

# Notes

## Chapter 1

- 1 The data used for this research are publically available on the RNGS website in “Text Appendices” at <http://libarts.wsu.edu/polisci/rngs/>. Additional data on each debate were provided to the author upon request from RNGS scholars.

## Chapter 2

- 1 Harrington uses the term “women’s bureaucracies” rather than “women’s policy agencies”; however, “women’s policy agencies” is utilized in this chapter because it has become the accepted term within the feminist literature, and the term “women’s bureaucracy” is unduly vague.

## Chapter 3

- 1 Google search conducted October 2010, December 2011, and October 2014.
- 2 The researcher takes this opportunity to thank TARGET for supplying the interview questionnaire utilized in their research of gender experts and gender trainers.
- 3 Two activities were not included in both the interview and survey questionnaires. Interview participants were not asked whether they had ever performed gender planning or gender mainstreaming. Gender mainstreaming was added to the survey questionnaire based on interview comments that it should be included, while gender planning was added due to the number of individuals working with the EU and UN development planning.
- 4 Many respondents listed simply the EU or UN rather than specific agencies within these organizations.
- 5 Due to the UN restructuring, individuals who have worked for the Division for the Advancement of Women (DAW), International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women (INSTRAW), Office of the Special Adviser on Gender Issues and Advancement of Women (OSAGI), and United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM) have been assigned to the UN Women category.

## Chapter 4

- 1 Gender Expert 5 made this statement when asked to characterize her impact as a gender expert. She opined that her attitude regarding impact depended on the day. More specifically, on good days she felt she had done her best, but on bad days she thinks “it is all fighting against windmills” (6/29/11).

## Chapter 5

- 1 Research was conducted prior to the creation of the UN Women Roster of Gender Experts and Trainers.
- 2 Survey respondents were instructed that success is achieved when their advice, information, and recommendations are incorporated into a formal rule, policy, decision, project, or action of a particular organization.
- 3 Nonparametric statistical tests were conducted due to the categorical nature of the variables, and the descriptive data and histograms reveal the data to not be normally distributed.
- 4 The Mann-Whitney U test compares rank orderings by “calculating the number of scores in the first group preceding each score in the second group.” The resulting U score is converted to a normal variable ( $z$ ) and compared with a normal frequency distribution (Hood, Dunsire, and Thompson 1979, 277).
- 5 Respondents were asked their current occupation and professional affiliation; these two questions were used to create the variable professional affiliation. Unfortunately, the information provided by some respondents was not sufficient to determine in which category they belonged. The data for this category are presented; nonetheless, these results are not interpreted.

## Chapter 6

- 1 The exception to this rule is the partial birth abortion debate in the United States, which was not adopted due to a presidential veto (McBride Stetson 2001). This case was coded as a success because the gender expert's recommendation in this case was that the policy not be adopted.
- 2 In Boolean notation, a condition in capital letters reflects the presence of the condition in that case, while all lowercase letters reflects its absence.
- 3 Coding for each of the factors utilized in this chapter can be found in Appendix.

# Bibliography

- (DESA), U. N. (1997). *Report of the Economic and Social Council for 1997*. Retrieved November 18, 2010, from <http://www.un.org/documents/ga/docs/52/plenary/a52-3.htm>
- (OSAGI), U. N. (n.d.). *Gender Mainstreaming*. Retrieved November 18, 2010, from <http://www.un.org/womenwatch/osagi/gendermainstreaming.htm>
- Achoka, A., & Aterna, J. (2005). *What Happened to the PRSP in Kenya? The Role of Politics*. Retrieved 29 November, 2011, from International Institute for Environment and Development: <http://pubs.iied.org/pdfs/G02117.pdf>
- Acker, J. (1992). From Sex Roles to Gendered Institutions. *Contemporary Sociology*, 565–569.
- Acker, J. (1990). Hierarchies, Jobs, Bodies: A Theory of Gendered Organizations. *Gender and Society*, 139–158.
- Alvarez, S. (1990). *Engendering Democracy in Brazil: Women's Movements and Transition Politics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Andersen, M. (1993). The Concept of Mainstreaming: Experience and Change. In *Focusing on Women: UNIFEM's Experience with Mainstreaming* (pp. 1–32). New York: United Nations Development Fund for Women.
- Andresen, Sunne/Dölling, Irene (2005). Umbau des Geschlechter-Wissens von ReformakteurInnen durch Gender Mainstreaming. In: Ute Behning/Birgit Sauer (Hrsg.) *Was Bewirkt Gender Mainstreaming Evaluierung durch Policy-Analysen*. Ebook: Campus Verlag, quoted in Çağlar, G. (2010). Multiple Meanings of Gender Budgeting: Gender Knowledge and Economic Knowledge in the World Bank and UNDP. In B. Young, & C. Scherrer (Eds.), *Gender Knowledge and Knowledge Networks in International Political Economy* (pp. 55–74). Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft.
- Attride-Stirling, J. (2001). Thematic Networks: An Analytic Tool for Qualitative Research. *Qualitative Research*, 1 (3), 385–405.
- Avdeyeva, O. (2009). Enlarging the Club: When Do Candidate States Enforce Gender Equality Laws? *Comparative European Politics*, 7, 158–176.
- Bacchi, C. L. (2001). Gender Mainstreaming: A New Vision, More of the Same, or Backlash? *Dialogue Academy of the Social Sciences in Australia*, 20 (2), 16–20.
- Bacchi, C. (2009). The Issue of Intentionality in Frame Theory: The Need for Reflexive Framing. In E. Lombardo, P. Meier, & M. Verloo (Eds.), *The Discursive Politics of Gender Equality: Stretching, Bending and Policymaking* (pp. 19–35). New York: Routledge.
- Bacchi, C., & Eveline, J. (2010). Mainstreaming and Neoliberalism: A Contested Relationship. In C. Bacchi, & J. Eveline (Eds.), *Mainstreaming Politics: Gendering Practices and Feminist Theory* (pp. 39–60). South Australia: University of Adelaide Press.
- Baldez, L. (2001). Coalition Politics and the Limits of State Feminism in Chile. *Women and Politics*, 22 (4), 1–28.

- Baldez, L. (2010). The Gender Lacuna in Comparative Politics. *Perspectives on Politics*, 8 (1), 199–205.
- Banaszak, L. A. (2010). *The Women's Movement Inside and Outside the State*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Barnard, C. (2000). *EC Employment Law*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Basu, A. (1995). *The Challenge of Local Feminism: Women's Movements in Global Perspectives*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Baumgartner, F. R., & Jones, B. D. (1991). Agenda Dynamics and Policy Subsystems. *Journal of Politics*, 53, 1044–1074.
- Baumgartner, F. R., & Jones, B. D. (1993). *Agendas and Instability in American Politics*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Beasley, C. (1999). *What Is Feminism: An Introduction to Feminist Theory*. St Leonards NSW: Allen and Unwin.
- Beckwith, K. (2010). A Comparative Politics of Gender Symposium Introduction: Comparative Politics and the Logics of a Comparative Politics of Gender. *Perspectives on Politics*, 8 (1), 159–168.
- Bell, D. J. (1973). *The Coming of Post-Industrial Society: A Venture in Social Forecasting*. New York: Basic Books.
- Benford, R. D., & Snow, D. A. (2000). Framing Processes and Social Movements: An Overview and Assessment. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26, 611–630.
- Bennett, A. (2007). Symposium: Multi-Method Work, Dispatches from the Front Lines. *Organized Section on Qualitative Methods: Newsletter of the American Political Science Association*, 5 (1), 34–47.
- Berg-Schlosser, D., & De Meur, G. (2009). Comparative Research Design: Case and Variable Selection. In B. Rihoux, & C. C. Ragin (Eds.), *Configurational Comparative Methods: Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA) and Related Techniques* (pp. 19–32). Los Angeles: Sage.
- Berg-Schlosser, D., De Meur, G., Rihoux, B., & Ragin, C. C. (2009). Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA) as an Approach. In B. Rihoux, & C. C. Ragin (Eds.), *Configurational Comparative Methods* (pp. 1–18). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Berg-Schlosser, D., De Meur, G., Rihoux, B., & Ragin, C. C. (2009). Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA) as an Approach. In B. Rihoux, & C. C. Ragin (Eds.), *Configurational Comparative Methods: Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA) and Related Techniques* (pp. 1–18). Los Angeles: Sage.
- Beveridge, F., & Nott, S. (2002). Mainstreaming: A Case for Optimism and Cynicism. *Feminist Legal Studies*, 10, 299–311.
- Black, N. (1989). *Social Feminism*. New York: Cornell University Press.
- Boyatzis, R. (1998). *Transforming Qualitative Information: Thematic Analysis and Code Development*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Braun, K. (2007). Women, Embryos, and the Good Society: Gendering the Bioethics Debate in Germany. In M. Haussman, & B. Sauer (Eds.), *Gendering the State in the Age of Globalization: Women's Movements and State Feminism in Postindustrial Democracies* (pp. 19–38). Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, INC.
- Brendel, E. (1999). Coherence Theory of Knowledge: A Gradual Account. *Erkenntnis*, 50 (2/3), 293–307.
- Brint, S. (1994). *In the Age of Experts*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Britton, D. (1997). Gendered Organization Logic: Policy and Practice in Men's and Women's Prisons. *Gender and Society*, 796–818.

- Bustelo, M. (2009). Intersectionality Faces the Strong Gender Norm. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 11 (4), 530–546.
- Bustelo, M., & Verloo, M. (2009). Grounding Policy Evaluation in a Discursive Understanding of Politics. In E. Lombardo, P. Meier, & M. Verloo (Eds.), *The Discursive Politics of Gender Equality: Stretching, Bending and Policymaking* (pp. 153–168). New York: Routledge.
- Butler, J. (1990). *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge.
- Byrne, B., Laier, J., Baden, S., & Marcus, R. (1996). *National Machineries for Women in Development: Experiences, Lessons and Strategies for Institutionalizing Gender in Development and Planning*. Retrieved December 21, 2010, from [www.generoy-ambiente.org/arcangel2/documentos/38.pdf](http://www.generoy-ambiente.org/arcangel2/documentos/38.pdf)
- Çağlar, G. (2010). Multiple Meanings of Gender Budgeting: Gender Knowledge and Economic Knowledge in the World Bank and UNDP. In B. Young, & C. Scherrer (Eds.), *Gender Knowledge and Knowledge Networks in International Political Economy* (pp. 55–74). Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft.
- Çağlar, G. (2013). Gender Mainstreaming. *Politics and Gender*, 9 (3), 336–344.
- Callander, S. (2008). A Theory of Policy Expertise. *Quarterly Journal Of Political Science*, 3 (2), 123–140.
- Canadian International Development Agency. (n.d.). Retrieved February 14, 2012, from <http://www.acdi-cida.gc.ca/acdi-cida/acdi-cida.nsf/eng/JUD-31194519-KBD>
- Caraway, T. L. (2010). Gendering Comparative Politics. *Perspectives on Politics*, 8 (1), 169–175.
- Carroll, S. J., & Zerilli, L. M. (1993). Feminist Challenges to Political Science. In A. W. Finifter (Ed.), *The State of the Discipline II*. Washington D.C.: American Political Science Association.
- Catching the Wind of Change*. (n.d.). Retrieved November 29, 2011, from United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP): [http://www.unep.org/pdf/OP\\_dec/2010/EN/OP-2010-12-EN-ARTICLE4.pdf](http://www.unep.org/pdf/OP_dec/2010/EN/OP-2010-12-EN-ARTICLE4.pdf)
- Caul, M. (2001). Political Parties and the Adoption of Candidate Gender Quotas: A Cross-national Analysis. *The Journal of Politics*, 63, 1214–1229.
- Caul-Kittilson, M. (2005). In Support of Gender Quotas: Setting New Standards, Bringing Visible Gains. *Politics and Gender*, 1 (4), 638–645.
- Celis, K. (2008). Gendering Representation. In G. Goertz, & A. Mazur (Eds.), *Politics, Gender, and Concepts: Theory and Methodology* (pp. 71–93). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Centre, U. N. (2011, February 24). *UN Celebrates Birth of Powerful New Agency for Women and Girls*. Retrieved November 29, 2011, from <http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=37612&Cr=UN+Women&Cr1>
- Chafetz, J. S. (1988). *Feminist Sociology: An Overview of Contemporary Theories*. Itasca: Peacock.
- Chafetz, J. S. (1997). Feminist Theory and Sociology: Underutilized Contributions for Mainstream Theory. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 23, 97–120.
- Collier, D. (1993). The Comparative Method. In A. Finifter (Ed.), *Political Science: The State of the Discipline II* (pp. 105–119). Washington, D.C.: American Political Science Association.
- Collier, D., & Levitsky, S. (1997). Democracy with Adjectives: Conceptual Innovation in Comparative Research. *World Politics*, 49 (3), 430–451.
- Collins, H., & Evans, R. (2007). *Rethinking Expertise*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Collins, H., & Evans, R. (2002). The Third Wave of Science Studies: Studies of Expertise and Experience. *Social Studies of Science* (32), 235–296.
- Collins, H., & Pinch, T. (1982). *Frames of Meaning: The Social Construction of Extraordinary Science*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Collins, P. H. (1998). Its All in the Family: Intersections of Gender, Race, and Nation. *Hypatia*, 13, 62–82.
- Covaghan, R. (2010). Gender Knowledge: A Review of Theory and Practice. In B. Young, & C. Scherrer (Eds.), *Gender Knowledge and Knowledge Networks in International Political Economy* (pp. 18–35). Baden-Baden: Normos Verlagsgesellschaft.
- Crawford, V. P., & Sobel, J. (1982). Strategic Information Transmission. *Econometrica*, 50 (6), 1431–1451.
- Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics and Violence Against Women of Color. *Stanford Law Review* (6), 1241–1299.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Cronqvist, L. (2011). *Tosmana—Tool for Small-N Analysis [Version 1.3.2]*. Retrieved from Trier: <http://www.tosmana.net>
- Dahlerup, D. (2006). Gender Quotas: Controversial but Trendy. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 322–328.
- Daly, M. (2005). Gender Mainstreaming in Theory and Practice. *Social Politics*, 12 (3), 433–450.
- Dillman, D. A., Smyth, J. D., & Christian, L. M. (2009). *Internet, Mail, and Mixed-Mode Surveys: The Tailored Design Method*. Hoboken: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Dodson, D. (2006). *The Impact of Women in Congress*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Donaghy, T. B. (2004). Applications of Mainstreaming in Australia and Northern Ireland. *International Political Science Review*, 25 (4), 393–410.
- Dunn, W. (1988). Methods of the Second Type: Coping with the Wilderness of Conventional Policy Analysis. *Policy Studies Review*, 7, 720–737.
- Dunn, W. (1994). *Public Policy Analysis: An Introduction*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Dye, T. (1966). *Politics, Economics, and the Public: Policy Outcomes in the American States*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Dye, T. (1984). *Understanding Public Policy*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hill.
- Easton, D. (1965). *A Framework for Political Analysis*. Englewood: Prentice-Hull.
- Edelman, M. S. (1977). *Political Language: Words that Succeed and Policies that Fail*. New York: Academic Press.
- Edelman, M. (1964). *The Symbolic Uses of Politics*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Eisenstein, H. (1996). *Inside Agitators: Australian Femocrats and the State*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Elgstom, O. (2000). Norm Negotiations: The Construction of New Norms Regarding Gender and Development in EU Foreign Aid Policy. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 7, 457–476.
- Equality, D. N. (2010). *Issues Brief 6: Integrating Gender Equality Dimensions into Public Financial Management Reforms Issues*. Retrieved November 29, 2011, from <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/24/10/46142807.pdf>
- Evans, S. M., & Nelson, B. J. (1989). Comparable Worth: The Paradox of Technocratic Reform. *Feminist Studies*, 15 (1), 171–190.

- Fagan, C., Rubery, J., Grimshaw, D., Smith, M., Hebson, G., & Figueiredo, H. (2005). Gender Mainstreaming in the Enlarged European Union: Recent Developments in the European Employment Strategy and the Social Inclusion Process. *Industrial Relations Journal*, 36 (6), 568–591.
- Fereday, J., & Muir-Cochrane, E. (2006). Demonstrating Rigor Using Thematic Analysis: A Hybrid Approach of Inductive and Deductive Coding and Theme Development. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 5 (1), 80–92.
- Ferguson, L., Forest, M., & Bustelo, M. (2011). *OPERA Conference Report*. IWM Vienna: Quality in Gender+ Equality Policies.
- Fischer, F. (2000). *Citizens, Experts, and the Environment: The Politics of Local Knowledge*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Foucault, M. (1980). Prison Talk. In C. Gordon (Ed.), *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972–1977* (pp. 37–54). New York: Pantheon Books.
- Franceschet, S., & Piscopo, J. M. (2008). Gender Quotas and Women's Substantive Representation: Lessons from Argentina. *Politics and Gender*, 4, 393–425.
- Frank, D. J. (2003). The Global Dimensions of Rape-Law Reform: A Cross-National Study of Policy Outcomes. *American Sociological Review*, 74 (2), 272–290.
- Freedman, E. (2003). *No Turning Back: The History of Feminism and the Future of Women*. London: Ballantine Books.
- Gamson, W. A., Croteau, D., Hoynes, W., & Sasson, T. (1992). Media Images and the Social Construction of Reality. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 18, 373–393.
- Gelb, J. (1989). *Feminism and Politics: A Comparative Perspective*. Berkeley: California Press.
- Gelb, J., & Shogan, C. J. (2005). Community Activism in the USA: Catholic Hospital Mergers and Reproductive Access. *Social Movement Studies*, 4 (3), 209–229.
- Gender Evaluation Methodology (GEM)*. (n.d.). Retrieved February 11, 2012, from <http://www.genderevaluation.net/>
- Gender Impact Assessment: Description of the Technique*. (n.d.). Retrieved 18 November, 2010, from European Union: [http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/sources/docgener/evaluation/evalsed/sourcebooks/method\\_techniques/conducting\\_impact\\_assessments/gender/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/evaluation/evalsed/sourcebooks/method_techniques/conducting_impact_assessments/gender/index_en.htm)
- George, A., & Bennett, A. (2004). *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Gerrin, J. (2007). The Case Study: What It Is and What It Does. In C. Boix, & S. C. Stokes (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics* (pp. 90–122). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gerver, I., & Bensman, J. (1954). Towards a Sociology of Expertness. *Social Forces*, 32 (3), 226–235.
- Gettier, E. L. (1963). Is Justified True Belief Knowledge? *Analysis*, 121–123.
- Gibbons, M., Limoges, C., Nowotny, H., Schwartzman, S., Scott, P., & Trow, M. (1994). *The New Production of Knowledge: The Dynamics of Science and Research in Contemporary Societies*. London: Sage Publications.
- Giddens, A. (1990). *The Consequences of Modernity*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Gilpin, R., & Wright, R. (Eds.). (1965). *Scientists and National Policy Making*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Godin, B., & Gingras, Y. (2000). The Place of Universities in the System of Knowledge Production. *Research Policy*, 273–278.

- Goertz, G., & Mazur, A. (2008). *Politics, Gender, and Concepts: Theory and Methodology*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Goetz, A. M. (2003). National Women's Machinery: State-Based Institutions to Advocate Gender Equality. In S. Rai (Ed.), *Mainstreaming Gender, Democratizing the State?* (pp. 69–95). Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Guerrina, R. (2002). Mothering in Europe: Feminist Critique of European Policies on Motherhood and Employment. *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 9 (1), 49–68.
- Haas, P. M. (1992). Introduction: Epistemic Communities and International Policy Coordination. *International Organization*, 46 (1), 1–35.
- Habermas, J. (1970). *Toward a Rational Society*. Boston: Beacon.
- Hafner-Burton, E. M., & Pollack, M. A. (2009). Mainstreaming Gender in the European Union: Getting the Incentives Right. *Comparative European Politics*, 7, 114–138.
- Pollack, M. & Hafner-Burton, E.M. (2000). Mainstreaming Gender in the European Union. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 7 (3), 432–456.
- Halley, J. (2006). *Split Decisions: How and Why to Take a Break from Feminism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Hansen, A. (1991). The Media and the Social Construction of the Environment. *Media, Culture and Society*, 13, 443–458.
- Harding, S. (1987). *Feminism and Methodology*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Harrington, C. (2006). Governing Peacekeeping: The Role of Authority and Expertise in the Case of Sexual Violence Trauma. *Economy and Society*, 35 (3), 346–380.
- Hassim, S. (2003). The Gender Pact and Democratic Consolidation: Institutionalizing Gender Equality in the South African State. *Feminist Studies*, 29 (3), 505–528.
- Hausman, M. (2001). Of Rights and Power: Canada's Federal Abortion Policy 1969–1991. In D. M. Stetson (Ed.), *Abortion Politics, Women's Movements, and the Democratic State* (pp. 63–86). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Havelkova, B. (2006). Effectiveness of the Transposed EU Equality Law in the Czech Republic. *Croatian Yearbook of European Law and Policy*, 2, 299–311.
- Heclo, H. (1978). Issue Networks and the Executive Establishment. In A. King (Ed.), *The New American Political System* (pp. 87–124). Washington, D.C.: American Enterprise Institute.
- Hessels, L. K., & Lente, H. V. (2008). Re-thinking New Knowledge Production: A Literature Review and a Research Agenda. *Research Policy*, 37, 740–760.
- Hisschemoller, M. (August 21–25 1994). The Democracy of Policy Problems: Exploring the Relationship between Policy Content and Method of Political Decision. *IPSA XVIth World Congress*. Berlin.
- Hisschemoller, M., & Gupta, J. (1999). Problem-solving through International Environmental Agreements: The Issue of Regime Effectiveness. *International Political Science Review*, 20, 151–174.
- Hisschemoller, M., & Hoppe, R. (1996). Coping with Intractable Controversies: The Case for Problem Structuring in Policy Design and Analysis. *Policy Studies Annual Review*, 8 (4), 40–61.
- Hood, C., Dunsire, A., & Thompson, S. (1979). Comparing the Scottish Office with 'Whitehall': A Quantitative Approach. *British Journal of Political Science*, 9 (3), 257–280.



- Hooks, B. (1981). *Ain't I a Woman? Black Women and Feminism*. Boston: South End Press.
- Hoppe, R., & Peterse, A. (1993). *Handling Frozen Fire*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Howard, P. L. (2002). Beyond the 'Grim Resisters': Towards More Effective Mainstreaming Through Stakeholder Participation. *Development in Practice*, 164–176.
- Htun, M., & Weldon, S. L. (2010). When and Why Do Governments Promote Women's Rights? A Framework for a Comparative Politics of Sexual Equality. *Perspectives on Politics*, 8 (1).
- Hubert, A., & Stratigaki, M. (2011). The European Institute for Gender Equality: A Window for Gender Equality Policies. *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 18 (2), 169–181.
- Inglehart, R., & Norris, P. (2003). *Rising Tide: Gender Equality and Cultural Change Around the World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ingram, H., Schneider, A., & deLeon, P. (2007). Social Construction and Policy Design. In P. A. Sabatier (Ed.), *Theories of the Policy Process* (pp. 93–128). Westview Press.
- Jahan, R. (1995). *The Elusive Agenda: Mainstreaming Women in Development*. London: Zed Books.
- Jeffrey, L. A. (2004). Prostitution as Public Nuisance: Prostitution Policy in Canada. In J. Outshoorn (Ed.), *The Politics of Prostitution: Women's Movements, Democratic States and the Globalisation of Sex Commerce* (pp. 83–102). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jezerska, Z. (2003). Gender Awareness and the National Machineries in the Countries of Central and Eastern Europe. In S. Rai (Ed.), *Mainstreaming Gender, Democratizing the State?* (pp. 167–183). Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Keck, M. E., & Sikkink, K. (1998). *Activists Beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Kelly, K. (2010). Learning to Mainstream Gender in Vietnam: Where 'Equity' Meets 'Locality' in Development Policy. *Unpublished Dissertation*. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin-Madison.
- Kenworthy, L., & Malami, M. (1999). Gender Inequality in Political Representation: A Worldwide Comparative Analysis. *Social Forces*, 78, 235–268.
- Kettel, B. (2007). Challenging the Margin: Gender Equality and the UN Reform Process. *Third World Quarterly*, 28 (5), 871–886.
- Kingdon, J. W. (2003). *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies*. New York: Longman.
- Krishna, V., & Morgan, J. (2001). A Model of Expertise. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 116 (2), 747–775.
- Krook, M. L. (2009). *Quotas for Women in Politics: Gender and Candidate Selection Reform Worldwide*. Cambridge: Oxford University Press.
- Kwesiga, J. (2003). The National Machinery for Gender Equality in Uganda: Institutionalised Gesture Politics? In S. Rai (Ed.), *Mainstreaming Gender, Democratizing the State? Institutional Mechanisms for the Advancement of Women* (pp. 96–114). Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Lapp, R. (1965). *The New Priesthood*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Leadership, C. f. (2006). *United Nations Pays Lip Service to Gender Equality Say Women's Advocates at the UN Commission on the Status of Women*. Retrieved November 30, 2011, from <http://www.cwgl.rutgers.edu/globalcenter/policy/csw06/index.html>

- Lewis, B. (1990). Farming Women, Public Policy, and the Women's Ministry: A Case Study from Cameroon. In K. Staudt (Ed.), *Women, International Development and Politics: The Bureaucratic Mire* (pp. 180–220). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Lieberman, E. (2005). Nested Analysis as a Mixed-Method Strategy for Comparative Research. *American Political Science Review*, 99 (3), 435–452.
- Liebert, U. (2003). *Gendering Europeanization*. Brussels: PIE Peter Lang.
- Little, A. W. (2010). *Access to Elementary Education in India: Politics, Policies and Progress*. The Institute of Education, University of London. Falmer, United Kingdom: Consortium for Research on Educational Access, Transitions and Equity (CREATE).
- Locher, B. (2003). International Norms and European Policy Making: Trafficking in Women in the EU. *Annual Meeting of the International Studies Association*. Portland.
- Lombardo, E. (2003). EU Gender Policy: Trapped in the 'Wollstonecraft Dilemma.' *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 10 (2), 159–180.
- Lombardo, E. (2005). Integrating or Setting the Agenda? Gender Mainstreaming in the European Constitution-Making Process. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State and Society*, 12 (3), 412–432.
- Lombardo, E., Meier, P., & Verloo, M. (2009). Conclusions: A Critical Understanding of the Discursive Politics of Gender Equality. In E. Lombardo, P. Meier, & M. Verloo (Eds.), *The Discursive Politics of Gender Equality* (pp. 186–203). New York: Routledge.
- Lovenduski, J. (1986). *Women and European Politics*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Lovenduski, J., & Guadagnini, M. (2010). Political Representation. In D. McBride, & A. Mazur (Eds.), *The Politics of State Feminism: Innovation in Comparative Research*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Lycklama a Nijeholt, G., Vargas, V., & Wieringa, S. (1998). *Women's Movements and Public Policy in Europe, Latin America, and the Caribbean*. New York and London: Garland Publishing, Inc.
- Maasen, S., & Weingart, P. (2005). What's New in Scientific Advice to Politics? In S. Maasen, & P. Weingart (Eds.), *Democratization of Expertise? Exploring Novel Forms of Science Advice in Political Decision-Making* (pp. 1–20). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- Mackay, F., & Bilton, K. (2003). *Learning from Experience: Lessons in Mainstreaming Equal Opportunities*. Edinburgh: Scottish Executive Social Research, Institute of Governance.
- Mainstreaming, G. o. (1998). *Gender Mainstreaming: Conceptual Framework, Methodology and Presentation of Good Practices*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Mama, A. (1997). Feminism or Femocracy? State Feminism and Democratization. In J. Ibrahim (Ed.), *The Expansion of Democratic Space in Nigeria*. Dakar: CODESRIA.
- Mancini, G., & O'Leary, S. (1999). The New Frontiers of Sex Equality Law in the European Union. *European Law Review*, 24, 331–353.
- Marx, A., & Dusa, A. (2011). Crisp-Set Qualitative Comparative Analysis (csQCA), Contradictions and Consistency Benchmarks for Model Specification. *Methodological Innovations Online*, 6 (2), 103–148.
- Mazey, S. (2000). Introduction: Integrating Gender—Intellectual and 'Real World' Mainstreaming. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 7 (3), 333–345.

- Mazur, A. G. (2003). Drawing Comparative Lessons from France and Germany. *Review of Policy Research*, 20, 493–524.
- Mazur, A. G., & Pollock, M. A. (2009). "Gender and Public Policy in Europe: An Introduction. *Comparative European Politics*, 7 (1), 1–11.
- Mazur, A. (2002). *Theorizing Feminist Policy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McBride, D. E., & Mazur, A. G. (2011, February 15). Women's Movements and Women's Policy Offices in Western Postindustrial Democracies, 1970–2001: User Guide and Codebook.
- McBride, D., & Mazur, A. (1995). *Comparative State Feminism*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- McBride, D., & Mazur, A. (2010). *The Politics of State Feminism: Innovation in Comparative Research*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- McCaffrey, D., & Keys, J. (2008). Competitive Framing Processes in the Abortion Debate: Polarization-Vilification, Frame Saving, and Frame Debunking. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 41 (1), 41–61.
- McGlynn, C. (2000). Ideologies of Motherhood in European Sex Equality Law. *European Law Journal*, 6 (1), 29–44.
- Meier, P., & Celis, K. (2011). Carrying the Seeds of One's Own Failure? Implementing Gender Mainstreaming in Policy Practices. *Social Politics*, 18 (4), 469.
- Mergaert, L., & Denis, A. (2007). *Quing*. Retrieved November 10, 2010, from Questionnaire for 'Gender Training' Commissioning Bodies Analysis of Responses: <http://www.guing.eu/files/opera/survey.pdf>
- Merry Engel, S. (2006). *Human Rights and Gender Violence: Translating International Law into Local Justice*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Mikkelsen, B., Freeman, T., & Keller, B. (2002). *Mainstreaming Gender Equality: Sida's Support for the Promotion of Gender Equality in Partner Countries*. Stockholm: Sida.
- Moser, C., & Moser, A. (2005). Gender Mainstreaming since Beijing: A Review of Success and Limitations in International Institutions. *Gender and Development*, 13 (2), 11–22.
- Nations, U. (2006). *Secretary General's High Level Panel on System-wide Coherence*. Retrieved November 30, 2011, from Delivering as One: <http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N06/621/41/PDF/N0662141.pdf?OpenElement>
- Nelkin, D. (1975). The Political Impact of Technical Expertise. *Social Studies of Science*, 5, 35–54.
- Norris, P. (1987). *Politics and Sexual Equality: The Comparative Position of Women in Western Democracies*. Boulder: Lynne Reiner.
- Okeke-Ihejirika, P. E., & Francheschet, S. (2002). Democratization and State Feminism: Gender Politics in Africa and Latin America. *Development and Change*, 33 (3), 439–466.
- Outshoorn, J. (2004). *The Politics of Prostitution: Women's Movements, Democratic States and Globalization of Sex Commerce*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Paterson, S. (2010). What's the Problem with Gender-Based Analysis? Gender Mainstreaming Policy and Practice in Canada. *Canadian Public Administration/Administration Publique Du Canada*, 53 (3), 395–416.
- Phillips, A. (1998). Introduction. In *Feminism and Politics* (pp. 1–22). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Piot, P., Greener, R., & Russell, S. (2007). Squaring the Circle: AIDS, Poverty, and Human Development. *PLoS Med*, 4 (10).

- Pitkin, H. F. (1972). *The Concept of Representation*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Platform for Action: Beijing Declaration*. (1995). Retrieved November 28, 2011, from United Nations, Fourth World Conference on Women: [www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/beijing/official.htm](http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/beijing/official.htm)
- Plato. (1987). *The Republic* (Second ed.). (D. Lee, Trans.) New York: Penguin Books.
- Prügl, E. (2011a). Diversity Management and Gender Mainstreaming as Technologies of Government. *Politics and Gender*, 7, 71–89.
- Prügl, E. (2011b). Feminist International Relations. *Politics of Gender*, 7 (1), 111–116.
- Prügl, E. (2010). Gendered Knowledge in the Postmodern State: The Case of Agricultural Trade Liberalization in Europe. In B. Young, & C. Scherrer (Eds.), *Gender Knowledge and Knowledge Networks in International Political Economy* (pp. 115–129). Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft.
- Ragin, C. C. (1994). *Constructing Social Research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Ragin, C. C. (1987). *The Comparative Method: Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press.
- Rai, S. M. (2003). Institutional Mechanisms for the Advancement of Women: Mainstreaming Gender, Democratizing the State? In S. M. Rai (Ed.), *Mainstreaming Gender, Democratizing the State? Institutional Mechanisms for the Advancement of Women* (pp. 15–39). Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press.
- Rai, S. (2003). *Mainstreaming Gender, Democratizing the State?* Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Randal, V. (2000). Childcare Policy in the European States: Limits to Convergence. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 7, 346–68.
- Randall, V. (1991). Feminism and Political Analysis. *Political Studies*, 39, 513–532.
- Reanda, L. (1999). Engendering the United Nations: The Changing International Agenda. *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 6, 49–68.
- Rees, T. (1998). *Mainstreaming Equality in the European Union: Education, Training and Labour Market Policies*. London: Routledge.
- Reinharz, S. (1992). *Feminist Methods in Social Research*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Research Network on Gender, Politics and the State*. (n.d.). Retrieved July 01, 2009, from <http://libarts.wsu.edu/polisci/rngs/qualitative.html>
- Rice, P., & Ezzy, D. (1999). *Qualitative Research Methods: A Health Focus*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
- Rihoux, B., & De Meur, G. (2009). Crisp-Set Qualitative Comparative Analysis (csQCA). In B. Rihoux, & C. C. Ragin (Eds.), *Configurational Comparative Methods* (pp. 33–68). Los Angeles: Sage.
- Rihoux, B., & Ragin, C. C. (2009). Introduction. In *Configurational Comparative Methods: Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA) and Related Techniques* (pp. xvii–xxv). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Riley, N. E. (1999). Challenging Demography: Contributions from Feminist Theory. *Sociological Forum*, 14 (3), 369–397.
- Rincker, M., & Orbals, C. (2009). Leader or Laggards: Engendering Sub-National Governance through Women's Policy Agencies in Spain and Poland. *Democratization*, 16, 269–97.

- RNGS. (2005, May). *RNGS Project Description*. Retrieved February 11, 2012, from Research Network on Gender, Politics and the State: <http://libarts.wsu.edu/polisci/rngs/pdf/project505.pdf>
- Robert, C. (2010). Who Are the European Experts? Profiles, Trajectories and Expert 'Careers' of the European Commission. *French Politics*, 8 (3), 248–274.
- Robinson, J. C. (2001). Gendering the Abortion Debate: The French Case. In D. M. Stetson (Ed.), *Abortion Politics, Women's Movements, and the Democratic State* (pp. 87–110). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rossilli, M. (1997). The European Community's Policy on the Equality of Women: From the Treaty of Rome to Present. *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 4 (1), 63–82.
- Rule, W., & Zimmerman, J. F. (1987). Rule, Electoral Systems, Contextual Factors and Women's Opportunity for Election to Parliament in Twenty-Three Democracies. *Western Political Quarterly*, 40 (3), 15–30.
- Sabatier, P. A. (1988). An Advocacy Coalition Framework of Policy Change and the Role of Policy-Oriented Learning Therein. *Policy Sciences*, 21, 129–168.
- Sabatier, P. A. (2007). *Theories of the Policy Process*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Sabatier, P. A. (1986). Top-Down and Bottom-Up Approaches to Implementation Research: A Critical Analysis and Suggested Synthesis. *Journal of Public Policy* (6), 21–48.
- Sabatier, P. A., & Weible, C. M. (2007). The Advocacy Coalition Framework: Innovations and Clarifications. In P. A. Sabatier (Ed.), *Theories of the Policy Process* (pp. 189–222). Boulder: Westview Press.
- Sadik, N. (2005). *Statement by Dr Nafis Sadik, Panel Discussion for International Women's Day*. Retrieved November 2011, 28, from United Nations: <http://www.un.org/events/women/iwd/2005/sadik.htm>
- Salisbury, R. (1968). *The Analysis of Public Policy*. Chicago: Markham Publishing Co.
- Sapiro, V. (1991). Gender Politics, Gendered Politics: The State of the Field. In W. Crotty (Ed.), *The Theory and Practice of Political Science: Looking to the Future* (pp. 165–188). Evanston: Northwestern University Press.
- Sartori, G. (1970). Concept Misformation in Comparative Politics. *American Political Science Review*, 64 (4), 1033–1053.
- Sauer, B. (2010). Framing and Gendering. In D. McBride, & A. Mazur (Eds.), *The Politics of State Feminism: Innovation in Comparative Research* (pp. 193–216). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Savery, L. (2007). *Engendering the State: The International Diffusion of Women's Rights*. London: Routledge.
- Schalkwyk, J. (1998). *Building Capacity for Gender Mainstreaming: UNDP's Experience*. New York: UNDP.
- Schattschneider, E. (1960). *The Semisovereign People: A Realist's View of Democracy in America*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Schneider, A. L., & Ingram, H. (1997). *Policy Design for Democracy*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.
- Schudson, M. (2006). The Trouble with Experts—and Why Democracies Need Them. *Theory and Society*, 35 (5/6), 491–506.
- Schwindt-Bayer, L. A. (2010). Comparison and Integration: A Path Toward a Comparative Politics of Gender. *Perspectives on Politics*, 8 (1), 177–182.

- Schwindt-Bayer, L. A. (2006). Still Supermadres? Gender and Policy Priorities of Latin American Legislators. *American Journal of Political Science*, 50 (3), 570–585.
- Scott, J. C. (1998). *Seeing Like a State*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Scott, J. W. (1986). *Gender and the Politics of History*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Shapin, S., & Schaffer, S. (1985). *Leviathan and the Air-pump*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Shaw, J. (2000). *Social Law and Policy in an Evolving European Union*. Oxford: Hart.
- Smith, M. J., & Villa, P. (2010). The Ever-Declining Role of Gender Equality in the European Employment Strategy. *Industrial Relations Journal*, 41 (6), 526–543.
- Snyder, M. (2003). Women Determine Development: The Unfinished Revolutions. *Signs*, 29 (2), 630.
- Sperling, V. (1999). *Organizing Women in Contemporary Russia: Engendering Transition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Squires, J. (2005). Is Gender Mainstreaming Transformative? Theorising Mainstreaming in the Context of Diversity of Deliberation. *Social Politics*, 12 (3), 366–388.
- Staudt, K. (1990). *Women, International Development and Politics: The Bureaucratic Mire*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Stetson, D. M. (2004). The Invisible Issue: Prostitution and Trafficking of Women and Girls in the United States. In J. Outshoorn (Ed.), *The Politics of Prostitution: Women's Movements, Democratic States and the Globalisation of Sex Commerce* (pp. 245–264). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stone, D., Maxwell, S., & Keating, M. (2001). Bridging Research and Policy. *Bridging Research and Policy: An International Workshop* (pp. 1–50). Coventry, UK: UK Department for International Development, Warwick University.
- Swirski, B. (n.d.). *What Is a Gender Audit*. Retrieved November 6, 2010, from [iknowpolitics.org](http://www.iknowpolitics.org): <http://www.iknowpolitics.org/note/1273>
- TARGET: *Transatlantic Applied Research in Gender Equity Training*. (n.d.). Retrieved February 8, 2012, from Gender and International Policy Research Circle: <http://www.ssc.wisc.edu/TARGET/aboutus2.htm>
- Taylor, V. (1999, June). *Gender Mainstreaming in Development Planning: A Reference Manual for Governments and Other Stakeholders*. Retrieved February 10, 2012, from [http://resources.thecommonwealth.org/ARCHIVED%2022-OCT-2003/gender\\_old/htm/publications/plana4.pdf](http://resources.thecommonwealth.org/ARCHIVED%2022-OCT-2003/gender_old/htm/publications/plana4.pdf)
- Teghtsoonian, K. (2003). Gender Policy Analysis in the Government of British Columbia: Strategies, Possibilities, and Constraints. *Policy, Organisation and Society*, 22 (1), 26–47.
- Thomas, S. (1994). *How Women Legislate*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Tripp, A. M. (2010). Toward a Comparative Politics of Gender Research in which Women Matter. *Perspectives on Politics*, 8 (1), 191–197.
- Tripp, A. M., Casimiro, I., Kwesiga, J., & Mungwa, A. (2009). *African Women's Movements: Changing Political Landscapes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- True, J. (2008). Gender Specialists and Global Governance: New Forms of Women's Movement Mobilisation? In S. Grey, & M. Sawer (Eds.), *Women's Movements: Flourishing or in Abeyance?* (pp. 91–104). London and New York: Routledge.

- True, J. (2003). Mainstreaming Gender in Global Public Policy. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 5 (3), 368–396.
- True, J., & Mintrom, M. (2001). Transnational Networks and Policy Diffusion: The Case of Gender Mainstreaming. *International Studies Quarterly*, 45 (1), 27–57.
- True, J., & Parisi, L. (2013). "Gender Mainstreaming Strategies in International Governance." In E. Çağlar, E. Prügl, & S. Zwingel (Eds.), *Feminist Strategies in International Governance*. London: Routledge.
- Truman, D. (1951). *The Governmental Process*. New York: Knopf.
- Ugalde, S. V. (2003). The Role of the Women's Movement in Institutionalizing a Gender Focus in Public Policy: The Ecuadorian Experience. In S. Rai (Ed.), *Mainstreaming Gender, Democratizing the State?* (pp. 117–130). Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- U.N. Women (2011). *Directory of National Mechanisms for Gender Equality*. New York: UN Women.
- U.N. Women (n.d.). *Gender Responsive Budgeting*. Retrieved November 18, 2010, from <http://www.gender-budgets.org/>
- U.N. Women (2005). *Directory of National Mechanisms for the Advancement of Women*. New York: United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Division for the Advancement of Women.
- U.N. Women (2010). *Directory of National Mechanisms for Gender Equality*. New York: Division for the Advancement of Women, UN Women.
- United Nations. (n.d.). Retrieved February 14, 2012, from Fourth World Conference on Women (1995): <http://www.un.org/geninfo/bp/women.html>
- Valiente, C. (1995). The Power of Persuasion: The Instituto de la Mujer in Spain. In D. McBride Stetson, & G. A. Mazur, *Comparative State Feminism* (pp. 221–236). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Vargas, V., & Wieringa, S. (1998). The Triangle of Empowerment. In G. L. Nijeholt, V. Vargas, & S. Wieringa (Eds.), *Women's Movements and Public Policy in Europe, Latin America, and the Caribbean* (pp. 3–20). New York and London: Garland Publishing.
- Verloo, M. (2001). Another Velvet Revolution? Gender Mainstreaming and the Politics of Implementation. *IWM Working Paper*, 5. Vienna.
- Verloo, M. (2005). Displacement and Empowerment: Reflections on the Concept and Practice of the Council of Europe Approach to Gender Mainstreaming and Gender Equality. *Social Politics*, 12 (3), 344–365.
- Verloo, M. (2006). Multiple Inequalities, Intersectionality and the European Union. *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 13 (3), 211–228.
- Verloo, M., Bustelo, M., & Lombardo, E. (2007). Conclusions on Framing Gender Inequality as a Policy Problem in Europe. In M. Verloo (Ed.), *Multiple Meanings of Gender Inequality. A Critical Frame Analysis of Gender Policies in Europe*. Budapest: CEU Press.
- Walby, S. (2009). Beyond the Politics of Location: The Power of Argument in Gender Equality Politics. In E. Lombardo, P. Meier, & M. Verloo (Eds.), *The Discursive Politics of Gender Equality: Stretching, Bending and Policymaking* (pp. 36–51). New York: Routledge.
- Walby, S. (2005). Gender Mainstreaming: Productive Tensions in Theory and Practice. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State and Society*, 12 (3), 321–343.
- Walby, S. (2000). In Search of Feminist Theory. *Feminist Theory*, 1 (2), 236–238.

- Waylen, G. (2007). *Engendering Transitions: Women's Mobilization, Institutions and Gender Outcomes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Webster, J. (2005). *Changing European Gender Relations: The Findings of Recent Social Research and Their Implications for Gender Equality Policy: Policy Synthesis Report to the European Commission DG Research September 2005*. London: Work and Equality Research Company.
- Weible, C. M. (2008). Expert-Based Information and Policy Subsystems: A Review and Synthesis. *The Policy Studies Journal*, 36 (4), 615–635.
- Weldon, L. (2002). *Protest, Policy and the Problem of Violence Against Women: A Cross National Comparison*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Woodward, A. E. (2008). Too Late for Gender Mainstreaming? Taking Stock in Brussels. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 18 (3), 289–302.
- Wohl, S. (2008). "Global Governance as Neo Liberal Governmentality: Gender Mainstreaming in the European Employment Strategy." In S. M. Rai, & G. Waylen (Eds.) *Global Governance: Feminist Perspectives* (64–83). Houndsmill: Palgrave.
- Women's Environment and Development Organization*. (2005). Retrieved November 30 2011, from <http://www.wedo.org/themes/global-governance/beijing-betrayed-2005>
- Woodward, A. (2000). *Building Velvet Triangles: Gender in EU Policy Making*. Copenhagen: European Consortium for Political Research 28th Joint Sessions.
- Woodward, A. E. (2008). Too Late for Gender Mainstreaming? Taking Stock in Brussels. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 18 (3), 289–302.
- Yamasaki, S., & Rihoux, B. (2009). A Commented Review of Applications. In B. Rihoux, & C. C. Ragin (Eds.), *Configurational Comparative Methods: Qualitative Comparative Methods* (pp. 123–146). Los Angeles: Sage.
- Zahariadis, N. (1999). Ambiguity, Time and Multiple Streams. In P. A. Sabatier (Ed.), *Theories of the Policy Process* (pp. 73–96). Boulder: Westview Press.
- Zippel, K. (2003). The European Union 2002 Directive on Sexual Harassment Policies: Individual Versus Collective Strategies. *Review of Policy Research*, 20, 175–198.
- Zwingel, S. (2012). How Do Norms Travel? Theorizing International Women's Rights in Transnational Perspective. *International Studies Quarterly*, 56 (1), 115–129.



# Appendix

## Interview Protocol and Coding

I interviewed 24 individuals currently working as gender experts from October 2010 to August 2011. Several interviews were conducted in person, via Skype and phone, during fieldwork conducted in France from October 2010 to March 2011. Additional interviews were conducted via Skype and phone from May 2011 to August 2011 upon my return to the United States. The interviews included ten academic experts, nine independent/private consultants, five bureaucratic experts working in the International Labour Organization, the European Institute for Gender Equality, the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe, and the European Commission. I developed a semi-structured interview protocol that utilized mostly open-ended questions to provide interview participants the opportunity to elaborate upon important concepts and experiences.

During the interview stage of the research, I was interested in determining how individuals become gender experts and the qualifications they felt were most important for performing these activities as well as identifying the factors that influence the utilization of gender expertise. Therefore, the interview questions were divided largely into two parts: 1) focusing on qualifications and experience, and 2) focusing on goals and success of gender expertise. I began by asking questions about whether individuals consider themselves gender experts, how individuals became involved in providing gender expertise, what activities are typically performed, and for which organizations respondents have worked as a gender expert. Due to the fact that I was most interested in the success of gender expertise, the majority of the interview focused on questions regarding expert success. I asked interview participants about their goals, the circumstances that impact the utilization or implementation of their expertise, and their impact as a gender expert.

The interviews lasted approximately 30 minutes. The interviews were not recorded, and I took copious notes both during and after the interview. The data were coded and analyzed utilizing the Joanna Briggs Institute Thematic Analysis software (TAP). TAP software is provided for free (upon registration) and is designed to be utilized by researchers in health,

social sciences, and humanities. In order to utilize TAP, a researcher must select illustrations that represent the views of individual cases, create broader categories that encompass the illustrations, and finally abstract further by developing overarching themes based on the categories. Once illustrations, categories, and themes have been created and identified, the software will create visual maps of the data that illustrate the different ideas and themes present in the data. It is important to note that TAP does not generate or apply coding schemes; the researcher must code the data by manually entering illustrations into the software, linking these illustrations to the categories (generated by the researcher), and then categories are manually linked to broader themes (also created by the researcher).

In order to code the data, I utilized an inductive coding process in which I examined verbatim pieces of text (illustrations). In this case, I uploaded whole sentences as illustrations of respondent views. If a sentence implied two separate ideas or factors, the sentence was divided into two separate illustrations. The verbatim pieces of text were used to develop categories and broader themes that encompassed the original pieces of text. In this case, I was looking for common themes that could be identified across respondents. TAP software only allows for two levels of abstraction: categories and themes. Due to the fact that I am utilizing thematic network analysis to organize and analyze the data, which requires three levels of abstraction—basic themes, organization themes, and global themes—TAP was used to create the basic and organizational themes from the verbatim pieces of text. Once these themes were mapped utilizing TAP, the global themes were identified by further abstracting from the organizational themes.

## **Survey Methodology**

Due to budget limitations and the fact that many agencies do not provide postal addresses for gender experts and specialists, a mail survey of gender experts was not feasible, nor was it possible to conduct a web-based survey utilizing mail invitations to participate. Therefore, it was decided that potential participants would be invited via e-mail to participate in the web-based survey. In November of 2011, 196 e-mail invitations were sent to individuals on the European Commission's network of experts on gender and employment; the European Commission's network of experts in gender equality, social inclusion, health, and long-term care; the European Commission's network of legal experts; members of the European Institute for Gender Equality's Experts' Forum; gender specialists

working for the International Labour Organization (both at the headquarters and in field offices); United Nations gender focal points; gender experts within UN Women; and individuals participating in expert group meetings for the Commission on the Status of Women since 2006. It is important to note that all individuals for which an e-mail address could be located were sent an e-mail invitation to take the survey. While it is acknowledged that the use of a web-based survey presents several limitations to the analysis, particularly due to limited Internet services in some countries and regions, it was the purpose of the survey to begin broadening the participants of the study and expand the analysis.

The survey questionnaire was designed utilizing the interview data in order to develop questions regarding the factors that impact the success of gender experts in public policy. The questionnaire included both closed- and open-ended questions covering basic demographic information (age, sex, occupation, and years' experience), individual qualifications to provide expertise (education, training, and activities performed), and assessments of success and conditions that affect success. More specifically, the final part of the questionnaire focused on the success of gender expertise through self-evaluation of respondents' achievements. Respondents were asked to evaluate their own success, provide examples of successes, and rate the impact of several factors on achievements.

## **Survey Coding**

### **Years' Experience:**

Years' experience is a ratio, continuous variable. Respondents were asked approximately how many years they have worked as a gender expert. The question was open ended and respondents were asked to round up to whole year values.

### **Professional Affiliation:**

Professional affiliation is a nominal, categorical variable. Respondents were asked two questions: What is your current occupation? and What is your professional affiliation? These questions were open ended. Answers to the question were then used to develop the following response categories: (1) university, (2) researcher, (3) NGO, (4) civil service, (5) freelance/private, and (6) unknown.

### **Region:**

Region is a nominal, categorical variable. Respondents were asked to provide the country in which they currently live. The question was open ended and used to construct the following response categories:

(1) North America, (2) Western Europe, (3) Latin America, (4) Central, East, and Southern Europe, (5) Asia, and (6) Africa.

**Age:**

Age is an interval, continuous variable. Respondents were asked to provide their age in an open-ended question.

**Highest Level of Education:**

Highest level of education is an interval, categorical variable. Respondents were asked a series of closed-ended questions concerning their education, which included whether they had a bachelor's degree (yes/no), master's degree (yes/no), PhD (yes/no), or specialized training (yes/no). Answers to these questions were used to develop the following categories: (1) no degree, (2) specialized training only, (3) bachelor's degree, (4) master's degree, and (5) PhD.

**Success:**

Success is an ordinal, categorical variable. Respondents were asked to evaluate how successful or unsuccessful they have been as gender experts on a Likert scale from very successful to very unsuccessful. Response categories were reversed coded for analysis: (1) very unsuccessful, (2) somewhat unsuccessful, (3) neutral, (4) somewhat successful, or (5) very successful.

**High-Level Support:**

High-level support is an ordinal, categorical variable. Respondents were asked to evaluate how important or unimportant high-level support (supportive minister, head of department, head of administration, or manager) is to their success on a Likert scale from very important to very unimportant. Response categories were reverse coded: (1) very unimportant, (2) somewhat unimportant, (3) neutral, (4) somewhat important, or (5) very important.

**Left Governments:**

Left governments is an ordinal, categorical variable. Respondents were asked to evaluate how important or unimportant left governments are to their success on a Likert scale from very important to very unimportant. Response categories were reverse coded: (1) very unimportant, (2) somewhat unimportant, (3) neutral, (4) somewhat important, or (5) very important.

**Feminist Agents within an Organization:**

Feminist agents within an organization is an ordinal, categorical variable. Respondents were asked to evaluate how important or unimportant feminist agents within an organization are to their success on a Likert scale from very important to very unimportant. Response categories were reverse coded: (1) very unimportant, (2) somewhat unimportant, (3) neutral, (4) somewhat important, or (5) very important.

**Gender Equality Machineries:**

Gender equality machineries is an ordinal, categorical variable. Respondents were asked to evaluate how important or unimportant gender equality machineries are to their success on a Likert scale from very important to very unimportant. Response categories were reverse coded: (1) very unimportant, (2) somewhat unimportant, (3) neutral, (4) somewhat important, or (5) very important.

**EU Support:**

EU support is an ordinal, categorical variable. Respondents were asked to evaluate how important or unimportant EU support is to their success on a Likert scale from very important to very unimportant. Response categories were reverse coded: (1) very unimportant, (2) somewhat unimportant, (3) neutral, (4) somewhat important, or (5) very important.

**UN Support:**

UN support is an ordinal, categorical variable. Respondents were asked to evaluate how important or unimportant UN support is to their success on a Likert scale from very important to very unimportant. Response categories were reverse coded: (1) very unimportant, (2) somewhat unimportant, (3) neutral, (4) somewhat important, or (5) very important.

**Women Politicians:**

Building alliances with women politicians is an ordinal, categorical variable. Respondents were asked to evaluate how important or unimportant building alliances with women politicians is to their success on a Likert scale from very important to very unimportant. Response categories were reverse coded: (1) very unimportant, (2) somewhat unimportant, (3) neutral, (4) somewhat important, or (5) very important.

**National Feminist NGOs:**

Building alliances with national feminist NGOs is an ordinal, categorical variable. Respondents were asked to evaluate how important or

unimportant building alliances with national feminist NGOs is to their success on a Likert scale from very important to very unimportant. Response categories were reverse coded: (1) very unimportant, (2) somewhat unimportant, (3) neutral, (4) somewhat important, or (5) very important.

### **International Feminist NGOs:**

Building alliances with international feminist NGOs is an ordinal, categorical variable. Respondents were asked to evaluate how important or unimportant building alliances with international feminist NGOs is to their success on a Likert scale from very important to very unimportant. Response categories were reverse coded: (1) very unimportant, (2) somewhat unimportant, (3) neutral, (4) somewhat important, or (5) very important.

### **Broad Coalitions:**

Broad coalitions is an ordinal, categorical variable. Respondents were asked to evaluate how important or unimportant broad coalitions of support (alliances with *both* feminists and non-feminist individuals/groups) are to their success on a Likert scale from very important to very unimportant. Response categories were reverse coded: (1) very unimportant, (2) somewhat unimportant, (3) neutral, (4) somewhat important, or (5) very important.

### **Women's Movement Mobilization:**

Women's movement mobilization is an ordinal, categorical variable. Respondents were asked to evaluate how important or unimportant women's movement mobilization is to their success on a Likert scale from very important to very unimportant. Response categories were reverse coded: (1) very unimportant, (2) somewhat unimportant, (3) neutral, (4) somewhat important, or (5) very important.

### **Public Support for Women's Rights:**

Public support for women's rights is an ordinal, categorical variable. Respondents were asked to evaluate how important or unimportant public support for women's rights is to their success on a Likert scale from very important to very unimportant. Response categories were reverse coded: (1) very unimportant, (2) somewhat unimportant, (3) neutral, (4) somewhat important, or (5) very important.

### **Women's Issues:**

Women's issues is an ordinal, categorical variable. Respondents were asked to evaluate how successful or unsuccessful gender expertise is when

the issue/project falls within those areas typically associated with women using a Likert Scale from very successful to very unsuccessful. Response categories were reverse coded: (1) very successful, (2) somewhat successful, (3) neutral, (4) somewhat unsuccessful, or (5) very unsuccessful.

**Non Women's Issues:**

Non women's issues is an ordinal, categorical variable. Respondents were asked to evaluate how successful or unsuccessful gender expertise is when the issue/project falls outside those areas typically associated with women using a Likert Scale from very successful to very unsuccessful. Response categories were reverse coded: (1) very successful, (2) somewhat successful, (3) neutral, (4) somewhat unsuccessful, or (5) very unsuccessful.

**Other Policy Concerns:**

Other policy concerns is an ordinal, categorical variable. Respondents were asked to indicate how much they agree or disagree that gender experts have more success when gender can be tied to other policy concerns on a Likert Scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Response categories were reverse coded: (1) strongly agree, (2) agree, (3) neutral, (4) disagree, or (5) strongly disagree.

**Gender Machineries Institutionalized with EU/UN:**

Gender machineries institutionalized with EU/UN is an ordinal, categorical variable. Respondents were asked to indicate how much they agree or disagree that the future success of gender expertise depends on having gender machineries institutionalized within the EU and UN on a Likert Scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Response categories were reverse coded: (1) strongly agree, (2) agree, (3) neutral, (4) disagree, or (5) strongly disagree.

**Inadequate Resources:**

Inadequate resources is a nominal, categorical variable. Respondents were asked if inadequate resources are leading to a loss of initial successes of gender expertise; the question was closed ended and coded (0) yes or (1) no.

**Economic Crisis:**

Economic crisis is a nominal, categorical variable. Respondents were asked if the economic crisis is leading to a loss of initial successes of gender expertise; the question was closed ended and coded (0) yes or (1) no.

**Neoliberal Discourse:**

Neoliberal discourse is a nominal, categorical variable. Respondents were asked if neoliberal discourses are leading to a loss of initial successes of gender expertise; the question was closed ended and coded (0) yes or (1) no.

**Gender Fatigue:**

Gender fatigue is a nominal, categorical variable. Respondents were asked if gender fatigue was leading to a loss of initial successes of gender expertise; the question was closed ended and coded (0) yes or (1) no.

**Backlash:**

Backlash is a nominal, categorical variable. Respondents were asked if backlash was leading to a loss of initial successes of gender expertise; the question was closed ended and coded (0) yes or (1) no.

**csQCA Values**

**Success (SUCCESS):**

Coded a success if majority (51 percent) of recommendations were included into adopted policy.

1 (yes), 0 (no)

**High-Level Support (HIGHLEV):**

Coded as present if senior political actors (ministers, prime minister, or president) located within structures in charge of the policy in question articulate support for expert recommendations.

1 (yes), 0 (no)

**Women Politician Advocacy (WADV):**

Coded as present if women politicians articulate support of gender expert demands in policy debate.

1 (yes), 0 (no)

**Women's Policy Agency Advocacy (WPAADV):**

Coded as present if women's policy agencies are active in the debate and argue in support of gender expert demands.

1 (on the agenda), 0 (not on the agenda)



**Left Government in Power (LEFT):**

1 (yes), 0 (no)

**Women's Movement Priority (WMPRIOR):**

1 (on agenda), 0 (not on agenda)

**Women's Movement Activism (ACTIVISM):**

RNGS scholars developed a scale ranging from 1 to 10 for women's movement actor (WMA) activism. The scale developed examines activism during the period of the policy debate in five mobilization structures: informal networks, protests, local movement communities and cultural centers, formation of new organizations, and policy campaigns (RNGS 2011). Scores on this scale range from 1 (growth in regional networks and one national network sponsoring national conference or two national networks, 0–3 protests in 10-year period, no growth in local communities and cultural centers, little growth in formation of new organizations, and 0–2 policy campaigns during 10-year period) to 10 (many networks formed, several massive rallies, hundreds of local movement communities and cultural centers formed, number of new organizations substantially increased or informal organizations grew throughout period, 4 or more national policy campaigns during time period). I use RNGS QCA coding 1 (4–10) and 0 (1–3) to code the presence or absence of activism because 4 represents growth and/or activity in at least 4 of the 5 mobilization structures.

1 (4–10), 0 (1–3)

**Broad Coalitions of Support (BROADCOAL):**

Coded as present if women's movement organizations and feminist actors formed alliances with non-feminist actors and organizations to achieve policy goals.

1 (present), 0 (absent)

**Weak Countermovement (COUNTER):**

Uses RNGS scholars' assessment of strength of countermovement: none (nonexistent), weak (nearly extinct), moderate (less than strong activity) = 1, strong (widespread movement against issue) = 0.

## csQCA Truth Tables of Gender Expert Success

Truth Table:

v1	v2	v3	v4	v5	v6	v7	v8	O	id
1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	LEFOAPT3,ANTTILAFPT1,NWCIRJT3
0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	
0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	WHEALCHI
1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	NACWCJT1,CONGJT1
0	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	NACIMCJT1
0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	EMPCOALCJT3,TRADECJT3
0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	
0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	WALLACECPT1,EBERTSPT1
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	NACWPT2,NAWLCPT2,FRYCPT2
0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	
0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	MLACFAB1
1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	MLACFAB2,MFFFFAB2,CHOISIRFAB2
0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	PISIERPR3
1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	

(continued)

v1	v2	v3	v4	v5	v6	v7	v8	O	id
0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	
	GRAUMANNNGHI,KOLLECKGHI,FRANZICKGHI,SCHNEIDERGHI,HAUFFEGHI,BERGGHI								
1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	
	WALJENGHI,ZUMSTEINGHI,FROMMELGHI								
0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	
	NWCIRAB3,EDUCIRAB3,TRINIRAB3,AIDIRAB3,COUNSELIRAB3,DUBLINIRAB3, WHEALIRAB3								
1	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	
0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	
	MOREENHI,VULTONHI,BEENHI,HERIKNHI,LEIENAARNPR2								
0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	
0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	LEIJENAARNPR3,OLDERSMANPR3
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	FATWNP1,ANTISGNPT1
0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	FATWNP2
1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	FEMLAWNP2
1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	BREMERSPT2,ROKSSPT2
0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	MICHELMANUSAB3
	MICHELMANUSHI,IWPRUSH,WIDERUSHI,NBWHIPUSH								
1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	DAVISUSH
1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	
	WATTENBURGUSJT1,SCHMIDTUSJT1,HARTWELLUSJT1,ADAMUSJT1								
0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	FLEMINGUSJT2
1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	ARRINDELLUSJT3,MILLERUSJT3
1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	PIVENUSPR3
1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	LEDERERUSPT3,TRAFFICKINGUSPT3
0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	REFUGIOUSPT3

Created with Tosmana Version 1.3.2

# Index

- advocacy coalition framework (ACF), 83–4
  - Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action, 6, 7, 50
  - comparative politics of gender, 10–11, 14–15, 178
  - Collins, H. M. and Evans, Robert (Expertise), 4, 31–3
  - conceptualization of gender expertise, 25–49
  - csQCA (crisp-set Qualitative Comparative Analysis), 141–2, 150–1
    - cases, 144–50
    - conditions, 150–1
    - configurations, 151–3
    - results, 151–62, 172–3
      - high-level support, 162–4
      - logical remainders, 155–8, 161–2
      - model specification, 153
      - outcome, 150
      - solution paths, 153–62
      - truth table, 151
      - women's policy agencies and women's movements, 163–6
  - epistemic communities, 86–7
  - European Union (*see also* gender mainstreaming)
    - diffusion of gender equality policy, 95–6, 178–9
    - European Commission, 67, 68
    - European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE), 67, 68, 114–15
    - gender expert lists/data, 16–17, 99, 121–2, 136
    - results
      - gender expert work experience, 66–8
      - interview results, **102**, 103–4, **112**, 114–15
      - survey results, **124**, 125, 136
  - expertise, 3–5, 11–12, 26–7, 35–42 (*see also* gender expertise and gender mainstreaming)
    - in feminist literature, 27–30, 37–41
    - triangle of empowerment, 89
    - velvet triangle, 89–90
  - gendering, 11–12
  - knowledge; specialist knowledge, 11–12, 32–3, 35–41, 47
    - contributory expertise, 32–3
    - interactional expertise, 32–3, 47
    - knowledge production, 36, 51, 52–3
  - in non-feminist literature, 23–7
    - advocacy coalition framework (ACF), 83–4
    - epistemic communities, 86–7
    - multiple streams theory, 84–5
    - policy problems, 81–3
    - social construction theory, 85–6
  - politicization, 4–5
  - proliferation, 4–6
- feminist comparative public policy
    - literature, 88–98 (*see also* gender mainstreaming, state feminism, feminist international relations)
    - left support, 92, 104, 116, 136
    - policy sectors, 88–9
    - triangle of empowerment, 89
    - velvet triangle, 89–90
    - women's movements, 90–1, 92, 163–4, 174
    - women's policy agencies, 27–8, 91–2, 163–4, 165–6, 174
  - feminist international relations (*see also* gender mainstreaming)
    - international organizations, 95–6, 97
    - norm translation, 97–8
    - transnational advocacy networks (TANs), 98
  - feminist knowledge, 12, 38–42, 43, 48, 168–9 (*see also* gender expertise)

- gender equality machineries, *see*  
women's policy agencies
- gender expertise (*see also* expertise  
and knowledge)  
activities, 61–3, 169  
conceptualization, 25–49  
definition, 12, 41–2, 143, 168  
dimensions, 41–2, 168–9  
education, 57–61, 169  
experience, 64–71  
knowledge, 12, 28–30  
feminist knowledge, 12, 38–42,  
43, 48, 168–9  
location, 27–8, 53–4  
operationalization (identifying  
gender experts) 45–7,  
132–44, 169  
regional affiliation, 54–7
- gender mainstreaming (*see also* gender  
expertise, feminist compara-  
tive public policy and feminist  
international relations)  
adoption, 6–7  
definitions, 7  
goals, 7, 9  
literature 6–11, 27–30, 37–39, 41,  
93–96  
approach, 93–4  
conceptual clarity, 93–4  
democratic tensions, 8–9  
European Union, 7, 95–6  
feminist knowledge, 38–9,  
40–1, 47  
gender knowledge, 38, 39  
high-level support, 94–5  
international relations, 97–8  
limitations, 9–10, 93–4  
need for gender expertise, 8–9  
tools of gender experts, 8  
transformative potential, 9–10  
United Nations, 7, 95–6
- in research results  
European Union, 66–9, **102**,  
103–4, 114–15, **124**, **125**  
future limitations, 112–14  
high-level support, 101–3, 135,  
163–4, 171, 172–3, 174–5  
mainstreaming tensions, 111–12
- mainstream resistance, 107–8  
women's ministries / women's  
policy agencies, 105–7, 114–15,  
124, 125, 135, 155–8, 161–2,  
163–5  
United Nations, 66–9, **102**, 103–4,  
114–15, **124**, 125
- Goertz, Gary and Mazur, Amy  
(conceptualization), 21–49
- high-level support,  
in gender mainstreaming literature,  
94–5  
in results, 101–3, 135, 163–4, 171,  
172–3, 174–5  
interview results, 101–3  
QCA analysis, 162–4  
survey results, 135
- intersectionality, 41, 43
- interviews, 16–17  
approach, 99–100  
contact strategy, 99  
results, 53–75, 101–15, 170–1  
high-level support, 101–3  
institutionalization, 114–15  
international importance  
(EU and UN), 103–4  
limits to long-term success,  
112–14  
mainstream resistance, 107–9  
narrow impact, 106–7  
networking/coalitions, 109–11  
policy sacrifice, 111–12  
supportive administrations,  
governments and government  
actors, 104–5
- knowledge, 11–12, 34–5, 41–5  
(*see also* expertise)  
feminist knowledge, 12, 38–42, 43,  
48, 168–9  
gender knowledge, 37–8, 41–2  
objective knowledge, 33  
scientific knowledge, 35–7, 52  
contributory expertise, 32–3  
interactional expertise, 32–3, 47  
knowledge production, 36, 51, 52–3

- role in public policy, 3–6
  - specialist knowledge (expertise), 11–12, 32–3, 35–41, 47
- social construction of knowledge, 35–6
- subjective knowledge, 33
- ubiquitous knowledge, 31–2
- left government, 92, 104, 116, 136
- mixed-methods (*see also* interviews, survey and csQCA)
  - approach, 3, 15–19
  - elite interviews, 16–7, 53–75, 99–100, 101–15, 170–1
  - online survey, 17, 99–100, 101–15, 121–2, 123–34, 170–1
  - Qualitative Comparative Analysis, 18, 141–2, 144–51, 151–62, 172–3
  - research findings, 53–75, 101–15, 123–34, 151–62, 170–3
  - theoretical propositions, 173
- multiple streams theory, 84–5
- national machineries for gender equality, *see* women's policy agencies
- Non-western countries
  - regional comparisons, 69–71, 136, 172
- OPERA, 1
- Pitkin, Hannah (categories of representation), 130–2 (*see also* representation)
- policy debates, 142–9, 163
  - policy debates with gender experts, 72–5, 144–9
- policy success (*see also* feminist, comparative public policy literature and policy literature)
  - definition, 3, 13, 19, 79–81, 150
  - factors impacting success, 12–13
  - in feminist literature, 88–99
  - in non-feminist literature, 81–8
- in results, 101–15, 123–34, 151–62, 170–3
  - theoretical propositions of success, 173
- policy theories (*see also* feminist comparative public policy literature)
  - feminist literature, 12–13, 88–98
  - non-feminist literature, 12–13, 81–88
  - advocacy coalition framework (ACF), 83–4
  - epistemic communities, 86–7
  - multiple streams theory, 84–5
  - policy problems, 81–3
  - social construction theory, 85–6
- Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA), 18, 140–1 (*see also* csQCA)
  - causal complexity, 140–1
  - equifinality, 141
  - multiple conjunctural causation, 141
- Quality in Gender+ Equality Policies (QUING), 1
- representation
  - descriptive representation, 13–4, 76–7
  - substantive representation, 13–4, 150, 164, 175
- research findings (*see also* csQCA, interviews and survey)
  - csQCA results, 151–62, 172–3
  - interview results, 53–75, 101–15, 170–1
  - survey results, 101–15, 123–34, 171
- Research Network on Gender, Politics and the State (RNGS)
  - data, 18–9, 29–30, 71–5, 142–9, 172
  - identifying experts, 143–4
  - policy debates, 142–9, 163
  - policy debates with gender experts, 72–5, 144–9
- sequential mixed-methods analysis, 12–13, 16–18, 170–3 (*see also mixed methods*)

- social construction theory, 85–6
- state feminism, 90, 163–4, 174  
(*see also* women's policy agencies)
- survey  
 distribution, 121–2  
 results, 101–15, 123–34, 171  
 age, 127–8  
 descriptive statistics, 123–6  
 statistical comparisons, 126–34  
 region, 130–32  
 professional affiliation, 132–4  
 years' experience, 128–9
- TARGET, 61–2
- theoretical propositions of policy success, 173
- thematic network analysis (*see also* interviews)  
 approach, 99–100  
 results, 101–15, 170–1  
 coalitions of support for an issue, 109–112  
 future impact of gender expertise and gender mainstreaming limited, 112–15  
 governments supportive of implementing gender equality and gender mainstreaming, 101–5  
 most success in traditional women's issues and women's ministries, 105–9
- transnational advocacy networks (TANs), 98
- triangle of empowerment, 89–90
- United Nations (*see also* Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action, gender mainstreaming)  
 Commission on the Status of Women, 50  
 diffusion of gender equality policy, 6–8, 95–6, 178–9  
 Division for the Advancement of Women (DAW), 50  
 Fourth World Conference on Women (Beijing Conference), 7, 50, 74–5  
 in results, 66–9, **102**, 103–4  
 interview results, **112**, 114–15  
 survey results, **124**, 125, 136  
 United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN Women), 78, 96
- velvet triangle, 89–90
- women's movements / women's movement mobilization, 90–1, 92, 174  
 in results  
 survey results, **124**, 125, 127, 130, **131**, 136  
 csQCA results, 157, 161–2, 163–4  
 women's policy agencies, 27–8, 91–2, 163–4, 165–6, 174 (*see also* state feminism)  
 in results  
 interview results, 105–7, 114–15  
 csQCA results, 155–8, 161–2, 163–5  
 survey results, 124, 125, 135