in movement*. Cambridge: CUP.

Tobío, Constanza (2005), *Madres que trabajan: dilemas y estrategias*. Madrid: Cátedra.

Toots, Anu (2008), "Kodanikuharidus 21. sajandiks", in *Ülevaade kodanikuhariduse hetkeseisust ja arengusuundatest*. Open Estonia Foundation.

Trujillo, Alfonso Lopez and Karl Romer (2006), *Family and Human Procreation*, Vatican City: The Pontifical Council for the Family.

Urbanek, Doris (2008), Pillarised, Blind and Biased: The Construction of Intersectionalities in Recent German Gender Equality and Diversity Policies.

Verloo, Mieke (2005), "Mainstreaming Gender Equality in Europe. A Frame Analysis Approach", *The Greek Review of Social Research*. 117(B), pp. 11-34.

_____ (2006), "Multiple Inequalities, Intersectionality and the European Union", *European Journal of Women's Studies* 13(3), pp. 211-228.

_____ (ed.) (2007), *Multiple meanings of gender equality: a critical frame analysis of gender policies in Europe*, Budapest: CPS Books.

Verloo, Mieke and Emanuela Lombardo (2007), "Contested Gender Equality and Policy Variety in Europe: Introducing a Critical Frame Analysis Approach", in Mieke Verloo (ed.), *Multiple Meanings of Gender Equality: A Critical Frame Analysis of Gender Policies in Europe*, Budapest, New York: CEU Press, pp. 21-49.

Walby, Sylvia (1997), *Gender Transformations*. London: Routledge.

_____ (2005), "Gender mainstreaming: productive tensions in theory and practice", *Social Politics* 12 (3), pp. 321-343.

_____ (2007), *A review of theory and methodology for the analysis of the implications of intersectionality for gender equality policies in the EU – D13 and D14*, WP16, STRIQ – QUING.

_____ (2009), *Globalization and Inequalities: Complexity and Contested Modernities*, Los Angeles: Sage Publications.

Walby, Sylvia, Jo Armstrong and Sofia Strid (2009), "Intersectionality and the quality of equality architecture in Britain, Unpublished paper written as part of a series of explanatory country and thematic reports", Deliverable 47/49, Quing project. Lancaster, Vienna: Lancaster University, Institut für die Wissenschaften vom Menschen.

Warren, Tracey (2003), "A Privileged Pole? Diversity in Women's Pay, Pensions and Wealth in Britain", *Gender, Work & Organization* 10, pp. 605-628.

Weldon, Laurel (2008), "Intersectionality", in Gary Goertz and Amy Mazur (eds.), *Politics, gender and concepts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Williams, Fiona (1995), "Race/Ethnicity, Gender, and Class in Welfare States: A Framework for Comparative Analysis", *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society*, 2(2), pp. 127-159.

Woodward, Alison E. (2004), "Building Velvet Triangles: Gender and Informal Governance", in Simona Piattoni and Thomas Christiansen (eds.), *Informal Governance and the European Union*, London: Edward Elgar, pp. 76-93.

Yuval-Davis, Nira (2006), "Intersectionality and Feminist Politics", *European Journal of Women's Studies* 13(3), pp. 193-209.