

Encyclopedia of Public Administration and Public Policy, Third Edition

ISSN: (Print) (Online) Journal homepage: <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/book/10.1081/E-EPAP3>

Policy Analysis: Feminist Comparative Policy

Amy G. Mazur

To cite this entry: Amy G. Mazur . Policy Analysis: Feminist Comparative Policy. In Encyclopedia of Public Administration and Public Policy, Third Edition. Taylor and Francis: New York, Published online: 20 May 2016; 1-7.

To link to this chapter: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1081/E-EPAP3-120053606>



Published online: 20 May 2016



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



View related articles [↗](#)

Policy Analysis: Feminist Comparative Policy

Amy G. Mazur

School of Politics, Philosophy and Public Affairs, Washington State University, Pullman, Washington, U.S.A.

Abstract

This entry maps out a new area of policy studies, Feminist Comparative Policy (FCP), that seeks to answer the highly complex questions of if, how, and why contemporary, Western, post-industrial democracies are feminist by focusing on the interface between gender politics and the state. The analysis first examines the approach, research community, and infrastructure of FCP up to 2000, and then turns to a discussion of more recent developments since 2000 through nine international FCP projects with a particular focus on the Research Network on Gender Politics and the State.

INTRODUCTION

It has been over 30 years since the second-wave women's movements took to the streets to change society in western democracies. In part, as a response to women's movement demands, governments across the ideological spectrum have developed a complex and varied set of machineries and policies. These policies and agencies are specifically charged with promoting women's rights and status and, in some cases, with addressing the deep-rooted causes of gender-based inequalities between men and women. Like the women's movements that inspired them, they have had varying levels of success in achieving ambitious goals. Moreover, government policies and structures that promote women's status and rights, as well as gender equality, have the potential to better represent women as a group, both substantively and descriptively, and in doing so, to make democracies more democratic.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Since the late 1980s, a new area of study has taken shape within the purview of political science to study, assess, and develop empirically based theory about the impact, both direct and indirect, of these gender-based political dynamics between women's movements and the state. This field is distinct from nonfeminist work in political science and policy studies that has tended to ignore gender-specific dynamics and is also distinct from work in feminist studies that takes a critical view of social science inquiry and state action. Filling in the gaps of and building from scholarship in Comparative Politics and Policy, as well as Gender and Politics, Feminist Comparative Policy (FCP) focuses specifically on feminist policy dynamics through a distinct approach and research community. Feminist Comparative Policy scholars seek to answer the highly complex questions of if, how, and why contemporary, Western, post-industrial democracies are feminist. Up to the mid-2000s, FCP focused

on Western, post-industrial democracies, given that the women's movement and its state responses in these countries share basic, common patterns that are a product of the particular level of economic, political, and social development found in the 23 countries in this category.

An ever-growing community of over 100 researchers in Europe, North America, Australia, and New Zealand, share a common comparative approach to the study of gender, policy, and the state. By 2014, FCP scholars have produced a significant body of literature deserving attention and created permanent research and teaching infrastructures on three continents. The goal of this entry is to map out this relatively new area of study. It first examines the approach, research community, and infrastructure of FCP up to 2000 and then presents the more recent development in FCP work through nine large-scale research projects, with a focus on the Research Network on Gender Politics and the State (RNGS).

Given the centrality of the term feminist for FCP, it is important to provide a working definition of this oft-contested concept. Feminism is defined here using the approach of recent FCP work that recognizes the core ideas of western feminism from which academics, activists, and policy practitioners choose. These ideas include: 1) a certain understanding of women as a group within the context of the social, economic, and cultural diversity of women; 2) the advancement of women's rights, status, or condition as a group in both the public and private spheres; and 3) the reduction or elimination of gender-based hierarchy or patriarchy that underpins basic inequalities between men and women in the public and private spheres.

FEMINIST COMPARATIVE POLICY UP TO 2000: APPROACH, RESEARCH COMMUNITY, AND INFRASTRUCTURE

Feminist policy scholars in Western Europe first acknowledged the empirical gaps and gender biases in theory and

methodology used in the study of the state and public policy in the early 1980s. By the early 1990s, researchers in North America and Australia joined their Western European counterparts in the new feminist academic enterprise that sought to systematically study the interface between gender and the state. In the mid-1990s, a loose consensus formed in this transnational community around conventions for conducting research, developing theory, and reporting findings, moving the field into a new stage of vitality and institutionalization. In 2006, with 1) over 400 published pieces, over one-fourth of which were published in the past five years; 2) an estimated 20 million euros received in research funding since the mid-1980s; and 3) four journals that serve as major outlets for FCP work—*Social Politics*, *International Journal of Feminist Politics, Politics and Gender*, and *Women and Politics*—FCP scholars and their work constitute a formidable presence in political science and public policy studies.^[1] The FCP approach includes the following six features.

Feature 1: an Applied Feminist Empirical Approach

Labels commonly used to identify different strands of Western feminist thought are not useful in identifying the feminist approach of FCP, e.g., liberal, radical, or socialist. Individuals who contribute to this new field mostly carry-out a feminist agenda through designing, conducting, and disseminating their research and teaching about the topics they study. Some FCP scholars participate in women's movements and organizations and serve periodically as experts on government commissions. Most researchers, however, pursue their political action in academia. Unlike many feminist scholars who seek to transform or revolutionize the study of politics, FCP scholars have a more moderate agenda aimed at working within the rules of the scientific arena and contributing to non-feminist and feminist bodies of knowledge. They tend to eschew a separatist approach to research; most would agree that men and women should conduct feminist research.

Reflecting what Sandra Harding refers to as an “empirical feminist” approach, FCP scholars agree that past social science research was androcentric, dominated by men, with research problems and methodology excluding the considerations of gender and women.^[2] At the same time, they do not seek to dismiss the entire social scientific process. Feminist Comparative Policy scholars recognize that social science inquiry is not entirely value-free. In their view, social scientists that claimed to be conducting objective science in the past essentially ignored empirical gender policy issues in the formulation of research problems and designs.

Most FCP practitioners use empirical observation to test and explore hypotheses in order to contribute to theories about gender, politics, and the state. Feminist Comparative

Policy studies are often designed so that findings can be used to help policy practitioners and activists in women's policy agencies, political parties, movements, and organizations learn more about the causes of gender-based inequities and the complex range of solutions, including different ways of designing good practices. Since the early 1980s, FCP scholars have been consulted regularly in their expert capacity by the European Union (in the context of the Action Plans on gender equality), the Council of Europe, the Nordic Council, and the United Nations, as well as numerous country-based commissions at national and sub-national levels.

The applied feminist empirical approach underpins FCP scholar attitudes about identifying with specific feminist currents of thought and about adhering to a single fixed definition of what constitutes feminist policy, feminist states, and feminist political action in general. Feminist Comparative Policy scholars tend to avoid articulating a specific political stance on feminism in their research and teaching. They do not deny adhering to a certain type of feminist politics; they just do not apply their specific political views of feminism to their research. The definitions of feminism that FCP researchers use in their analyses, therefore, come from comparative studies of feminist politics, rather than their own feminist politics. Feminist Comparative Policy scholars tend to be leery of pinning down a single narrow definition of feminism connected to a specific current of Western political thought. In recent years, many agree that there is a growing consensus around broad definitions of feminism, like the one proposed earlier, that take into consideration the diversity of feminist ideas in Western countries and extend across national boundaries.

Feature 2: Operationalizing Normative Feminist Theory on Democracy

Normative political theory has been an integral part of the development of feminist studies in general. A major question asked by the extensive literature on feminist theory is whether Western democracies are as democratic as observers think, particularly given the degree to which women and women's issues have been excluded from politics, often in the context of the formal articulation of universal, gender-blind values of equality, freedom, and representation.^[3] Feminist theorists who write on democracy argue for a better inclusion of women and ideas that favor women's rights in the political process through “descriptive” and “substantive” representation.^[4] These themes of representation and democracy are at the center of FCP studies in so far as they ask the empirical question of whether, how, and why democratic states can be feminist. The question is less about the specific form and design of democracy than its capacity to incorporate women's interests and women themselves into the political process and, in doing so, to promote gender equality and a more complete democratic system.

Feature 3: Bringing the Patriarchal State Back in as a Research Question

As most political scientists agree, particularly since the state was “brought back in” in the 1980s, the concept of the state—government structures as opposed to country—is not a simple idea. For many feminist theorists, the state is highly problematic, given that it is a product of systems of power based on male domination, or patriarchy. From the assumption of the patriarchal nature of the state, where state actions, structures, and actors seek to perpetuate systems of gender domination that keep women in their inferior positions in the public and private spheres, many feminist analysts dismiss or are highly critical of the state as an arena for positive social change. Other feminist theorists provide a more malleable view of state patriarchy and argue that certain state arenas may be appropriate sites for feminist action. Feminist Comparative Policy analysts do not entirely dismiss the possibility of a patriarchal state; they see the issue of state patriarchy as a question for empirical research. Some parts of the state may be patriarchal, while other parts may have the potential to be quite woman-friendly. Feminist Comparative Policy places the state and its institutions at its analytical core. The four major areas of FCP research, outlined in the next section, focus on some aspect of the state or state action.

Feature 4: Using Gender as a Category of Analysis

Since the mid-1980s, feminist research across different disciplines has shifted its focus from sex, a more-or-less dichotomous variable based on biological differences between men and women, to gender, the social construction of sexual difference between men and women. As Joan Scott first asserted in 1986, the relational concept of gender should be the prime “category of analysis” in theoretical frameworks and research designs.^[5] This holistic approach to the use of gender is intended to push analyses beyond an “add women and stir” phase where sex or women are added as an analytical afterthought. Since the mid-1990s, FCP scholars have incorporated gender into their research designs in a variety of ways.

Feature 5: Comparative Theory-Building in Western Post-Industrial Democracies

Feminist Comparative Policy scholars seek to develop theory through culturally sensitive, comparative, and cross-national analysis. They often employ principles of research design and methods developed outside a feminist perspective. Up until 2000, with a few exceptions, FCP work utilized small n analysis—case studies and the comparative method. In recent years, many studies include a large number of observations and, hence, use the statistical tools of large n analysis. Other studies take a bridging approach,

incorporating both qualitative and quantitative analysis. Feminist Comparative Policy studies take a *most similar systems approach*, where economic and political development in Western, post-industrial democracies are the control variables and variations in nation-based culture, state-society relations, women’s movement mobilization, and government design are examined as they influence gender, state, and policy issues. Most FCP work assumes that post-industrial countries in the West, unlike other countries of the world, share certain environments and institutions, with notable cross-national variations. A part of the common heritage is that women’s movements have developed strategies aimed, at least in part, at influencing the democratic policy process and the development of large welfare states. Designing and using concepts like feminism that are able, as Giovanni Sartori first elaborated, to “travel” across national boundaries without “stretching” the core meaning are also a key part of the comparative agenda of FCP.^[6]

Feature 6: One-Way Intersections with Nonfeminist Political Science

Many FCP scholars since the mid-1990s have actively sought to intersect their work with nonfeminist literature. Instead of completely rejecting traditional political studies or uncritically using feminist studies, FCP work purposefully develops the strengths and shores up the weaknesses of each to advance knowledge in both areas. In general, efforts to intersect work with nonfeminist political science tend to be one-way. Feminist Comparative Policy scholars seek to contribute to nonfeminist work, and nonfeminist policy analysts ignore FCP theory building that speaks directly to central analytical issues. Even within the context of the increasing methodological pluralism of Political Science, few studies outside the purview of feminist analysis use the findings or concepts of FCP research or even focus specifically on gender policy dynamics.

Research Community and Infrastructure

Following this unified approach, FCP scholars examine four different substantive areas related to the state and its institutions in a large and growing literature (see bibliography in Mazur^[1]). *Feminist Policy Formation* work scrutinizes the ways in which public policy promotes women’s status and strikes down gender hierarchies through studying the obstacles, actors, content, and processes of policy that is purposefully feminist. *Feminist Movements and Policy* research is concerned with the interplay between women’s movements, the state, and policy. A major issue of interest here is to evaluate the success of women’s movements in influencing public policy and the structures of the state. *State Feminism* scholarship considers whether state structures and actors can promote feminism through focusing on the relations between women’s movement actors and

the activities of women's and gender equality policy machineries and the bureaucrats, or femocrats, that staff them, in a wide variety of government agencies and branches. *Gender and Welfare State* literature examines the welfare state as a prime obstacle and/or promoter of gender discrimination and equality. Much of this scholarship looks at the impacts of social policy in terms women's social conditions in comparison to men's in the public and private spheres.

In 2001, there were roughly 100 scholars who worked regularly on FCP research. To be counted as a part of the FCP community, individuals needed to have two or more publications on an FCP topic. The list of active FCP scholars used for this analysis is available on request. Members of the FCP scientific community are mostly women. More than a result of any collective decision to exclude men, their absence is a result of the realities of graduate education; women tend to be more interested in the study of feminist politics and male students tend to be channelled away from what is often perceived as a less prestigious area of study. Less than one quarter of FCP scholars are from the United States, nearly three quarters from Europe. One half of FCP scholars is based in English-speaking countries—Ireland, the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, and the United States. The other half is based in continental Europe—the Netherlands, Germany, Austria, Italy, Spain, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Finland, France, Belgium, and Greece. Controlling for national population and size of university infrastructure, this community is quite evenly spread among the different countries. Many FCP researchers are trained in one country and then work and live in others.

Feminist Comparative Policy practitioners began to develop research networks in the early 1980s. The networks often meet at the conferences of the European Consortium of Political Research, the American Political Science Association, the International Political Science Association, or the International Studies Association. At least 20 FCP books have come out of ECPR workshops. In the 1990s, FCP scholars increasingly developed multinational research projects. Once in place, the network convenors secure funds from a combination of supra-national, national, university, private funding agencies, and other institutionalized venues that are not overtly feminist. These projects implement a complex, long-term, gendered research program; produce a series of publications; and often create more permanent infrastructure such as newsletters, journals, homepages, graduate funding, and permanent teaching programs.

DEVELOPMENTS SINCE 2000 THROUGH NINE FCP PROJECTS

This section identifies the new trends in FCP research through nine international research projects presented in Table 1.^[7]

Table 1 List of FCP research projects

Women's Movements and Reconfigured States (1997–2003) ^[8] Banaszak et al. (2003)
Gendering Europeanisation (1999–2003) Liebert (2003) ^[9]
RNGS (1995–2009). Research Network on Gender Politics and the State http://www.libarts.wsu.edu/pppa/rngs/ ^[10] (e.g., McBride and Mazur 2010)
EGG (2002–2005). Enlargement, Gender and Governance: The Civic and Political Participation and Representation of Women in Central and Eastern Europe http://www.qub.ac.uk/egg/ ^[11] (e.g., Galligan et al. 2007)
MAGEEQ (2003–2007). Policy Frames and Implementation Problems: The Case of Gender Mainstreaming http://www.mageeq.net/ ^[12] (e.g., Verloo 2007)
QUING (2006–2011). Quality in Gender Equality + Policies http://www.quing.eu/ ^[13] (e.g., Lombardo et al. 2009)
FEMCIT (2006–2010). Gendered Citizenship in Multi-Cultural Europe: The Impact of Contemporary Women's Movements http://www.femcit.org
VEIL (2006–2009). Values Equality and Differences in Liberal Democracies http://www.univie.ac.at/veil/
Governing Difference (2006–2009). A Challenge for New Democracies in Central and South Eastern European Countries

While by no means a systematic assessment of all recent work in Feminist Comparative Policy, this analysis provides an opportunity to reflect upon the state of current comparative gender and policy scholarship, particularly given that over 160 scholars in 27 countries have actively participated in these studies. In some ways gender and comparative policy scholarship has not changed since 2000. Gender remains a fundamental category for analysis; issues of patriarchy, gender-biased norms and the state are at the center of study designs; feminist and nonfeminist theory continues to be operationalized in studies, and comparative theory building based on qualitative analysis is an important part of analysis. At the same time, there have also been significant new developments reflected in these projects, also identified by other feminist policy scholars.^[14,15]

While not a pre-requisite, the creation of a large international research group is becoming more of the norm, as a reflection of shifting priorities of major government funding agencies and efforts to include a broader range of countries into comparative studies. Given that research funding is often provided for by women's policy agencies also with feminist agendas, the goals of the researchers tend to be quite compatible with funders. The inclusion of East Central and South Eastern European countries into the analytical purview of many of the newer FCP projects opens the door for the consideration of countries from outside of the West with different levels of economic and political development and cultural contexts. As a result, FCP is faced with a new level of cultural diversity and the need to rethink core analytical concepts to make them better "travel" across

cultural boundaries. This new development may allow FCP analyses of western countries to bridge the gap with a growing and rich body of comparative work on non-western countries and research that analyzes trends across a broad range of regions of the world. This push to go beyond the West clearly resonates with the calls for systematic cross-national research made by the advocates of a Comparative Politics of Gender as well.^[16]

The analytical perspective of FCP has clearly gone beyond the nation-state to include a multilevel approach where the sub-national and extra-national levels are just as, if not more, important than the national level. Also, cultural differences must be placed in an intersectional perspective where race, ethnicity, class, religion, and sexual orientation become important and fundamental considerations alongside gender. Time period and policy issue area have also become salient analytical dimensions when understanding the dynamics and determinants of gender and policy processes, perhaps even more important than national-level trends and dynamics.

Normative and empirical questions of democracy have increasingly become a focal point of FCP studies in terms of placing women's movements at the center of making the democratic process more democratic, and for the newer democracies in terms of effective transitions to democracies. An increasing emphasis on representation as a means to link issues of women's presence to policy outcomes in the FCP scholarship dovetails with comparative scholarship on women in politics, which is also taking a more systematic look at substantive representation and policy outcomes.^[17] Thus, although in 2002, the work on women's political representation was identified as an adjacent area of research, today policy and representation research are becoming one and the same. Here too intersectional approaches are becoming essential; women's interests, movements, and representation must be disaggregated and understood in terms of differences among women by religion, race, ethnicity, class, etc.

Methodological pluralism is also a more pronounced attribute of recent FCP work. Much work is qualitative emphasizing the importance of expert analyses of country cases and process tracing. Studies are also increasingly bringing in quantitative large "n" analysis out of necessity, owing to the tendency to include more countries in study designs. In addition, the tools of moderate "n" analysis outside any feminist purview, Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA) are also being increasingly used in FCP studies. An emerging part of the feminist approach is to more formally conceptualize and to develop specific data collection and analysis techniques, drawing from both feminist and non-feminist work. While earlier FCP studies tended to take a more purely empirical feminist approach where studies were designed to test hypotheses through empirical analysis without putting into question the scientific method, some of the more recent feminist research has embraced the European "discursive turn."^[18] These studies have

brought in approaches based on feminist standpoint theory and social constructivism with a focus on framing, discourse and policy content and often eschew the scientific method. They also have a strong emphasis on bringing research to public officials and citizens through public meetings, conferences and training, an emphasis brought in by a standpoint approach.

Identifying common trends in findings is still an open-ended question, awaiting a systematic meta-analysis of all current FCP work to try to develop propositions about gender, policy and the state that can be fine-tuned in future studies. Indeed, the FCP projects reviewed here do not directly build from each other and have little direct intra-group communication except through a few individuals who are in several projects. Analyzing the results and common conclusions of all current FCP research has the potential to build a bridge among all of the studies and in so doing to allow FCP scholarship to more systematically contribute to theory building and the cumulation of knowledge.

One characteristic of FCP that has remained quite similar is the degree to which nonfeminist policy studies and political science continue to ignore gender and policy research. Mainstream comparative politics and policy studies still do not integrate the findings of feminist scholarship in a meaningful way or bring gender, women's movements, or women's representation in as an important aspect to be analyzed in comparative studies of democratic politics. To be sure, there has been an increase in publications of gender research in nonfeminist journals, but few non-feminist scholars have seriously gendered their own analysis beyond isolated cases or the more expedient approach of "add women and stir."

THE RESEARCH NETWORK ON GENDER POLITICS AND THE STATE (RNGS)

Created in 1995 as a response to the weaknesses of an initial cross-national study of women's policy agencies, the Research Network on Gender, Politics and the State (RNGS) was composed of 40 researchers from 16 countries and 145 associates.^[19] From the beginning, RNGS members met regularly to develop the complex multiphase research design and present findings: over 30 meetings in all. Receiving significant public funding, RNGS examined the following questions: if, how, and why do women's policy agencies (WPAs) make post-industrial democracies more democratic and the state more feminist by helping women's movement actors and ideas gain entry to the state as a way to represent women more generally? In other words, the study assessed the dynamics and determinants of state feminism.

The network conducted a systematic analysis of these questions across the full range of policy issues that could potentially affect gender relations and over the period of

time of women's movements mobilization in western post industrial democracies from the 1970s to the present. Country studies were conducted in five areas by experts of each country: job training, abortion, prostitution, political representation, and issues of national significance, the "hot issue." The unit of analysis was the policy debate, and not the country, which takes place in a public arena and ends with an official state decision or nondecision. Researchers developed a set of criteria for selecting three representative debates for each issue area in each country and for the hot issue. Framing is a major analytical focus of the RNGS study. Here, the policy-making process is seen as a conflict of ideas and that actors struggle over the political meaning of problems and policy. The dominant frame for each policy debate is identified as well as the "micro frames" of the women's policy agencies and the women's movement actors who took a position on the issue to see if the debate frame was gendered and if so by which policy actors/frames.

RNGS took a mixed-methods approach, seeking to bridge the qualitative and quantitative divide. In a first qualitative phase, researchers in Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Finland, France, Germany, Great Britain, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, Spain, Sweden, and the United States studied between one and four debates on the five issues: not all issues were studied in all countries. Five books presented the findings of the qualitative phase, one on each issue.^[20–24] In a second quantitative phase, RNGS researchers transposed the major concepts of the qualitative model into a set of numerically based variables operationalized to facilitate testing the project's hypotheses and to provide user-friendly information about the policy debates, policy subsystems, women's movements, and women's policy agencies. This process involved the construction of a codebook and a SPSS dataset available on the RNGS website (see Research Network on Gender Politics and the State^[19] and Mazur and McBride^[25] for more on the RNGS approach, study and data set), which contains 130 policy debates/observations from 13 countries coded on over 200 variables.

While each book presented results about state feminism for that particular issue-area showing the variation of rates of state feminism across issue-areas, the final phase of the RNGS study analyzed the presence of state feminist dynamics across all issues in a single "capstone" book that used a multi-methods approach (see McBride and Mazur^[10]). Indeed, the large number of variables and the limited number of observations in each issue book meant that the issue-based findings only presented a partial picture. The final capstone analysis "triangulated" the quantitative and qualitative data through statistical methods, Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA) and case studies. The findings point to the multiple paths to successful state feminism and the important, but not crucial, role of women's policy agencies in enhancing women's representation within state arenas. There is a clear variation to successful state feminism by

issue-area, but not by country. Also, success does not necessarily occur under left-wing governments, when women's movements are strong or when women's policy agencies are more powerful. Despite the complex patterns in state feminism, the capstone analysis definitively shows that women's policy agencies are a permanent presence within the state and are important partners for women's movements to make a difference in public policy and hence have an important part to play in making stable democracies more democratic.

While RNGS was primarily an academic research and theory-building endeavor with an eye toward making contributions to both feminist and non-feminist scholarship, the project from the beginning made connections to a more policy-oriented audience in dissemination, including the presentation of findings in 2005 at a conference at the Institute for Women's Policy Research, a US-based think tank, and at a United Nations Expert Group Meeting on Women's Political Participation and a subsequent meeting of the UN's Commission on the Status of Women.

CONCLUSIONS

To be sure, FCP research is in a period of vitality and growth. With an empirical feminist approach, FCP scholars are increasingly contributing to the study of policy and politics in Western, post-industrial democracies. It is increasingly difficult to conduct a study of state-based politics without mentioning gender-specific elements. So, FCP researchers are making non-feminist theories more complete and sound. At the same time, it is of fundamental importance that scholars who do not share the FCP agenda take account of FCP work. It is still quite common to find policy studies and textbooks on adjacent topics that completely ignore, or only marginally discuss, gender considerations. More than any systematic resistance to feminist policy work, we are often all too busy to learn about new areas. Thus, this entry provides a go-to source for busy policy scholars unaware of this new field. Feminist Comparative Policy scholars throughout the world are reaching out to policy makers and activists, beyond the halls of academia. Through their work on government reports, expert consultations, and as members of state-based commission, practitioners of FCP, arguably more than many fields of study, have the potential to contribute to making our democracies more democratic.

REFERENCES

1. Mazur, A.G. *Theorizing Feminist Policy*; Oxford University Press: Oxford, 2002.
2. Harding, S. *Conclusion: Epistemological Questions Feminism and Methodology*; Indiana University Press: Bloomington and Indianapolis, 1987.

3. Squires, J. *Gender in Political Theory*; Polity Press: Cambridge, 1999.
4. Pitkin, H.F. *The Concept of Representation*; University of California Press: Berkeley, 1967.
5. Scott, J. Gender: a useful category of historical analysis. *Am. Hist. Rev.* **1986**, *91*, 1053–1075.
6. Sartori, G. Concept misformation in comparative politics. *Am. Pol. Sci. Rev.* **1970**, *64*, 1033–1053.
7. Mazur, A.G.; Pollock, Eds. M. Gender and public policy in Europe. *Comp. Eur. Polit.* (a special issue) **2009**, *9*, 1.
8. Banaszak, L.A.; Beckwith, K.; Rucht, D., Eds. *Women's Movements Facing a Reconfigured State*; Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 2003.
9. Liebert, U., Ed. *Europeanisation and Gender Equality. Reframing Public Policy in EU Member States*; Peter Lang: Bruxelles, 2003.
10. McBride, D.E.; Mazur, A.G. The politics of state feminism: innovation in comparative research. In *The Politics of State Feminism: Innovation in Comparative Research*; With the participation of Lovenduski, J., Outshoorn, J., Sauer, B., Guadagnini, M., Eds.; Temple University Press: Philadelphia, PA, 2010.
11. Galligan, Y.; Clavero, S.; Calloni, M. *Gender, Politics and Democracy*; Barbara Budrich Publishers: Opladen and Farmington Hills, 2007.
12. Verloo, M., Ed. *Multiple Meanings of Gender Equality: A Critical Frame Analysis of Gender Policies in Europe*; CEU Press: Budapest, 2007.
13. Lombardo, E.; Meier, P.; Verloo, M., Eds. *The Discursive Politics of Gender Equality. Stretching, Bending and Policy-making*; Taylor & Francis, 2009.
14. Lombardo, E.; Meier, P.; Verloo, M. Policy making. In *The OUP Handbook on Gender and Politics*; Waylen, G., Celis, K., Kantola, J., Weldon, L., Eds.; Oxford University Press: Oxford, 2013; 677–700.
15. Blofield, M.; Haas, L. Policy outputs. In *The OUP Handbook on Gender and Politics*; Waylen, G., Celis, K., Kantola, J., Weldon, L., Eds.; Oxford University Press: Oxford, 2013; 677–700.
16. Beckwith, K. Toward a comparative politics of gender: advancing the discipline along interdisciplinary boundaries. *Perspect. Polit.* **2010**, *8* (1), 159–168.
17. Celis, K.; Childs, S., Eds. Special issue: the substantive representation of women. *Representation* **2008**, *44*, 2.
18. Kantola, J. *Feminists Theorize the State*; Palgrave Macmillan: New York, 2006.
19. Research Network on Gender Politics and the State. <http://libarts.wsu.edu/pppa/rngs/> (accessed November 17, 2014)
20. Mazur, A.G., Ed. *State Feminism, Women's Movements, and Job Training: Making Democracies Work in the Global Economy*; Routledge: New York, 2001.
21. Stetson, D.M., Ed. *Abortion Politics, Women's Movements and the Democratic State: A Comparative Study of State Feminism*; Oxford University Press: Oxford, 2001.
22. Outshoorn, J., Ed. *The Politics of Prostitution: Women's Movements, Democratic States, and the Globalization of Sex-Commerce*; Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 2004.
23. Lovenduski, J., Ed. *State Feminism and Political Representation*; Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 2005.
24. Haussman, M.; Sauer, B., Eds. *Gendering the State in the Age of Globalization. Women's Movements and State Feminism in Post Industrial Democracies*; Rowan and Littlefield: Lanham, 2006.
25. Mazur, A.G.; McBride, D. The RNGS dataset: Women's Policy Agencies, women's movements and policy debates in western post industrial democracies. *French Polit.* **2006**, *4*, 209–236.