Women's Movements and Women's Policy Offices in Western Postindustrial Democracies, 1970-2001

Dataset for a Study Conducted by the Research Network on Gender Politics and the State

USER GUIDE AND CODEBOOK
February 15th, 2011

Coordinated by
Dorothy E. McBride, Florida Atlantic University
Amy G. Mazur, Washington State University

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Overview of RNGS Dataset Project……...3
Acknowledgements……4

I. RNGS Project Information
Principal Investigators……6
Contact Information……6
Funding Sources……6
Unit of Analysis and Sample……..6
Project Participants……7
Data Collection and Source Information……..10

II. Project Description
Overview of RNGS Project and Qualitative Phase I……12
Phase II – The Quantitative Phase
Overview……...13
Transposing the Qualitative Model into Quantifiable Concepts……...13
Collecting the Numerical Data……..13
Study Population and Sampling Procedures……..14
Coding and Intercoder-reliability……...15
Publications and Reports……16

III. Dataset Contents
Master List of Concepts and Variables…….……..18
Descriptive Variables
VAR INT_1 POLICY DEBATE ID……...22
VAR INT_2 COUNTRY ID……...23
VAR INT_3 DEBATE ISSUE ID……..24
VAR INT_4 YEAR POLICY DEBATE BEGINS…….24
VAR INT_5 YEAR POLICY DEBATE ENDS…….24
Contents of Analytical Concepts
Template for Concept Content……...……25
Variables
Nominal Definition
Question
Operational Definition
Variable construction notes
Variables in Dataset
CONCEPT 1. POLICY RESPONSE……..26
CONCEPT 2. PROCEDURAL RESPONSE……..31
CONCEPT 3. GENDERING ISSUE FRAME……...……....35
CONCEPT 4. WPA GENDERING……...……40
CONCEPT 5. WPA/WMA FIT……...……...45
CONCEPT 6. TYPE OF WPA……...……48
CONCEPT 7. WPA-TYPE OF APPOINTMENT……...……...50
CONCEPT 8. WPA-POLICY ORIENTATION…… 52

CONCEPT 9. WPA – POLICY AGENDA……....55
CONCEPT 10. WPA – POLICY-MAKING CAPACITY…….57
CONCEPT 11. WPA – ADMINISTRATIVE RESOURCES……....62
CONCEPT 12. WPA – WM LEADERSHIP……..70
CONCEPT 13. WMA – STAGE……73
CONCEPT 14. WMA – ORGANIZATIONAL CLOSENESS TO LEFT……75
CONCEPT 15. WMA – IDEOLOGICAL CLOSENESS TO LEFT…..…...77
CONCEPT 16. WMA – PRIORITY……...…79
CONCEPT 17. WMA – COHESION……..……..81
CONCEPT 18. WMA – LOCATION……....…82
CONCEPT 19. WMA – FEMINIST ACTIVISM……....…87
CONCEPT 20. PE – COUNTERMOVEMENT……..……..90
CONCEPT 21. WMA STRENGTH – MOBILIZATION……..……...92
CONCEPT 22. WMA STRENGTH – INSTITUTIONALIZATION……..……..97
CONCEPT 23. PE – SUB-SYSTEM STRUCTURE……..……101
CONCEPT 24. PE – ISSUE FRAME FIT……..……104
CONCEPT 25. PE – GOVERNING MAJORITY……..……106
CONCEPT 26. EXTRA-NATIONAL LINKAGES……..……..108
CONCEPT 27. LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT……..……...113
CONCEPT 28 PARTY DEBATES ……..114
CONCEPT 28. COUNTRY-SPECIFIC FACTORS……..……..115
CONTENTS OF TEXT APPENDICES……...……118

IV. Frequency Tables……119

Appendices
Appendix 1 List of 130 Policy Debates in Dataset……...172
Appendix 2 Glossary of Terms……183
Appendix 3 Modules for Codebook Concept Entries……...190
Appendix 4 Coding Notes……198
Appendix 5 List of RNGS Publications and Papers……204
Appendix 6 Project Description for Qualitative Phase of RNGS Study……...210
Appendix 7 Works Cited……...……..…237

Overview of RNGS Dataset

The RNGS dataset contains 130 policy debates/observations from 13 countries coded on 28 concepts and over 110 variables (See Appendix 1 for the specific list of policy debates). It provides information on women's movements, women's policy offices, policy making processes and policy debates over a 35 year time period. There are two data files—one of the numerically based dataset in SPSS and a second file with text appendices of supplemental descriptive information for 22 variables, indicated by an 'A' in the dataset, for each policy debate (See p. 116 for the specific contents of the text appendices). To transpose the SPSS datafile go to http://www.ats.ucla.edu/stat/stata/faq/convert_pkg.htm.

This dataset was produced by the Research Network on Gender Politics and the State as a part of cross-national longitudinal study of women's policy offices and women's movements in western postindustrial democracies. Created in 1995, RNGS is composed of 40 researchers from 16 countries. The RNGS website, **http://libarts.wsu.edu/polisci/rngs**, contains detailed information on all aspects of the project.

RNGS members designed and carried out the large-scale comparative research project to examine if, how, and why women's policy offices, through their relations with women's movements, make postindustrial democracies more democratic and the state more feminist. The network's study encompasses the momentous years of women's movements from the emergence of autonomous protests in Europe and North America for the liberation of women in the 1960s and 1970s through the successful integration of movement activists into conventional politics in the 1990s and 2000s. The unit of analysis in the study and the dataset is a policy debate which takes place in a political/government arena and ends with an official decision or non-decision. Information in the dataset comes from the two phases of the project—qualitative and quantitative.

This codebook describes these two phases of the project as they relate to the construction of the dataset and describes its contents. Section I sets out basic information about the project. Section II contains a summary of the qualitative phase and a detailed discussion of the quantitative phase—conceptualization, operationalization, dataset construction, and sampling and coding procedures. Section III presents the description of the contents of the dataset – the component variables of each concept, the descriptive and system-wide variables, and the text appendices. Section IV provides frequency tables for each concept/variable. The references for all works cited in the codebook can be found in Appendix 7.

Acknowledgements

This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation (NSF) under grants 0084570/80. Any opinions, findings and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the NSF.

The coordinators of the codebook and dataset recognize that these research tools are the result of collaboration among many people: RNGS researchers who gathered the information about women's movements, agencies, and policy debates and countries; issue directors who carried the qualitative phase to completion; consultants who guided the work of transposition to the quantitative phase; and research assistants. Their contributions were made possible through a wide range of financial sponsors. Readers will find their names and their relationship to the project in the material that follows. The opportunity to work with all of them on this project has been a gift and the rewards of the work, unlike the dataset itself, immeasurable.

Dorothy E. McBride and Amy G. Mazur
February 15, 2011

I. RNGS PROJECT INFORMATION

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS

Dorothy E. McBride, Florida Atlantic University
Amy G. Mazur, Washington State University

CONTACT INFORMATION

Dorothy E. McBride
Emeritus Professor of Political Science
5005 60th Avenue Ct W
University Place, WA 98467
TEL : 253 503 6114
e-mail : lillygardenia@yahoo.com

Amy Mazur, Professor
Department of Political Science
Washington State University
Pullman, WA 99164-4880
TEL: 509-335-4615 FAX: 509-335-7990
e-mail: mazur@wsu.edu

RNGS Website: http://libarts.wsu.edu/polisci/rngs

FUNDING SOURCES

National Science Foundation, Law and Social Sciences, SES 0084570/80
European Scientific Foundation Network Grant, AESM/IM NW.GC/75

UNIT OF ANALYSIS AND SAMPLE

The unit of analysis in this study is a policy debate that leads to some type of state action. The focus is the effect of activities of women's movements and women's policy offices on problem definition, policy content, and the policy-making processes.

Sample Size: N=130

Countries: Policy debates are examined in the following countries.

Austria
Belgium
Canada
Finland
France
Germany
Great Britain
Ireland
Italy
Netherlands

Spain
Sweden
USA

Policy Issue Areas: Policy debates are examined in the following policy issue areas:
Abortion
Job Training
Prostitution
Political Representation
"Hot Issue" – Issues of National Significance

TABLE 1. COVERAGE OF ISSUE AREAS BY COUNTRY

The following table shows coverage of issue areas by country. See Appendix 1 for a specific list of the policy debates, including the title and the years of each debate.

Country	**Abortion**	**Job Training**	**Prostitution**	**Representation**	**Hot Issue**
Austria	X		X	X	X
Belgium	X			X	X
Canada	X	X	X		X
Finland		X	X	X	X
France	X	X	X	X	X
Germany	X			X	X
Great Britain	X		X	X	X
Ireland	X	X			
Italy	X	X	X	X	X
Netherlands	X		X	X	X
Spain	X	X	X	X	X
Sweden			X	X	X
USA	X	X	X	X	X
Total	11	7	10	11	12

PROJECT PARTICIPANTS

Research Network on Gender, Politics and the State (RNGS): RNGS included scholars with expertise in gender and policy issues. The RNGS organizational structure was as follows:

Dataset Coordinators (2) were responsible for overseeing the transposition of the qualitative cases into a coding plan, producing the dataset, and assembling the supporting documentation.
Conveners (5) were responsible for administration, grant management, and network communications;
Country Directors (13*)* were responsible for recruiting researchers to gather data on specific debates in each country and coordinating data collection at the national level;
Issue Network Directors (6) were responsible for organizing specific sessions/ meetings

of their respective issue networks, editing an issue book, and conducting the comparative qualitative analysis for that issue area.
Researchers (35) were responsible for gathering data on policy debates in a specific issue area and country using the common project design.
Research Assistants (4) were responsible for helping to manage the data collection worksheets, collect system level data, input data into the dataset and edit project materials.
Consultants (6) were experts consulted in developing coding plan for the codebook.

The following is a list of participants in the RNGS project, listed by institutional affiliation and role in RNGS. For more detailed participant information go to the RNGS website.

APPLETON, Andrew
Washington State University; Consultant
BAUDINO, Claudie
Free University, Brussels; Researcher – France/Political Representation
BERGQVIST, Christina
Uppsala University; Researcher – Sweden/Hot Issue
BRAUN, Kathrin
University of Hanover; Researcher – Germany/ Hot Issue
CALLONI, Marina
University of Milan –Bococca; Researcher – Italy/ Abortion
CELIS, Karen
Hogeschool Gent; Researcher – Belgium/Abortion
CAPORASO, James
University of Washington; Consultant
DANNA, Daniella
University of Trento; Researcher – Italy/Prostitution
ELGAR, Richard
Washington State University; Research Assistant
GEISSEL, Brigitte
Martin Luther University, Halle-Wittenberg; Researcher – Germany/ Political Representation
GEISLER, Jason
Washington State University; Research Assistant
GOOD, Anne
NDA Research and Standards Development; Researcher – Ireland/ Job Training
GRACE, Joan
University of Winnipeg; Researcher – Canada/ Job Training
GROSSE, Ashley
Polimetrix; Consultant
GUADAGNINI, Marila
University of Turin; Convener; Country Director – Italy; Researcher – Italy/ Job Training, Political Representation, Hot Issue
HAUSSMAN, Melissa

Carleton University; Issue Network Director – Hot Issue; Researcher – Canada/Abortion, Hot Issue

HOLLI, Anne Maria
University of Helsinki; Country Director – Finland; Researcher – Finland/ Job Training, Prostitution, Hot Issue

JEFFREYS, Leslie
University of New Brunswick – St. Johns; Researcher – Canada/ Prostitution

KAMENITSA, Lynn
Northern Illinois University; Country Director – Germany; Researcher – Germany/ Abortion, Political Representation

KANTOLA, Johanna
University of Helsinki; Researcher – Great Britain/ Prostitution

KÖPL, Regina
University of Vienna; Researcher – Austria/Abortion, Political Representation

LAATIKAINEN, Katie Verlin
Adelphi University; Researcher – EU/Job Training

LOVENDUSKI, Joni
Birkbeck College; Convener; Country Director – Great Britain; Issue Network Directory-Political Representation; Researcher – UK/ Political Representation; Hot Issue

McBRIDE, Dorothy E.
Florida Atlantic University; Dataset Coordinator; Convener; Issue Network Director – Abortion; Country Director – USA; Researcher – Great Britain/ Abortion; USA/Abortion, Job Training, Prostitution, Hot Issue

MAHON, Evelyn
Trinity College, Dublin; Country Director – Ireland; Researcher – Ireland/ Abortion,

MAZUR, Amy G.
Washington State University; Dataset Coordinator; Convener; Issue Network Director – Job Training; Country Director – France; Researcher – France/Job Training; Prostitution; Hot Issue

MEIER, Petra
Free University, Brussels; Researcher – Belgium/ Political Representation

MINTROM, Michael
University of Auckland; Consultant

O'NEILL, Elizabeth
Oregon State University; Research Assistant

OLDERSMA, Jantine
University of Leiden; Researcher – Netherlands/ Political Representation, Hot Issue

OUTSHOORN, Joyce
University of Leiden; Convener; Issue Network Director – Prostitution; Country Director – Netherlands; Researcher – Netherlands/ Abortion, Prostitution, Hot Issue

PARRY, Janine Alisa
University of Arkansas; Researcher – USA/ Political Representation

ROBINSON, Jean C.
Indiana University; Researcher – France/Abortion

ROSENBERGER, Sieglinde
University of Vienna; Researcher – Austria/ Hot Issue

SAINSBURY, Diane
University of Stockholm; Country Director – Sweden; Researcher – Sweden/ Political Representation
SAUER, Birgit
University of Vienna; Issue Network Director – Hot Issue; Country Director – Austria; Researcher – Austria/ Prostitution, Hot Issue
SQUIRES, Judith
University of Bristol; Researcher – Great Britain/ Prostitution
SVANSTRÖM, Yvonne
Stockholm University; Researcher – Sweden/ Prostitution
TEGHTSOONIAN, Kathy
University of Victoria; Country Director – Canada; Researcher – Canada/ Job Training
TRUE, Jacqui
University of Auckland; Consultant
VALIENTE, Celia
University Carlos III of Madrid; Country Director – Spain; Researcher – Spain/ Job Training, Abortion, Prostitution, Political Representation; Hot Issue
WALKER, Lindsay
Florida Atlantic University; Research Assistant.
WELDON, Laurel
Purdue University; Consultant
WOODWARD, Alison
Vrije University, Brussels; Country Director – Belgium; Researcher – Belgium/ Hot Issue

DATA COLLECTION AND SOURCE INFORMATION

There are two sources of information in the dataset: Concepts 1-27 offer data collected by RNGS researchers for each policy debate/observation and Concept 28 contains information collected from public sources about economic characteristics and women's status at the national level.

Between 1997 and 2004, the RNGS researchers collected the policy debate information using the protocol first developed for the qualitative phase of the project. See the RNGS Project Description in Appendix 6 for the specific procedures and instruments used by researchers to record the debate specific information in the qualitative phase. Researchers also used two additional worksheets--instruments developed by the group--to clarify and supplement the qualitative information from the case analyses. These data collection worksheets--one for debate-specific variables and one for women's movement variables--were completed between 2002-2005. For a copy of the worksheet templates, contact Amy Mazur.

Lindsay Walker and Elizabeth O'Neill, project research assistants, collected the data on country-specific economic and women's status variables in 2003 and 2007 from public sources. The specific variables and the sources for each variable are listed under Concept 28, pps. 113-116.

II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

OVERVIEW OF RNGS PROJECT AND QUALITATIVE PHASE I

The RNGS study in both its qualitative and quantitative phases seeks to address several questions pertaining to the interrelations between women's movement activists and government processes between 1970 and the early 2000s:

1. To what extent have women's movements been successful in gaining a dual response from the state, in other words achieving their goals for policy and procedural success? To what extent have they failed?
2. What features of women's movement activism and the policy environment explain state responses?
3. How important are women's policy agency activities to achieving success? Which characteristics of these agencies explain their activities?

Hypotheses for studying these questions are based on the model developed by the RNGS group and presented below. The structure of the dataset was also based on this model.

THE RNGS MODEL

INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

Women's Movement Actor Characteristics: Stage; Closeness to Left; Issue Priority; Cohesion; Location; Feminist Activism
Policy Environment: Policy Sub-system Structure; Issue Frame Fit; Party/coalition in power; Countermovement strength

INTERVENING VARIABLES

Women's Policy Agency Characteristics: Scope; Type; Proximity; Administrative Capacity; Leadership; Policy Mandate
Women's Policy Agency Activities: Insider, Marginal, Non-feminist, Symbolic

DEPENDENT VARIABLE

Women's Movement Impact/State Response: Dual Response, Co-optation, Pre-emption; No Response

In the qualitative phase, RNGS researchers used this model to address the analytical questions of the project by conducting detailed case analyses of policy debates pertaining to five issues: job training, abortion, prostitution, political representation, and issues of national priority in the 1990s. Researchers studied between 1-4 debates on each issue in Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Finland, France, Germany, Great Britain, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, Spain, Sweden, and the U.S. Five books—one on each issue—contain the findings of the qualitative phase, presented by country. In analyzing the descriptive cases, editors of the books used a classification/sorting approach to explain variations in the impact of women's movements and women's policy agencies on policy formation. In a final capstone book, researchers use multiple methods, including causal inference, Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA) and case studies to analyze findings in the debates across issues and through three decades. (For a list of RNGS project publications and papers see Appendix 5).

The RNGS project description, attached in Appendix 6 in an abridged version, was developed and fine-tuned by group members at frequent network meetings. It outlines the goals, contributions, theoretical framework and research design for the project, including a detailed discussion and theoretical justification of the different components of the RNGS model, specific operationalization guidelines, and the methods used by RNGS researchers to collect and interpret the results for the first phase of the project. The project description was simultaneously a reflection of the policy decisions made by the group about the research design and a guide for research for the collective work of the RNGS project.

PHASE II –THE QUANTITATIVE PHASE

Overview

The quantitative aspect of the RNGS project followed closely from the qualitative phase. The purpose of constructing the data set was two-fold: first, to facilitate testing the project's hypotheses, presented above, and second, to provide user-friendly information for a broad audience of practitioners and scholars about the policy debates, policy sub-systems, women's movements, and women's policy agencies. It involved starting with the qualitative RNGS model, transposing all its concepts into variables with quantitative measures, and constructing a data set with these measures. Through numerous meetings, the network first worked on identifying the variable components of the model and agreeing on measurement techniques for each variable. It then developed a protocol to collect additional information, using the qualitative information collected for the case analyses as a starting point, collected that data and coded the data. For more on how the RNGS project bridged the qualitative-quantitative divide see McBride and Mazur (2006).

Transposing the Qualitative Model into Quantifiable Concepts

The main challenge in constructing a data set from descriptive cases studied in a variety of political systems over time is to assure both the validity and reliability of the final numerical measures. In this study, the qualitative information was collected according to a common set of indicators for each of the framework concepts. However, classification of the characteristics of each debate was primarily the responsibility of different researchers in different contexts. It became necessary, therefore, to examine carefully both the validity and the reliability of each of the variable measures used to assemble the dataset and reduce errors in testing the hypotheses suggested by the model of state feminism.

Led by McBride and Mazur, the transposition process brought RNGS members together with five external consultants several times from 2002-2004 to examine proposed measures. The two leads drafted an initial code plan which the group first discussed in 2002. A working draft was adopted in 2003. It has been subsequently amended and revised to produce this final draft. Section III of the codebook includes the nominal and operational definitions for each concept in the RNGS model as measured in the dataset. There is also a separate "module" in Appendix 3 that discusses, in detail, the conceptualization for the more complex concepts: women's movement, feminism, and framing. The "Glossary of Terms" in Appendix 2 presents short definitions for the terms used in the project. For each concept, sections marked "variable construction notes" document the decisions made by the group in constructing the concept and component variables in Section III from qualitative to quantitative measures.

Study Population and Sampling Procedures

The RNGS sample came from a series of decisions the group made about what population was to be addressed in the analysis and final assessment of hypotheses. From the beginning, the group followed a "most similar systems" design and decided to focus the study only on Western postindustrial democracies. This allowed for the control of certain shared common economic, political, and social characteristics. Initially, RNGS sought to include all members of the European Union, as of 1995, Norway, Canada, the USA and Australia and also the EU itself. The final list of countries studied was limited by availability of researchers able to participate and complete the work. Finally, a few debates found in the issue books are not included in the dataset: Australia (prostitution, hot issue), Japan (hot issue) Israel (prostitution), and EU (job training).

For theoretical reasons elaborated in the project description in Appendix 6, RNGS decided to use, as the units of analysis, discrete policy debates that led to some sort of government decision or non decision. The next stage of sample selection occurred on three levels—first, the categories of issues to be studied, second, the specific policy areas within those issues, and third, the individual policy debates in each country. At all levels, the principle of representative sampling was followed.

The research questions guided the selection of issues to be studied. RNGS sought to assess the degree to which women's movements and women's policy agencies affected policy processes by gendering the frames of the debates. In order to increase the likelihood that policy debates could incorporate gendered frames, the goal was to select policy problems that have gender dimensions, but which are not inherently gendered in that they can be framed in non-gendered terms. The network distinguished the universe of issues along four such dimensions: (1) the division of labor in the home and work place; (2) human reproduction; (3) sexuality; and (4) citizenship rights. Public problems that affect people according to the gendered division of labor in the home and at work include labor matters and family laws. Public questions posed by family planning, abortion and contraceptive practices and new reproductive technologies pertain to gender differences in reproduction. Political regulation of sexuality is expressed in laws about prostitution, pornography, and rape. Constitutional provisions regulating opportunities to attain citizenship, vote and to gain both substantive and descriptive representation in decision-making arenas are all issues of citizenship rights.

The group then used the following criteria to select the specific policy issues that would be studied in each of the four gender-pertinent areas of government action: 1) **Cross national comparability**. Policy making on the subject must have occurred in the political arenas of each country since the establishment of the women's policy machinery. At the same time, the issues need not have the same salience in each system. 2) **Capability of being both gendered and non-gendered**. Policy debates about these issues must not be inherently gendered in the sense that it is impossible to discuss them without explicit reference to gendered characteristics of people. Using these criteria, four specific policy issues were identified from which a representative sample of policy debates were drawn for all countries in the study: job training representing division of labor; abortion representing reproduction; political representation representing citizenship rights and prostitution representing sexuality. RNGS opted to study a

fifth issue–called the "hot issue" – to assess the overall importance of gender and women's policy agencies to political debates of prominent national significance in the 1990s in the democracies under study, not necessarily based on gender-specific dimensions.

In order to examine research questions over time, the network set a goal to sample three policy debates for each country for job training, abortion, prostitution and political representation and one debate for the hot issue. The following is a summary of the sampling procedures used to select the debates in each country and issue area. For a more detailed discussion, see the attached project description (Appendix 6), which also contains the worksheets used by RNGS researchers for debate selection in its Appendix 4.

For the four gender-pertinent issues, researchers were first asked to identify the decision making arenas primarily responsible for making policy on the issue. Then they constructed a universe of policy debates on that particular issue that had taken place since the appearance of the first women's policy agency after 1970. The debates included were to meet the following base criteria: (1) debates take place in public policy arenas such as the legislature, courts, bureaucracy, or policy party conferences; (2) debates occur when a women's policy agency is in existence; 3) debates end with an official decision, including for instance, legislation, an executive order, a court ruling or a government policy proposal. Next, researchers were asked to select the three policy debates that would be studied using the following criteria: 1) decisional system importance; 2) life cycle; and 3) issue area salience. In some cases, issue salience of a particular debate made it essential despite the fact that the debate did not meet the other criteria; therefore there are a few debates that took place before the establishment of a women's policy agency. In Austria and Spain, the debates with respect to political representation were drawn from a list of debates on women's representation and not all of the possible debates about political representation.

For the hot issue selection, a different sampling procedure, still based on representativeness, was developed and followed. Researchers first constructed the top five priority policy issues during 1989 to 2002 that met the following criteria: large scope; high degree of conflict, wide range of public attention, and top priority of major policy actors. Next, following the RNGS decision to focus attention on policy issues that addressed major changes in state-society relations, researchers selected an issue from the list that fell into the state-society change category. Finally, if the issue area contained more than one discrete policy debate the researcher selected a debate to study according to: (1) salience in issue area, that is, the debate represented the most important debate in the issue; and (2) the debate was a top priority debate in the issue area according to scope, degree of conflict, public attention and policy actor priority.

Coding and Intercoder-reliability

Coders Dorothy McBride and Amy Mazur each separately coded twenty-five cases to check for intercoder-reliability. The Cohen's Kappa for the overall test of reliability of 0.651 indicates "good agreement beyond chance". This criterion is based on Banerjee et al. (1999) where .75 and above indicates excellent agreement beyond chance; .4 to .75 indicates fair to good agreement, and below .4 indicates poor agreement. Coding disagreements between the two coders of these first twenty-five cases were resolved. Given the highly complex nature of coding on some of the variables and the relatively small number of observations in the dataset, McBride and Mazur

coded each observation together; the two shared work in constructing the text appendices. Dorothy McBride, Lindsay Walker, Amy Mazur and Andrew Appleton worked on inputting the codes into the SPSS file.

Publications and Reports

All publications on the RNGS project and data are listed in Appendix 5. The following are included: the books reporting the comparative findings in each of the five issue areas and each country-specific chapter; the book that launched the RNGS project in 1995 – *Comparative State Feminism*; the capstone analysis—*The Politics of State Feminism: Innovation in Comparative Research*--a co authored volume presenting the results of an integrated mixed methods analysis; the volume edited by Joyce Outshoorn and Johanna Kantola, a second look at women's policy agencies ten years after *Comparative State Feminism*; articles and chapters on RNGS research by RNGS members; several pieces on the methodology of the project and concept formation issues. In 2005, RNGS country directors presented their results at a policy practitioners' conference at the Institute of Women's Policy Research in Washington D.C. The paper packet for the RNGS mini conference is available on the network website. RNGS results were also presented at an Expert Group Meeting of the United Nations in Fall, 2005 (Mazur 2005). That report is also available on the RNGS website. In 2011, the authors of the capstone book presented a review of the RNGS project, the development of the theory of state feminism, and the contribution of the theory to the study of comparative gender politics and its foundational theories at the European Conference on Politics and Gender at the Central European University in Budapest. A copy of this Power Point presentation and a link to a YouTube video of the session is available on the RNGS website.

III. DATA SET CONTENTS

MASTER LIST OF CONCEPTS AND VARIABLES

There are three types of variables, those that are used to identify each observation, those that are indicator variables for concepts and are specifically designed to test the hypotheses of the original RNGS model, and those that supply important additional information on each country at the time of each policy debate. The indicator variables for concepts are string, nominal, ordinal, or interval. For each concept, there is information on how each is relevant to the RNGS model and a specific discussion of the variables that follow. The data for each variable is located in the SPSS data file of coded data or in the Word files of appendices for each policy debate/ observation. Each variable is identified by its location in the dataset, C1_1, C1_2, and so on; all variables with separate text appendices are indicated with an A, e.g., C1A_1. The template on p.116 shows the specific appendix information for each variable covered.

Identification Variables

VAR INT_1 POLICY DEBATE ID
VAR INT_2 COUNTRY ID
VAR INT_3 DEBATE ISSUE ID
VAR INT_4 YEAR POLICY DEBATE BEGINS
VAR INT_5 YEAR POLICY DEBATE ENDS

Analytical Concepts/Variables

C1. POLICY RESPONSE

- C1A_1. WMA Issue Definition and Policy Goals
- C1A_2. WMA Issue Definition and Policy Goals That are Feminist
- C1_3. Policy Title
- C1_4. Policy Type
- C1A_5. Major Stipulations of Policy Outcome
- C1_6. Policy Fit to WMA micro-frame
- C1_7. Policy Content Mixed
- C1_8. Policy Fit to WMA feminist micro-frame

C2. PROCEDURAL RESPONSE:

- C2A_1. WMA Form, Location, and Activities
- C2A_2. Information on Beginning of the Debate
- C2_1. WMA participation at beginning of debate
- C2_2. Degree of WMA presence at beginning of debate
- C2_3. WMA participation at the end of the debate
- C2_4. Degree of WMA presence at end of debate
- C2_5. WMA Feminist micro-frames in sub-system

C3 GENDERING ISSUE FRAME

- C3A_1. Issue Frame at the Beginning of the Debate
- C3A_2. List of Gender Ideas in Issue Frame at the Beginning of the Debate
- C3A_3. Issue Frame at the End of the Debate
- C3A_4. List of Gender Ideas at the End of the Debate
- C3_1. Issue Frame gendered at beginning of debate
- C3_2. Issue Frame gendered at end of debate

MASTER LIST OF CONCEPTS AND VARIABLES

C3_3. Frame Gendering
C3_4. Feminist frame gendering

C4 WPA GENDERING
C4_1. List of WPAs
C4_2. No. of WPAs in the debate
C4_3. Number of QUAWPAs
C4A_4. WPA Micro-frame
C4_5. WPA advances gendered micro-frame or not
C5A_3 WPA Feminist Micro Frames
C4_6. WPA micro-frame feminist or not
C4_7. WPA gendered the debate or not.

C5 WPA/WMA FIT
C5A_3 WPA Feminist Micro Frames
C5_4. WPA/WMA Micro-frame fit
C5_5. Mixed Micro-frame fit
C5_6. WPA/WMA Feminist Micro-Frame Fit

C6 TYPE OF WPA
C6_1. Type of WPA

C7 WPA-TYPE OF APPOINTMENT:
C7_1. Type of Appointment

C8 WPA-POLICY ORIENTATION
C8A_1. Policy Orientation of WPAs
C8_1. Policy Orientation of WPAs

C9. WPA-POLICY AGENDA
C9_1. Debate Issue in WPA Policy Orientation

C10 WPA-POLICY-MAKING CAPACITY
C10A_1. Institutional Setting
C10_1. Proximity to Centers of Power in Institutional Setting
C10_2. Policy-making proposal power
C10_3. Policy-making recommending power
C10_4. Policy-making enforcing power

C11 WPA-ADMINISTRATIVE RESOURCES
C11_1A Source Year
C11_1. Staff
C11_2. Administrative Divisions
C11_3. Field Offices
C11_4. Separate Budget
C11_5. Subsidies for Women's Groups

MASTER LIST OF CONCEPTS AND VARIABLES

C11_6. Research Resources

C12. WPA-WMA LEADERSHIP
- C12A_1. WPA Leadership
- C12_1. Leader's WMA activities
- C12_2. Feminist leadership

C13 WMA –STAGE
- C13A_1. Women's Movement Stage and Evidence
- C13_1. Women's Movement Stage

C14 WMA-ORGANIZATIONAL CLOSENESS TO LEFT
- C14_1. Organizational closeness to the Left

C15 WMA-IDEOLOGICAL CLOSENESS TO LEFT
- C15_1. Ideological closeness to the Left

C16 WMA-PRIORITY
- C16A_1. List of Policy Agendas for WMAs for the Period of the Debate
- C16_1. Priority of issue to all WMAs

C17 WMA-COHESION
- C17_1. WMA Micro-frames (appendices for C1A_1)
- C17_2. Proportion of WMA in agreement

C18 WMA- LOCATION
- C18_1a. Individuals in women's movement informal or formal organizations
- C18_1b. Relation to policy sub-system
- C18_2a. Individuals in Non women's movement informal or formal organization
- C18_2b. Relation to policy sub-system
- C18_3a. Informal women's movement organizations
- C18_3b. Relation to policy sub-system
- C18_4a. Formal women's movement organizations
- C18_4b. Relation to policy sub-system
- C18_5a. Informal organizations inside women's movement organizations
- C18_5b. Relation to policy sub-system
- C18_6a. Formal organizations inside women's movement organizations
- C18_6b. Relation to policy sub-system
- C18_7a. Informal organizations inside non women's movement organizations
- C18_7b. Relation to policy sub-system
- C18_8a. Formal organizations inside non women's movement organizations
- C18_8b. Relation to policy sub-system

C19. WMA-FEMINIST ACTIVISM
- C19_1. Informal organizations
- C19_2. Formal organizations

MASTER LIST OF CONCEPTS AND VARIABLES

C19_3. Individuals in women's movement informal or formal organizations
C19_4. Individuals in Non women's movement informal or formal organizations
C19_5. Informal organizations inside women's movement organizations
C19_6. Formal organizations inside women's movement organizations
C19_7. Informal organizations inside non women's movement organizations
C19_8. Formal organizations inside non women's movement organizations

C20 WMA-COUNTERMOVEMENT
C20A_1. Countermovement Strength
C20_1. Countermovement Strength in Debate

C21 WMA STRENGTH –MOBILIZATION
C21_1a. WMA Mobilization Potential (*no data)*
C21_2b. WMA Activism

C22 WM ASTRENGTH –INSTITUTIONALIZATION
C22_1. WMA Institutionalization

C23 PE-SUB-SYSTEM STRUCTURE:
C23A_1. Sub-system actors
C23_1. Presence of rules
C23_2. Occasional participants
C23_3. Chain of command
C23_4. Sub-system Structure

C24 PE-ISSUE FRAME FIT:
C24_1. Issue frame fit
C24_2. Mixed fit

C25 PE-GOVERNING MAJORITY:
C25A_1. List of parties in the governing majority (text appendices)
C25_1. Governing majority on the left-right spectrum

C 26 EXTRA-NATIONAL LINKAGES
C26A_1. List of TANs by Name
C26_1. WMA Participation in Trans-national Advocacy Networks
C26_2. CEDAW Membership
C26A_3. CEDAW requirements
C26_4. CEDAW/WM goals
C26_5. CEDAW Exceptions
C26_7. EU Membership
C26_8. Compliance with EU directive
C26_9. Compliance with EU recommendations
C26_10. Compliance with EU regulations
C26_11. Compliance with EU soft law
C26_12. EU/WM goals

MASTER LIST OF CONCEPTS AND VARIABLES

C26_13. ECJ compliance order

C 27 LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT

C27_1. Level of Government

C 28 PARTY DEBATES

Additional information on countries

C. 29 COUNTRY-SPECIFIC FACTORS

C29_2. Percentage of Women in Lower House of Parliament
C29_3a. Labor Force Participation Rate for women
C29_3b. Percentage of Work Force that are women
C29_4. Gender-based Pay Gap
C29_5. National Population
C29_6. Economic Prosperity/Growth
C29_7. Ratio of women in tertiary education

DESCRIPTIVE VARIABLES

VAR INT_1 POLICY DEBATE ID

Created using country, issue type, and policy debate number.

CAN_JT1 - CAN_JT3	CANADA JOB TRAINING
FIN_JT1 - FIN_JT4	FINLAND JOB TRAINING
FRA_JT1 - FRA_JT5	FRANCE JOB TRAINING
IRL_JT1 - IRL_JT3	IRELAND JOB TRAINING
ITA_JT1 - ITA_JT2	ITALY JOB TRAINING
SPA_JT1 - SPA_JT3	SPAIN JOB TRAINING
USA_JT1 - USA_JT3	UNITED STATES JOB TRAINING

AUT_AB1 - AUT_AB4	AUSTRIA ABORTION
BEL_AB1 - BEL_AB3	BELGIUM ABORTION
CAN_AB1 - CAN_AB3	CANADA ABORTION
FRA_AB1 - FRA_AB3	FRANCE ABORTION
GER_AB1 - GERAB3	GERMANY ABORTION
GBR_AB1 – GBR_AB3	GREAT BRITAIN ABORTION
IRL_AB1 – IRL_AB3	IRELAND ABORTION
ITA_AB1 – ITA_AB3	ITALY ABORTION
NLD_AB1 – NLD_AB3	NETHERLANDS ABORTION
SPA_AB1- SPA_AB2	SPAIN ABORTION
USA_AB1- USA_AB3	UNITED STATES ABORTION

AUT_PT1 – AUT_PT3	AUSTRIA PROSTITUTION
CAN_PT1- CAN_PT3	CANADA PROSTITUTION
FIN_PT1- FIN_PT3	FINLAND PROSTITUTION

MASTER LIST OF CONCEPTS AND VARIABLES

FRA_PT1 – FRA_PT3	FRANCE PROSTITUTION
GBR_PT1- GBR_PT3	GREAT BRITAIN PROSTITUTION
ITA_PT1 – ITA_PT3	ITALY PROSTITUTION
NLD_PT1 – NLD_PT3	NETHERLANDS PROSTITUTION
SPA_PT1 – SPA_PT3	SPAIN PROSTITUTION
SWE_PT1 – SWE_PT3	SWEDEN PROSTITUTION
USA_PT1 – USA_PT3	UNITED STATES PROSTITUTION

AUT_PR1 – AUT_PR3	AUSTRIA POLITICAL REPRESENTATION
BEL_PR1 – BEL_PR3	BELGIUM POLITICAL REPRESENTATION
FRA_PR1 – FRA_PR3	FRANCE POLITICAL REPRESENTATION
GER_PR1 – GER_PR3	GERMANY POLITICAL REPRESENTATION
GBR_PR1- GBR_PR3	GREAT BRITAIN POLITICAL REPRESENTATION
IRL_PR1 – IRL_PR3	IRELAND POLITICAL REPRESENTATION
ITA_PR1 – ITA_PR3	ITALY POLITICAL REPRESENTATION
NLD_PR1 – NLD_PR3	NETHERLANDS POLITICAL REPRESENTATION
SPA_PR1 – SPA_PR3	SPAIN POLITICAL REPRESENTATION
SWE_PR1 – SWE_PR3	SWEDEN POLITICAL REPRESENTATION
USA_PR1 – USA_PR3	UNITED STATES POLITICAL REPRESENTATION

AUT_HI	AUSTRIA HOT ISSUE
BEL_HI	BELGIUM HOT ISSUE
CAN_HI	CANADA HOT ISSUE
FIN_HI	FINLAND HOT ISSUE
FRA_HI	FRANCE HOT ISSUE
GER_HI	GERMANY HOT ISSUE
GBR_HI	GREAT BRITAIN HOT ISSUE
ITA_HI	ITALY HOT ISSUE
NLD_HI	NETHERLANDS HOT ISSUE
SPA_HI	SPAIN HOT ISSUE
SWE_HI	SWEDEN HOT ISSUE
USA_HI	UNITED STATES HOT ISSUE

VAR INT_2 COUNTRY ID

This numeric variable uniquely identifies the countries in the study. The characters are numerical codes created by the United Nations statistics division.

40. AUSTRIA
56. BELGIUM
124. CANADA
246. FINLAND
250. FRANCE
276. GERMANY
372. IRELAND
380. ITALY

MASTER LIST OF CONCEPTS AND VARIABLES

724. SPAIN
752. SWEDEN
528 NETHERLANDS
826. GREAT BRITAIN
840. UNITED STATES

VAR INT_3 DEBATE ISSUE ID

Numeric

1. ABORTION
2. JOB TRAINING
3. PROSTITUTION
4. POLITICAL REPRESENTATION
5. HOT ISSUE – SPECIFIED IN EACH COUNTRY

VAR INT_4 YEAR POLICY DEBATE BEGINS

Numeric

1966-2002

VAR INT_5 YEAR POLICY DEBATE ENDS

Numeric

1969-2004

MASTER LIST OF CONCEPTS AND VARIABLES

CONTENTS OF ANALYTICAL CONCEPTS

TEMPLATE FOR CONCEPT CONTENT

The following rubrics are covered in each concept. A glossary in Appendix 2 provides short operational definitions for the major analytical concepts used.

Variables/Appendices – Some concepts comprise a single variable, others have several sub-variables listed. Variables found in the descriptive appendices are indicated with an A.

Nominal Definition – Nominal definitions provide general and specific definitions based on the scholarly literature. Full references for that literature are in Appendix 7.

Question – Questions that guided development of measures connect the nominal and operational definitions.

Operational Definition – Specific indicators are provided that lead to the measures.

Variable construction notes – All changes made by RNGS members and consultants to the measurements as the project progressed.

Variables in the Appendices/Dataset – This section includes the following information: variable/appendix location number; variable question and label in coding process; variable codes. Note that -4 indicates missing data and 999 indicates not applicable (NA).

CONCEPT 1. POLICY RESPONSE

CONCEPT 1. POLICY RESPONSE

Variables in the Appendices/Dataset

C1A_1. WMA Issue Definition and Policy Goals (text appendix)
C1A_2. WMA Issue Definition and Policy Goals That Are Feminist (text appendix)
C1_3. Policy Title (string)
C1_4. Policy Type (nominal)
C1A_5. Major Stipulations of Policy Outcome (text appendix)
C1_6. Policy Content Fit to WMA goals in micro-frame (ordinal)
C1_7. Policy Content Mixed (nominal)
C1_8. Policy Content Fit to WMA goals in feminist micro-frame (ordinal)

Nominal Definition

The dependent variable in the RNGS model – Movement Impact/State Response – is measured in terms of two variables that coincide with what Rochon & Mazmanian (1993) call process change; that is, state responses to social movements that change policy content ("substantive process change") and state recognition of movement activists as legitimate representatives and incorporating them into the policy making process ("procedural process change"). Concept 1 is the **policy response** aspect of the general dependent variable. Policy response covers the inclusion of policy goals advanced by women movement actors (WMA) as a part of their micro-frames during the debate in the content of the final policy outcome, more specifically, the degree to which the policy content fits the policy goals in the micro-frame of the WMAs that took a position in the debate.

The content of policies is examined in the formal policy statement that ended a given debate. Given that the project design focuses on policy debates that end in a single state action, and not whether that action led to an authoritative or binding outcome, a range of policy actions are included, e.g. reports, bill proposals, laws, administrative order etc. Some policy actions are "non decisions" (Bacharach and Baratz 1970), such as proposals for laws or reports or the defeat of a proposal, that ended the debate but did not change the direction of policy. In some instances, the decision to leave current policy unchanged is considered to be a policy action. Although this study understands that the implementation of a given policy has the potential to change the content of a policy (e.g., Mazmanian and Sabatier 1983 and Pressman and Wildavsky 1973), the focus here is explicitly on the content of the policy decision at the end of the debate; this avoids contending with cross-national differences in the policy implementation process.

Assessing policy response involves three stages: (1) identifying the policy goals of the WMAs advanced in the policy debate as they are articulated in each WMA micro-frame and determining whether they were feminist or not; (2) identifying the content and type of the policy action at the end of the debate; and (3) determining to what degree the policy provisions of the government action fit the policy goals in the feminist and non feminist WMA micro-frames. This first set of measures involves four concepts that need to be defined: women's movement actors, feminism, micro-frame, and micro-frame fit (for discussion of conceptualization see modules in Appendix 3).

Women's Movement Actors

Women's movement refers to discourse developed from gender consciousness in relation to actors who articulate these ideas in public arenas. Women's movement discourse includes all of

the following core ideas: explicit identity with women as a group; explicit gendered language; expressions of representing women in public life.

The actors articulating these ideas, identities and aspirations in public arenas are the representatives of the movement. In this study, women's movement discourse and aspirations are not operationally defined and empirical evidence of the entire discourse and aspirations has not been collected. What is defined and studied are the women's movement actors. Women's movement actors are the individuals, informal organizations and formal organizations who are inspired by movement thinkers to act to advance what they see as women's interests. Collective women's movement actors share the characteristics of social movement organizations as being, by definition, *non-state* structures. Similarly, individuals who hold positions in women's policy agencies are not women's movement actors. While they may be feminists and may be or have been participants in the women's movement organizations having a position in a women's policy agency precludes them from being considered part of the women's movement. For a recent synthesis of the concept women's/feminist movements see McBride and Mazur (forthcoming).

Feminist Movements and feminism

Scholars do not agree on clear guidelines for distinguishing between the women's movement and the feminist movement. Many writers use the terms interchangeably (Bull, Diamond, and Marsh 2000; Ferree 2000; Kaplan 1992; Katzenstein and Meuller 1987; Lovenduski 1986; Mansbridge 1996; Mazur 2002; Weldon 2002). Other writers find it useful to distinguish between the women's movement and the feminist movement in terms of the aims (Beckwith 2000; Ferree & Mueller 2004; Ferree 2006). RNGS agrees that the difference between the women's movement and the feminist movement ultimately relates to differences in the ideas, aspirations and identities. As such, feminist movements are sub categories of women's movements' ideas, identities and aspirations. Women's movement actors may relate to the feminist movement and articulate feminist aspirations and ideas in differing degrees and at different times. To be considered feminist, discourse must include all of the following core ideas: explicit identity with women as a group; explicitly gendered language; ideas expressed in terms of representing women as women in public life; based on the belief that there is something wrong with the treatment and status of women, goals are presented that will advance the status of women; views expressed explicitly or implicitly challenge gender hierarchies and forms of women's subordination.

Micro-frames

Analysts agree on the connection between problem definition and political participation and, eventually, policy outcomes (Cobb & Elder 1983; Kingdon 1995; Muller 1990; Schattschneider 1960; Schneider & Ingram 1993). In this study, we use the term framing to capture the way in which actors define policy issues in terms of problems (diagnosis) and policy goals (prognosis) (Benford & Snow 2000). A hierarchy of policy definitions at three levels facilitates analysis: general frames, issue frames and micro-frames. A micro-frame is the position specific actors seek to insert into the issue frame to change the definition of the issue and policy content. Any actors within the policy debate inside and outside the state such as, bureaucratic agencies, political parties, interest groups, can seek to bring their micro-frame into a specific policy debate (Gamson 1988; Snow and Benford 1992).

CONCEPT 1. POLICY RESPONSE

Policy action content fit is based on the concept of "goodness of fit" developed by Risse, Cowles and Caporaso (2001) in their study of Europeanization of national policy. They examined the degree to which national level policies "fit" EU policies. The extent of the "goodness of fit" determines, in turn the "adaptational pressures" placed on member states to change their policies (pp 6-7). Here, the extent to which the content of the policy action at the end of the debate coincides with the policy goals in the micro-frame of WMAs during the debate indicates whether the WM as a whole has a positive impact on state policy responses. Whether the policy content fits WMA goals elaborated in a feminist micro-frame or not is also a question examined here.

Questions

What type of policy action ended the debate? What were the major components of the policy action? What were the policy goals in the WMA micro-frames in the debate? Which goals were articulated in a feminist WMA micro-frame? To what degree did the content of the policy action fit the policy goals articulated by WMAs in their micro-frames during the debate? To what degree did the policy action fit the policy goals articulated by WMAs in their feminist micro-frames during the debate?

Operational Definition:

1. Determine the micro-frame of each WMA in the debate and list their policy goals.
2. Describe the general content of the policy action that ended the debate. Was it an authoritative decision, that is, a decision to change the current law or was it a non decision – a policy action that ended the debate but did not result in an authoritative policy decision that changed law/policy, such as a report or policy proposal, rejection of proposals or lack of action.
3. Assess to what degree the content of the policy action fit the WMA policy goals for that policy area using the following indicators:
    - Matching: Policy content incorporates all of the WMA policy goals advanced in the policy debate
    - Compatible: Policy content incorporates some WMA policy goals advanced in the policy debate
    - Incompatible: Policy content incorporates none of the WMA policy goals advanced in the policy debate
    - Threatening: Policy content is in direct conflict with WMA policy goals advanced in the policy debate
    - Mixed: Did the policy content coincide with some WMA goals and threaten other WMA goals at the same time? (Yes or No).
4. WMA goals are feminist if they reflect one of the following core ideas: advance the status of women in relation to men or explicitly or implicitly challenge gender hierarchies and forms of women's subordination. Actors often use shorthand phrases to refer to these ideas. To represent the idea of advancing the status of women, coders look for phrases that justify issue definitions and policy goals in terms of overcoming conditions of women's poverty, exploitation, mistreatment, inequality. To represent the idea of challenging gender hierarchy coders look for goals such as equity, emancipation, choice, and autonomy.

CONCEPT 1. POLICY RESPONSE

Variable Construction Notes

This concept now incorporates the type of policy decision, a non decision or not, an issue raised by several consultants at the APSA workshop.

1. Given the complexity of the concept, nominal definitions were included for all of the different aspects.
2. In the current operational definitions of micro-frame, WMA policy goals are actually located in the micro-frame that each actor is advancing during the debate. The micro-frame questions are based on operational definitions from the framing literature. The information for this should have already been collected when we "mapped the WM" on worksheet 3. This information may not be in the published chapters.
3. This proposal attempts to develop a uniform measure for assessing the extent of policy response to WMA goals. The issue of *whether* policies included WMA policy goals is easily addressed and was so in the original model; yes or no. The *degree* to which WMA goals were met is more difficult to measure. Amy conducted an initial sorting of job training and abortion debates and found that there was a range of policy responses that could be categorized at three levels, rather than two. The issue of which groups advanced policy proposals came was also analyzed, but it was decided at the workshop that this was not an important factor. One consultant wanted us to adopt a policy scale approach. This would entail agreeing on the range of possible policy options on a give policy, in a given country, that would be based on WM policy goals in general. This seemed to be too cumbersome and the present proposal was developed, based on the "goodness of fit approach" adopted by Risse, Cowles and Caporaso (2001).
4. The worksheet provides the descriptive information; the coders make the conclusions about the measurements from the operational definitions.
5. Question for discussion at Turin: is the scale here logical? Should "threatening" be measured as "0"?
6. Policy Content Mixed was added at Turin to deal with cases where policy outcomes were compatible and threatening at the same time.
8. All feminist measures agreed to at Leiden 2003 conference.

Variables in the Appendices/Dataset:

C1A_1

WMA GOALS IN MICRO-FRAME

FOR AN ENUMERATED LIST OF WMA(S) AND THEIR RESPECTIVE POLICY GOALS IN MICRO-FRAME SEE C1A_1 IN APPENDIX.

C1A_2

FEMINIST WMA GOALS IN MICRO-FRAME

FOR AN ENUMERATED LIST OF WMA(S) AND THEIR RESPECTIVE POLICY GOALS THAT WERE FEMINIST IN MICRO-FRAME SEE C1A_2 IN APPENDIX.

VAR C1_3

STRING

POLICY TITLE

WHAT WAS THE TITLE OF THE POLICY DEBATE?

CONCEPT 1. POLICY RESPONSE

VAR C1_4
NUMERIC
POLICY TYPE
WHAT TYPE OF POLICY ACTION ENDED THE DEBATE? (DECISION OR NO DECISION)
0. NO DECISION RESULTING
1. DECISION RESULTING

C1A_5
POLICY CONTENT
FOR AN ENUMERATION OF THE MAJOR STIPULATIONS OF THE POLICY OUTCOME, SEE APPENDIX C1A_5

VAR C1_6
NUMERIC
POLICY FIT TO WMA MICRO-FRAME
TO WHAT DEGREE DID THE CONTENT OF THE POLICY ACTION FIT THE POLICY GOALS ARTICULATED BY WMAS IN THEIR MICRO-FRAMES DURING THE DEBATE?
0. THREATENING
1. INCOMPATIBLE
2. COMPATIBLE
3. MATCHING
999. NOT APPLICABLE

VAR C1_7
NUMERIC
POLICY CONTENT MIXED
WAS THE POLICY OUTCOME MIXED, IN THAT IT WAS COMPATIBLE TO SOME WMA GOALS, AND THREATENING TO OTHERS?
0. NO
1. YES

VAR C1_8
NUMERIC
POLICY FIT TO WMA FEM MICRO-FRAME
TO WHAT DEGREE DID THE POLICY ACTION FIT THE POLICY GOALS ARTICULATED BY WMAS IN THEIR FEMINIST MICRO-FRAMES DURING THE DEBATE?
0. THREATENING
1. INCOMPATIBLE
2. COMPATIBLE
3. MATCHING
999. NOT APPLICABLE

CONCEPT 2. PROCEDURAL RESPONSE:

CONCEPT 2. PROCEDURAL RESPONSE:

Variables in the Appendices/Dataset:

C2A_1. WMA Form, Location, and Activities (text appendix)
C2A_2. Information on Beginning of the Debate (text appendix)
C2_1. WMA participate at beginning of debate (nominal)
C2_2. Degree of presence of WMA at the beginning of debate (interval)
C2_3. WMA participate at the end of the debate (nominal)
C2_4. Degree of presence of WMA at the end of the debate (interval)
C2_5. WMA Feminist micro-frames (nominal)

Nominal Definition

The dependent variable – Movement Impact/State Response – is measured in terms of two variables that coincide with what Rochon & Mazmanian (1993) call process change, that is, state responses to social movements that change policy content ("substantive process change") and state recognition of movement activists as legitimate representatives and incorporating them into the policy making process ("procedural process change").

Procedural response includes acceptance of women's movement actors as participants into the policy sub-system by the end of the debate. Women's movement actors are the individuals, collective organizations, and formal organizations that are inspired by movement thinkers to act to advance what they see as women's interests. Feminist actors are those who, during the debate, promote feminist micro-frames. Collective women's movement actors are non-state structures (for an extensive discussion of conceptualization of women's movement and feminism see Appendix 3). Women's movement actors are a form of women's political participation because they represent themselves as women, identify with each other and appeal to a constituency of women through a gender conscious discourse. Women's movement actors form a variety of relationships, inter-acting and organizing collectively as well as participating individually. When women's movement actors are part of a policy sub-system, this is evidence of women's descriptive representation.

Procedural response by the state pertains to changes brought about in the policy sub-system on an issue as a result of the activities of women's movement actors and/or women's policy agencies. If WMAs are brought into the policy sub-system process, they may be a token representation. Thus this concept includes an estimation of the degree of participation at the beginning and at the end of the debate. Of interest could be to what extent that sub-system remains changed the next time the issue reaches the sub-systems' agenda. Information on this concept should be considered in close relation to information on the policy sub-system that makes the most important policy on the issue. If the issue is taken up by different sub-systems over the course of this study, then procedural response is likely not to be long lasting.

Participation may include formal participation at governmental sites, such as being appointed to a decision-making or recommending body or being present at those times when issues are debated and resolved to form policy, and less formal types of participation such as claims making, that is, the articulation of needs and demands. Participation by women's movement actors in policy processes includes individuals, informal organizations, such as demonstrations and protests, cultural groups, and formal organizations such as lobbies and sections of political parties.

CONCEPT 2. PROCEDURAL RESPONSE:

Questions

What is the state's procedural response to women's movement actors? Do women's movement actors participate? Are they individuals, informal organizations or formal organizations? Were they part of the sub-system at the beginning of the debate? Of the policy sub-system actors, what proportion were women's movement actors at the beginning? Were they part of the sub-system at the end of the debate? Of the policy sub-system actors, what proportion were women's movement actors at the end of the debate? What were the micro-frames of the WMA actors in the policy sub-system at the end of the debate? Were those micro-frames feminist?

Operational Definition

1. Locate the policy sub-system and the list of sub-system actors.
2. List those women's movement actors who are part of the policy sub-system at the beginning of the debate: individuals, informal organizations, formal organizations.
3. List women's movement actors who were part of the policy sub-system during and at the end of the debate.
4. Estimate proportion of women's movement actors in terms of the total participants in the sub-system at the beginning and at the end of the debate.
5. Describe the micro-frames of the WMAs that were in the sub-system at the end of the debate.
6. Were those micro-frames feminist?

Variable Construction Notes

1. Our working research definition of women's movement actors and the differentiation between the women's movement and the feminist movement ideas allow us to focus on movement actors instead of the more general category of "women". This is because we define women movement as a discourse founded in gender consciousness. Thus it is the same as our earlier attention to women participants who advanced women's interests in the policy process. This makes this measure more congruent with the standard social movement literature which looks at procedural impact in terms of movement participation.
2. Consultants at the APSA workshop urged us to move toward a numerical measure of this concept, in other words, counting. This way we can include much more information about participation and come close to a measure of the degree of movement actors' participation rather than the too general classification of "yes" or "no" which was used in the Impact typology in the qualitative studies.
3. There is a standard taxonomy of WMAs used throughout this Codebook and data set. See WM/FM/WMA Module for elaboration of this taxonomy.
4. RNGS directors at the meeting in Turin rejected the requirement in the worksheet to list the number of WMA participating in the phases of the debate. Instead they agreed to estimate the proportion of WMA in terms of the total sub-system.
5. At the 2003 Leiden conference, RNGS directors agreed to the definition that women's movement discourse and actors are women identifying with women and do not include men. They also agreed to a definition of feminist discourse.

CONCEPT 2. PROCEDURAL RESPONSE:

Variables in the Appendices/Dataset:
C2A_1

SEE APPENDIX C2A_1 FOR DETAILED DESCRIPTIONS OF MOVEMENT ACTORS (INDIVIDUALS: NAME, AFFILIATION, & ACTIVITIES DURING THE DEBATE, WHERE THOSE ACTIVITIES TOOK PLACE; ORGANIZATIONS: NAME, FORM (FORMAL/INFORMAL) OF ORGANIZATIONS, MEMBERSHIP, ACTIVITIES DURING THE DEBATE, WHERE THOSE ACTIVITIES TOOK PLACE)

C2A_2

SEE APPENDIX C2_A2 FOR INFORMATION ON THE BEGINNING OF THE DEBATE.

VAR C2_1
NUMERIC
WMA PARTICIPATION AT BEGINNING OF DEBATE
DID WOMEN'S MOVEMENT ACTORS PARTICIPATE AT BEGINNING OF DEBATE?
0. NO
1. YES

VAR C2_2
NUMERIC
DEGREE OF WMA PRESENCE AT BEGINNING OF DEBATE
ESTIMATE OF PERCENT OF WMA THAT PARTICIPATED AT BEGINNING OF DEBATE, IN TERMS OF TOTAL SUB-SYSTEM ACTORS
0 -100

VAR C2_3
NUMERIC
WMA PARTICIPATION AT END OF DEBATE
DID WOMEN'S MOVEMENT ACTORS PARTICIPATE AT END OF DEBATE?
0. NO
1. YES

VAR C2_4
NUMERIC
DEGREE OF WMA PRESENCE AT END OF DEBATE
ESTIMATE OF PERCENT OF WMA THAT PARTICIPATED AT THE END OF POLICY DEBATE, IN TERMS OF TOTAL SUB-SYSTEM ACTORS
0 -100

VAR C2_5
NUMERIC
WMA FEM MICRO-FRAME IN SUBSYSTEM

CONCEPT 2. PROCEDURAL RESPONSE:

AT THE END OF THE DEBATE WERE THE WMA MICRO-FRAMES IN THE SUB-SYSTEM FEMINIST?
0. NO
1. YES

CONCEPT 3. GENDERING ISSUE FRAME

CONCEPT 3. GENDERING ISSUE FRAME

Variables in the Appendices/Dataset:

C3A_1. Issue Frame at the Beginning of the Debate
C3A_2. List of Gender Ideas in Issue Frame at the Beginning of the Debate
C3A_3. Issue Frame at the End of the Debate
C3A_4. List of Gender Ideas at the End of the Debate
C3_1. Issue Frame at beginning of debate (nominal)
C3_2. Issue Frame at end of debate (nominal)
C3_3. Frame Gendering (nominal)
C3_4. Feminist frame gendering (nominal)

Nominal Definitions: Gendering, Gendered Debates, and Issue Frame

Concepts 1 and 2, policy response and procedural response, cover two major aspects of women's movement actors' impact on the state. Concept 3 – *gendering the issue frame* – pertains to the cultural response of the state to women's movement actors. In the original RNGS design, gendering was a means by which analysts could assess the influence of women's policy agencies in assisting women's movement actors to attain their goals vis-à-vis the state. Subsequent investigations of social movement literature (Rochon 1998) and consultants' advice show that information from the case studies is present to measure the cultural impact on policy processes through changes in the issue frame, especially the extent to which the issue frame changes to incorporate gender perspectives during the course of a policy debate. Gendering the issue frame means the adoption or maintenance of a gendered issue frame as indicated by comparing the issue frame at the beginning of the debate with the issue frame at the end of the debate. This concept uses gendering in the sense of the explicit articulation of ideas in the way issues are defined and framed by the majority of policy actors.

Gendering and Gendered Debates

Gender refers to meaning or ideas people attach to biological and demographic differences between men and women. Gendering refers to the process whereby phenomena, such as identities, observations, entities, and processes acquire symbols based on gender (ideas about men and women). Gendered debates, therefore, are those policy debates framed in terms of ideas about how the problem and proposed solutions will affect women in comparison with men. It is important to distinguish gendered debates from gender issues and gendered policy. Gender issues are areas of gender conflict on the public agenda and are questions over policies which affect men and women differently. Gender issues may or may not be expressed in explicit gendered terms in the course of debate, decision or implementation. (See O'Connor, Orloff & Shaver 1999 for study of analysis of gendered effects of policy) Whether a gendered debate agrees with women's movement or feminist movement ideas is a research question in this study.

Issue Frame

In this study, we use the term framing to capture the way in which actors define policy issues in terms of problems (diagnosis) and policy goals (prognosis) (Benford & Snow 2000). A hierarchy of policy definitions at three levels facilitates analysis: general frames, issue frames and micro-frames. At the general level, the definition of policy problems and the actors that are involved occur at the national or even extra-national arenas; its dynamics affect action and policy content on a wide range of policy issues. This captures Jenson's "universe of political discourse" (1988). An issue frame is the definition or meaning of a specific policy area elaborated and used by

CONCEPT 3. GENDERING ISSUE FRAME

actors in that policy sub-system in a policy debate. Change in an issue frame may or may not affect the larger general frame (for a full discussion of conceptualization of framing see Appendix 3).

Questions

What is the issue frame at the beginning of the debate? What is the issue frame at the end of the debate? Does the issue frame change as a result of the debate? Has it become gendered, more gendered, unchanged gendered, or less gendered? Has gender been eliminated or was the debate non-gendered throughout? Is the gendering of the debate feminist?

Operational Definition

1. Locate the issue frame prevailing at the beginning of the debate.
2. Describe the issue frame and note any references to gender.
3. Locate the issue frame prevailing at the end of the debate.
4. Describe the issue frame at the end of the debate and note any references to gender.
5. List gender ideas in the issue frame.
6. List the feminist ideas in the issue frame. WPA framesare feminist if they reflect one of the following core ideas: advance the status of women in relation to men or explicitly or implicitly challenge gender hierarchies and forms of women's subordination. Actors often use shorthand phrases to refer to these ideas. To represent the idea of advancing the status of women, coders look for phrases that justify issue definitions and policy goals in terms of overcoming conditions of women's poverty, exploitation, mistreatment, inequality. To represent the idea of challenging gender hierarchy coders look for goals such as equity, emancipation, choice, and autonomy.

Variable Construction Notes:

1. The issue books' comparative conclusions showed some detailed information about different types of gendering which was not part of the RNGS project description. See section, "Gendering the Abortion Issue (pp. 273-278)" in McBride Stetson (2001) and "Job Training as a Gender/Gendered Issue (8-10)" in the Mazur (2001). This suggested that we code the data for this topic.
2. This was reinforced by the comments of Thomas Rochon and Ann Shola Orloff at the APSA roundtable on the abortion and job training books. Rochon's 1998 book, *Culture Moves* details information on culture change as a movement success. In his comments at the roundtable he noted that our gendering variable was that kind of change.
3. Orloff suggested we look at her book. Julia O'Connor, Ann Shola Orloff and Sheila Shaver. 1999. *States, Markets, Families: Gender, Liberalism and Social Policy in Australia, Canada, Great Britain and the United States*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. As noted above, their book is a different use of gender.
4. The worksheet needs to give the descriptive information on the debates; the coders will make the conclusions using the operational definitions and the measurements.
5. At Turin, the directors replaced the term "dominant frame at beginning of debate" used in the qualitative studies with "issue frame".
6. At Turin there was discussion of ways of scaling gendering to replace or add to the measurement of feminist gendering. Joni Lovenduski suggested a measure

combining two axes: one for Gendered and Non-gendered and one for Women's Friendly Gendering and Not Women's Friendly gendering. However, the same problems of validity in determining what is "women friendly" appear as when we try to determine what is feminist from what is not. Another solution to consider at Leiden is to develop a scale inductively from the coding appendices on this concept. More discussion at Leiden.

7. No framework for measuring gendering was discussed at the Leiden meeting. Directors agreed instead to a definition of the elements of feminist issue frames.

Variables in the Appendices/Dataset:

C3A_1. SEE APPENDIX C3A_1 FOR A DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE ISSUE FRAME AT THE BEGINNING OF THE DEBATE

C3A_2. SEE APPENDIX C3A_2 FOR A LIST OF GENDER IDEAS IN ISSUE FRAME AT THE BEGINNING OF THE DEBATE

C3A_3. SEE APPENDIX C3A_3 FOR A DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE ISSUE FRAME AT THE END OF THE DEBATE

C3A_4. SEE APPENDIX C3A_4 FOR A LIST OF GENDER IDEAS AT THE END OF THE DEBATE

VAR C3_1
NUMERIC
ISSUE FRAME GENDERED AT BEGINNING OF DEBATE
WAS THE ISSUE FRAME AT THE BEGINNING OF THE DEBATE GENDERED?
0. NO
1. YES

VAR C3_2
NUMERIC
ISSUE FRAME GENDERED AT END OF DEBATE
WAS THE ISSUE FRAME AT THE END OF THE DEBATE GENDERED?
0. NO
1. YES

VAR C3_3A
NUMERIC
FRAME EVOLUTION FROM NON-GEN TO GEN
DID ISSUE FRAME EVOLVE FROM NON-GENDERED TO A GENDERED FRAME?
0. NO
1. YES

VAR C3_3B
NUMERIC

CONCEPT 3. GENDERING ISSUE FRAME

FRAME EVOLUTION FROM GEN TO MORE GEN
DID ISSUE FRAME EVOLVE FROM GENDERED TO A MORE GENDERED FRAME?
0. NO
1. YES

VAR C3_3C
NUMERIC
FRAME GENDERED SIMILARLY THROUGHOUT DEBATE
WAS ISSUE FRAME GENDERED SIMILARLY THROUGHOUT THE DEBATE?
0. NO
1. YES

VAR C3_3D
NUMERIC
FRAME EVOLVED FROM GEN TO LESS GEN
DID ISSUE FRAME EVOLVE FROM GENDERED TO A LESS GENDERED FRAME?
0. NO
1. YES

VAR C3_3E
NUMERIC
FRAME EVOLVED FROM GEN TO NON-GEN
DID ISSUE FRAME EVOLVE FROM GENDERED TO A NON-GENDERED FRAME?
0. NO
1. YES

VAR C3_3F
NUMERIC
FRAME GENDERED SIMILARLY THROUGHOUT DEBATE
WAS FRAME NON-GENDERED SIMILARLY THROUGHOUT THE DEBATE?
0. NO
1. YES

VAR C3_4A
NUMERIC
FRAME FEMINIST AT BEGINNING OF DEBATE
IF ISSUE FRAME WAS GENDERED AT THE BEGINNING OF THE DEBATE, WAS IT FEMINIST?
0. NO
1. YES

VAR C3_4B
NUMERIC

CONCEPT 3. GENDERING ISSUE FRAME

FRAME FEMINIST AT END OF DEBATE

IF ISSUE FRAME WAS GENDERED AT THE END OF THE DEBATE, WAS IT FEMINIST?

0. NO
1. YES

CONCEPT 4. WPA GENDERING

CONCEPT 4. WPA GENDERING

Variables in the Appendices/Dataset:

C4_1 List of WPAs (string variable)
C4_2 No. of WPAs in the debate (ordinal)
C4_3 Presence of QUAWPA
C4A_4 WPA Micro-frame (text appendices)
C4_5 WPA advances gendered micro-frame or not (nominal)
C4_6 WPA micro-frame feminist or not (nominal)
C5A_3 WPA Feminist Micro Frames (Text Appendices)
C4_7 WPA gendered the debate or not (nominal)

Nominal Definition
This is one of two variables used to construct a typology of WPA activities. The purpose of the typology is to determine the effectiveness of the WPA as a WM advocate inside the state. The gendering variable measures the effectiveness of the WPA in inserting a gendered micro-frame into the issue frame by the end of the debate.

Women's Policy Agency – WPA is considered here to be any structure that meets both of the following criteria: (1) any agency/governmental body formally established by government statute or decree; and (2) any agency/governmental body formally charged with furthering women's status and rights or promoting sex-based equality. In some cases there may be more than one WPA with the potential to be active in the debate, in other cases, there is no WPA with the potential to be active in the debate.

Quasi Women's Policy Agency – QUAWPA may be found in a government or a political party. In the government a QUAWPA is attached to government institutions and functions in the policy process like a WPA without a formal government directive of establishment. To "function in the policy process like a WPA" means that the QUAWPA is explicitly charged with furthering women's status and rights or promoting sex-based equality by or through an institution that is part of the state. In parties, QUAWPAs are permanent structures in the party organization, formally charged by the party with promoting women's issues within the party, involved with some aspect of party policy making, and given party funds for a budget and permanent offices. Also in the parties, it is the function of the women's organization in the context of party decision making processes that permit its classification as a QUAWPA. The same party women's organization participating in a debate in the state (parliament, Cabinet, commissions) would be classified as a Women's Movement Actor. In cases where the women's party body has a wide membership of women in the party, only the official leadership organization is considered to be a QUAWPA; the members may operate separately as women's movement actors in the same debate.

Women's Policy Agencies and Quasi Women's Policy Agencies are formal organizations that may espouse women's movement, even feminist movement discourse. But their status as formal and official bodies that are part of the state's or authoritative party apparatus distinguish them from other organizations that present such discourse, that is, women's movement actors. Women's movement actors are not official state agencies; in this they share the characteristics of social movement organizations as being, by definition, *non-state* structures. Similarly, individuals who hold positions in women's policy agencies are not women's movement actors.

CONCEPT 4. WPA GENDERING

While they may be feminists and may be or have been participants in the women's movement organizations having a position in a women's policy agency precludes them from being considered part of the women's movement.

A WPA or QUAWPA is considered "active in the debate" if it had a micro-frame on the issue being considered in the policy debate.

The same data has been gathered for QUAWPAs as for WPAs. The data and measurement in CONCEPT3: GENDERING THE ISSUE FRAME is used to measure some of the variables relating to this concept.

Other definitions used in measuring this concept:
Gendering refers to the process whereby phenomena, such as identities, observations, entities, and processes acquire symbols based on gender (ideas about men and women).
Gendered debates are those policy debates framed in terms of ideas about how the problem and proposed solutions will affect women in comparison with men.
An issue frame is the definition or meaning of a specific policy area elaborated and used by actors in that policy sub-system in a policy debate.
A micro-frame is the position specific actors seek to insert into the issue frame to change the definition of the issue and policy content.

Questions
At the end of the debate, is the issue frame gendered? Did the WPA (s) adopt a gendered micro-frame? Was it feminist? Did the WPA (s) successfully gender the issue frame?

Operational Definition

1. Based on findings in CONCEPT 3 GENDERING THE ISSUE FRAME, debate is gendered or not.
2. List the WPAs, if any, which had the potential to be active in the policy debate. Was there more than one WPA active in the debate? Were there any QUAWPAs?
3. Describe the micro-frames/policy proposals advanced by WPAs pertaining to the policy proposals in the debate.
4. Compare micro-frame of WPA with the issue frame at the end of the debate (Concept 3).
5. Locate evidence in worksheets and published chapters that WPA activities had an effect on the gendering of the issue frame.
6. Based on this information, WPA gendered the debate or not.
7. Was the WPA micro-frame feminist or not?

Variable Construction Notes

1. Should this variable be coded for all WPAs active, regardless of whether the debate was gendered by the end? Should we have a measure for case where WPA advances a gendered micro-frame in the debate but is unsuccessful? It is in now.
2. The worksheet provides the descriptive information; the coders make the conclusions about the measurements from the operational definitions.

CONCEPT 4. WPA GENDERING

3. We agreed to code QUAWPAs and WPAs on the same variables rather than have separate variables. Whether the agency is a WPA or QUAWPA is answered in C4_3.

Variables in the Appendices/Dataset:

VAR C4_1
STRING
LIST OF WPAS AND QUAWPAS HAVING THE POTENTIAL TO GET INVOLVED WITH THE DEBATE (NAME AND ACRONYM)

VAR C4_1A **WPA1/QUAWPA 1**

VAR C4_1B **WPA 2/QUAWPA2**

VAR C4_1C **WPA 3/QUAWPA3**

VAR C4_2
NUMERIC
NO. OF WPA IN THE DEBATE
HOW MANY WOMEN'S POLICY AGENCIES WERE ACTIVE IN THE POLICY DEBATE?
0. NONE
1. ONE
2. MORE THAN ONE

VAR C4_3
NUMERIC
NO. OF QUAWPA IN THE DEBATE
HOW MANY QUASI-WOMEN'S POLICY AGENCIES WERE ACTIVE IN THE POLICY DEBATE?
0. NONE
1. ONE
2. MORE THAN ONE

C4A_4
DESCRIPTION OF EACH WPA MICRO-FRAME
DESCRIPTION OF EACH WPA MICRO-FRAME BY ACRONYM IN APPENDIX C4A_4.

VAR C4_5A
NUMERIC
WPA1 ADVANCED GENDERED MICRO-FRAME
DURING THE DEBATE, DID WPA1 ADVANCE A GENDERED MICRO-FRAME?
0. NO
1. YES

CONCEPT 4. WPA GENDERING

C5A_3

DESCRIPTION OF EACH WPA FEMINIST MICRO-FRAME
DESCRIPTION OF EACH WPA FEMINIST MICRO-FRAME BY ACRONYM IN APPENDIX C5A_3.

VAR C4_6A
NUMERIC
WPA1 ADVANCED FEMINIST MICRO-FRAME
DURING THE DEBATE, DID WPA1 ADVANCE A FEMINIST MICRO-FRAME?
0. NO
1. YES
999. NOT APPLICABLE

VAR C4_7A
NUMERIC
WPA1 GENDERED THE DEBATE
DID THE WPA1 SUCCESSFULLY GENDER THE ISSUE FRAME?
0. NO
1. YES

VAR C4_5B
NUMERIC
WPA2 ADVANCED GENDERED MICRO-FRAME
DURING THE DEBATE, DID WPA2 ADVANCE A GENDERED MICRO-FRAME?
0. NO
1. YES

VAR C4_6B
NUMERIC
WPA2 ADVANCED FEMINIST MICRO-FRAME
DURING THE DEBATE, DID WPA2 ADVANCE A FEMINISTGENDERED MICRO-FRAME?
0. NO
1. YES
999. NOT APPLICABLE

VAR C4_7B
NUMERIC
WPA2 GENDERED THE DEBATE
DID THE WPA2 SUCCESSFULLY GENDER THE ISSUE FRAME?
0. NO
1. YES

VAR C4_5C
NUMERIC

CONCEPT 4. WPA GENDERING

WPA3 ADVANCED GENDERED MICRO-FRAME
DURING THE DEBATE, DID WPA3 ADVANCE A GENDERED MICRO-FRAME?
0. NO
1. YES

VAR C4_6C
NUMERIC
WPA3 ADVANCED FEMINIST MICRO-FRAME
DURING THE DEBATE, DID WPA3 ADVANCE A FEMINIST MICRO-FRAME?
0. NO
1. YES
999. NOT APPLICABLE

VAR C4_7C
NUMERIC
WPA3 GENDERED THE DEBATE
DID THE WPA3 SUCCESSFULLY GENDER THE ISSUE FRAME?
0. NO
1. YES

CONCEPT 5. WPA/WMA FIT

CONCEPT 5. WPA/WMA FIT

Variables in the Appendices/Dataset:

C5_4. WPA/WMA Micro-frame fit (ordinal)
C5_5. Mixed Micro-frame fit (nominal)
C5_6. WPA/WMA Feminist Micro-Frame Fit (ordinal)

Nominal Definition

This is one of two variables used to construct a typology of WPA activities in the RNGS model. The purpose of the typology is to determine the effectiveness of the WPA as a WM advocate inside the state. This variable covers the extent to which the WPA micro-frame, also called position, coincides with the micro-frames of the Women's Movement Actors generally and with WMA feminist micro-frames specifically

In terms of our analytical focus, women's movement actors with their micro-frames attempt to weigh into the debates at the sub-system level to change the issue frame of a given debate to include their positions in the debate and policy content. Here the concern is whether and to what degree the micro-frame of the WPA fits the WMA micro-frames presented in the debate and the WPA fit to the micro-frames that are explicitly feminist. The same goodness of fit approach is adopted as in Concept 1 POLICY CONTENT and Concept 23 ISSUE FRAME FIT. Much of the information for the variables for this concept has already been assembled for Concept 1 POLICY CONTENT, Concept 4 WPA GENDERING, and Concept 2 PROCEDURAL RESPONSE.

Other terms used to measure this concept:

Women's Policy Agency – WPA is considered here to be any structure that meets both of the following criteria: (1) any agency/governmental body formally established by government statute or decree; and (2) any agency/governmental body formally charged with furthering women's status and rights or promoting sex-based equality.
Quasi-Women's Policy Agencies (QUAWPAs) are agencies that are attached to government institutions or political parties and function in the policy process like WPAs, without a formal government directive of establishment.
Women's Movement Actors are the individuals, informal organizations and formal organizations who are inspired by movement thinkers to act to advance what they see as women's interests. Collective women's movement actors are non-state structures.
Feminist movement actors use a specific feminist discourse**.** To be considered feminist, discourse must include all of these elements: identity with women; be explicitly gendered; represent women; improve the status of women; challenge gender hierarchies.
Micro-frame is the position specific actors seek to insert into the issue frame to change the definition of the issue and policy content.

Questions

Does the WPA's position in the policy debate fit the micro-frames of the WMA? Does the WPA's position in the policy debate fit the feminist micro-frames of the women's movement actors?

Operational Definition

CONCEPT 5. WPA/WMA FIT

Same steps as in Concept 4 on WPA Gendering:

1. List the WPAs active in each policy debate (step 2 in Concept 4 on WPA gendering).
2. List/ describe the micro-frames/policy proposals advanced by WPAs in the debate (step 2 in concept on WPA and gendering).
3. List the micro-frames/ policy goals advanced by each WMA in the debate and the overall list of different goals for all of the WMAs together (step 1 in Concept 1 on policy content).
4. List those micro-frames which are feminist for the issue (step 6 in Concept 2 on procedural response).
5. Assess to what degree the micro-frame of the WPA fits the micro-frame/policy goals of the WMAs and the explicit feminist micro-frames developed by WMAs using the following indicators:
    - Matching: Micro-frame of WPA incorporates completely the WMA micro-frame advanced in the policy debate.
    - Compatible: Micro-frame of WPA incorporates some WMA micro-frame advanced in the policy debate.
    - Incompatible: Micro-frame of WPA does not incorporate any WMA micro-frame advanced in the policy debate.
    - Threatening: Micro-frame of WPA is in direct conflict with the WMA policy goals/micro-frame advanced in the policy debate.
    - Mixed: micro-frame of the WPA incorporates WMA goals and threatens WMA goals at the same time.
6. Assess to what degree the micro-frame of the WPA fits the explicit feminist micro-frames developed by WMAs using the following indicators
    - Matching: Micro-frame of WPA incorporates the WMA feminist micro-frame advance in the policy debate.
    - Not feminist: Micro-frame of WPA does not incorporate any of the WMA feminist micro-frames advanced in the policy debate.
    - Threatening: Micro-frame of WPA is in direct conflict with the WMA feminist micro frame advanced in the policy debate.

Variable Construction Notes

1. Like the other WPA variables, we need to code this information for each WPA and QUAWPA active in the debate.
2. Question about the scale for Turin: Is it ok to put "threatening" in this measure as 0 on a scale of compatibility?
3. At Turin it was agreed to leave the scale with 0 as threatening, but to develop another measure to accommodate the mixed fit, which does not fit on the compatibility scale.
4. At Leiden, 2003, the ideas that compose feminism were accepted.
5. In 12/05 we revised the measurement of the WPA/WMA feminist frame fit because the operational definitions for compatible and incompatible were contradictory and thus not valid. The final values were threatening, not feminist, and matching.

Variables in the Appendices/Dataset:

C5A_3 (DEFINED UNDER C. 4 WPA GENDERING)

CONCEPT 5. WPA/WMA FIT

WMA(S) FEMINIST MICRO-FRAMES AND POLICY GOALS DURING DEBATE

SEE APPENDIX C5A_3 FOR A DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF EACH WMA FEMINIST MICRO-FRAME. APPENDICES C1A_2 AND C4A_4 ARE ALSO USED TO CODE THESE VARIABLES.

VAR C5_4
NUMERIC
WPA/WMA MICRO-FRAME FIT
TO WHAT DEGREE DID THE WOMEN'S POLICY AGENCY'S POSITION IN THE POLICY DEBATE FIT THE MICRO-FRAMES OF THE WOMEN MOVEMENT ACTORS?
0. THREATENING
1. INCOMPATIBLE
2. COMPATIBLE
3. MATCHING
999. NOT APPLICABLE

VAR C5_5
NUMERIC
MIXED MICRO-FRAME FIT
DID THE MICRO-FRAME OF THE WOMEN'S POLICY AGENCY INCORPORATE WOMEN'S MOVEMENT ACTORS' GOALS AND THREATEN WOMEN'S MOVEMENT ACTORS' GOALS AT THE SAME TIME?
0. NO
1. YES
999. NOT APPLICABLE

VAR C5_6
NUMERIC
WPA/WMA FEMINIST MICRO-FRAME FIT
TO WHAT DEGREE DID THE WOMEN'S POLICY AGENCY'S POSITION IN THE POLICY DEBATE FIT THE FEMINIST MICRO-FRAMES OF THE WOMEN'S MOVEMENT ACTORS?
0. THREATENING
1. NOT FEMINIST
2. MATCHING
999. NOT APPLICABLE

CONCEPT 6. TYPE OF WPA

Variable

C6_1. Type of WPA (Nominal)

Nominal Definition

WPAs differ in their form. The type or form of WPA refers to the institutional structure and membership. Some are established as bureaucratic or administrative agencies staffed with civil servants. Judicial officers handle gender equity issues. Others are appointed commissions of political leaders or lay leaders. The Ministry form is part of the political executive while a legislative caucus or committee is formed of elected representatives. This concept is included to capture the variation in the women's policy agencies and to permit analysis of questions regarding the activities of agencies that might vary by type and form.

Question

What is the form of the WPA(s) active in the debate?

Operational definition

For each WPA active in the debate:

1. Describe the structure, staff and institutional setting of the WPA
2. For each classify according to the following:
    - Ministry: Autonomous office in Cabinet or sub office in ministry
    - Administrative Office: bureaucratic agency
    - Commission in the Political Executive: committee appointed by the Prime Minister, President or Government
    - Judicial Body: commission or office located in the Ministry of Justice or that adjudicates claims or advocates in court
    - Advisory Council: lay panel advisory to ministries or political executive
    - Legislative Council: body composed of elected parliamentary representatives.

Variable Construction Notes

1. This is a new concept developed at Turin. The leadership concept was confusing when the leader was of one form, e.g. political or bureaucratic and the agency was of a different type.
2. Five categorical variables were transposed into a single nominal variable with five choices at consultant Andrew Appleton's suggestion.

Variable in Dataset

VAR C6_1A
NUMERIC
TYPE OF WPA1
WAS WPA1 A/AN (SELECT ONE)

1. MINISTRY
2. ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE
3. COMMISSION IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH
4. JUDICIAL BODY

5. ADVISORY COUNCIL
6. LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL
7. QUAWPA

VAR C6_1B
NUMERIC
TYPE OF WPA2
WAS WPA2 A/AN (SELECT ONE)

1. MINISTRY
2. ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE
3. COMMISSION IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH
4. JUDICIAL BODY
5. ADVISORY COUNCIL
6. LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL
7. QUAWPA

VAR C6_1C
NUMERIC
TYPE OF WPA3
WAS WPA3 A/AN (SELECT ONE)

1. MINISTRY
2. ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE
3. COMMISSION IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH
4. JUDICIAL BODY
5. ADVISORY COUNCIL
6. LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL
7. QUAWPA

CONCEPT 7. WPA – TYPE OF APPOINTMENT

Variables in the Appendices/Dataset

C7_1. WPA Type of appointment (Nominal)

Nominal Definition

Type of appointment refers to the logic behind the selection of the head of a WPA active in the policy debate. There are three types: political, bureaucratic, and lay panel. Political appointments are those agency heads who are appointed by a government, administration, parliament, or parties and whose tenure tends to change with the change in government, administration, parliament, etc. Bureaucratic appointments include agencies with directors that are appointed regardless of partisan circumstances in an administrative logic. Finally, lay panel appointments occur in WPAs that are commissions in executive or legislature and which select their own directors, chairs, or presidents through election or consensus.

Literature on WPAs suggests that the sources of appointment of a given WPA can enhance its effectiveness (chapters in Stetson and Mazur 1995). On one hand, while WPA heads that are politically appointed are more dependent on the political context in which they are named, bureaucratic agencies may be more protected from partisan politics. On the other hand, bureaucratically appointed heads may not be able to exert much power over policy leaders. These hypotheses can be tested with these variables, which focus on the logic of appointment of the agency head and may represent a different dynamic from agency as a whole. For example, although many WPAs are administrative agencies without portfolios, some have heads that are politically appointed: e.g., Equal Opportunities Commission, UK, Women's Bureau USA, or the Women's Rights Bureau in France. Since it was created in 1978, the Women's Rights Bureau in France has had shifting leadership, at times with a politically appointed minister, and other times with a purely bureaucratic leadership. It is important to note that this concept is different from the *proximity* of the WPA to decision-making power within a government or legislature, which focuses on the policy proposal capabilities of the WPA.

Question

What is the type of appointment of the WPA head(s) in the debate?

Operational Definition

Type of leadership appointment of WPA (s) involved with each debate determined by following indicators:

- political appointment: appointed by a government, administration, parliament, or parties
- bureaucratic appointment: appointed regardless of partisan circumstances in an administrative logic
- lay panel: select their own directors, chairs, or presidents through election or consensus
- combined: leadership appointment combines political, bureaucratic and lay panel features

Variable Construction Notes

CONCEPT 7. WPA – TYPE OF APPOINTMENT

1. The consultants raised the issue of cross-case reliability. Here we develop a measure that is clearly delineated in terms of the logic underlying the agency head appointment, and not of the entire organization.
2. There is still the question of whether an agency can be appointed under a combination of logics.
3. Also, some additional examples of each type of appointment would be helpful.
4. The current version differentiates appointment type from proximity.
5. Four categorical variables were transposed into a single nominal variable with four choices at consultant Andrew Appleton's suggestion. The categorical variables were left in the dataset.

Variable in Dataset

VAR C7_1A
NUMERIC
TYPE OF WPA1 APPOINTMENT
WAS THE LEADERSHIP OF THE WPA1 AT THE TIME OF THE DEBATE A (SELECT ONE)
1. POLITICAL APPOINTMENT
2. BUREAUCRATIC APPOINTMENT
3. LAY PANEL APPOINTMENT
4. COMBINED APPOINTMENT

VAR C7_1B
NUMERIC
TYPE OF WPA2 APPOINTMENT
WAS THE LEADERSHIP OF THE WPA2 AT THE TIME OF THE DEBATE A (SELECT ONE)
1. POLITICAL APPOINTMENT
2. BUREAUCRATIC APPOINTMENT
3. LAY PANEL APPOINTMENT
4. COMBINED APPOINTMENT

VAR C7_1C
NUMERIC
TYPE OF WPA3 APPOINTMENT
WAS THE LEADERSHIP OF THE WPA3 AT THE TIME OF THE DEBATE A (SELECT ONE)
1. POLITICAL APPOINTMENT
2. BUREAUCRATIC APPOINTMENT
3. LAY PANEL APPOINTMENT
4. COMBINED APPOINTMENT

CONCEPT 8. WPA – POLICY ORIENTATION

Variables in the Appendices/Dataset:

C8A_1. Policy Orientation –Formal and Informal (text appendices)
C8_3. WPA Policy Orientation (nominal)

Nominal Definition

Policy orientation refers to the range of policy areas a given agency formally covers during the period of the debate—single issue, multi-issue, or cross-sectional. The policy orientation can either be formally determined by statute or be defined by the leader of WPA through official policy statements, etc. Note that in some cases an official policy mandate may be changed by the specific decision of a WPA head to pursue certain policies and not others. Or, a very general mission statement can be developed into a targeted set of policy priorities in action. The policy orientation is found, in part, in the formal assignment given to the agency. However, agencies frequently operate outside of their formal remit, adding new policy areas or expanding traditional ones to their policy activities. Thus in this concept, both formal and informal assignments will be included in measuring policy orientation.

Some agencies are put in charge of a single policy area, others have multi-issue portfolios, and others are given a clear mission to monitor all policy areas, often in the context of inserting gender into policy considerations across a wide variety of areas. This latter category is reserved for those agencies specifically charged with a type of gender mainstreaming remit. Some analysts argue that WPAs with a single mission are more effective than those with multi or cross-sectional missions. While single issue missions are seen to be more focused, multi-issue and cross-sectional ministries are seen to be too diluted. Others argue that the focus of WPAs with a single mission is too narrow and thus they are not able to affect policy (Lovenduski 1995, Valiente 1995; and Guadagnini 1995), and WPAs whose remit is to inject gender equality across all policy areas are the most effective (Weldon 2002: 129).

Question

What is the list of policy areas in the formal policy orientation of each WPA in the debate? What is the list of policy areas in the informal policy orientation of each WPA in the debate? Combining both formal and informal assignments, is the policy orientation of the WPA: single issue, multi-issue or cross-sectional?

Operational Definition

1. List all WPAs involved with debate (Same as C. 4 WPA Gendering).
2. List the policy areas in the formal orientation of each WPA.
3. List the policy areas in the informal mission of each WPA.
4. Coding for C. 4 will have determined whether there is one WPA, more than one WPA, one QUAWPA or no WPAs or QUAWPAs active in the debate. For each WPA active in the debate, determine whether the formal and informal policy orientation during the time of the debate is single-issue ; multi-issue, or cross-sectional according to the following: single issue includes those agency actions restricted to a single area of policy or policy issue; multi-issue includes those agencies that may have a remit covering several different policy areas, but not a systematic transversal mission; cross-sectional includes agencies that have a mission to systematically cover, audit, or work with any policy area to bring gender into mainstream policymaking.

Variable Construction Notes

1. The consultants were concerned with reliability problems arising from author judgments, so this new measure attempts to develop a more objective measure, relying upon descriptive information given by the experts and coders and using more carefully specified operational definitions.
2. The new measure includes a third category to differentiate between WPAs that may cover several policy areas, without being formally charged with mainstreaming or gender audits.
3. The concept of scope is clarified here to differentiate it from mandate. Scope measures the range of policy issues covered while mandate measures whether the policy debate issue is actually covered in the agency portfolio.
4. These worksheet entries will be streamlined for all WPA characteristics, since there is some overlap with administrative capacity.
5. At Turin, the notion of scope was seen to be to confusing and the group opted for policy orientation. The group also opposed the use of mainstreaming as a measurement label and cross-sectional was used instead. They also agreed to include both formal and informal orientations/missions and distinguish between them in the coding.
6. Three categorical variables were transposed into a single interval variable with three choices at consultant's, Andrew Appleton's suggestion. The categorical variables were left in the dataset.

Variables in the Appendices/Dataset:

C8A_1

WPA POLICY ORIENTATION—FORMAL/INFORMAL
SEE APPENDIX C8A_1 FOR A DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF EACH WPA'S FORMAL AND INFORMAL POLICY ORIENTATION

VAR C8_3A
NUMERIC
WPA1 POLICY ORIENTATION
DURING THE DEBATE, WAS THE WPA1'S POLICY ORIENTATION (SELECT ONE)
1. SINGLE ISSUE
2. MULTI- ISSUE
3. CROSS-SECTIONAL

VAR8_3B
NUMERIC
WPA2 POLICY ORIENTATION
DURING THE DEBATE, WAS THE WPA2'S POLICY ORIENTATION (SELECT ONE)
1. SINGLE ISSUE
2. MULTI- ISSUE
3. CROSS-SECTIONAL

VAR8_3C
NUMERIC

WPA3 POLICY ORIENTATION

DURING THE DEBATE, WAS THE WPA3'S POLICY ORIENTATION (SELECT ONE)

1. SINGLE ISSUE
2. MULTI- ISSUE
3. CROSS-SECTIONAL

CONCEPT 9.WPA – POLICY AGENDA

Variable

C9_1. Policy Debate Issue in Policy Orientation (nominal)

Nominal Definition

Policy agenda indicates whether the issue under discussion in a policy debate is in the policy orientation of a given WPA, either implicitly or explicitly WPAs that have a specific policy issue in their formal policy orientation may be more likely to become actively involved with policy discussions in that area than WPAs which do not. We test this hypothesis through determining whether the policy issue covered in the debate is in the policy orientation of a given agency. The policy issues are found in the general rubric of the five major RNGS policy areas: job training, abortion, prostitution, political representation and the specific hot issue selected for that country. The policy orientation may be formally or informally determined (see Concept 8 POLICY ORIENTATION). Note that in some cases an official policy agenda may be changed by the specific decision of a WPA head to pursue certain policies and not others. Or, a very general policy orientation can be developed into a targeted set of policy priorities in action.

Question

Is the debate issue in the policy orientation of the WPA?

Operational Definition

Using the information gathered on the policy orientation of the WPA for C. 6 WPA- Policy Orientation, was the policy issue covered in the debate included, either explicitly or implicitly, in the general orientation of any of the WPAs in existence or not?

Variable Construction Notes

1. The issue here raised by the consultants was the gap between the formal mission of the WPA and what the WPA actually did in action.
2. It is important to provide the list of these actions both to establish reliability and also to supply key profile information for researchers who are interested in WPAs in general.
3. In the pre-Turin version, there was not a clear differentiation between mandate and scope.
4. At Turin, the directors decided to change the labels for this concept from mandate to policy agenda to avoid conceptual stretching and confusion over the meaning of the term when translated into various languages.

Variable in Dataset

VAR C9_1A
NUMERIC
DEBATE ISSUE IN WPA1 POLICY ORIENTATION
WAS THE DEBATE ISSUE IN THE POLICY ORIENTATION OF THE WPA1?
0. NO
1. YES

VAR C9_1B
NUMERIC

DEBATE ISSUE IN WPA2 POLICY ORIENTATION

WAS THE DEBATE ISSUE IN THE POLICY ORIENTATION OF THE WPA2?

0. NO
1. YES

VAR C9_1C

NUMERIC

DEBATE ISSUE IN WPA3POLICY ORIENTATION

WAS THE DEBATE ISSUE IN THE POLICY ORIENTATION OF THE WPA3?

0. NO
1. YES

CONCEPT 10. WPA – POLICY-MAKING CAPACITY

Variables in the Appendices/Dataset:

C10A_1. Institutional Setting (text appendices)
C10_1 Proximity to Centers of Power in Institutional Setting (ordinal)
C10_2 Policy-making proposal power (nominal)
C10_3 Policy-making recommending power (nominal)
C10_4 Policy-making enforcing power (nominal)

Nominal Definition

Is a well-situated WPA in the decision-making hierarchy of its specific institutional setting with full policymaking powers more effective than one that is not? This is a frequent question in work on WPAs (Stetson and Mazur 1995; Weldon 2002). This concept relates to the hypothesis that WPAs with higher levels of policymaking authority may be more successful than weaker WPAs. Policy-making capacity of a WPA consists of its formal policy responsibility and its proximity to the center of decision-making in a specific institutional setting. Some WPAs are given formal authority to propose laws, others are only allowed to review policies and recommend. Policy making authority depends in part on the agency's proximity to the decision making power centers in its institutional setting, e.g. the legislature, chief executive, the bureaucracy, regional government, etc. WPAs situated in important decision-making centers, however, may not have formal powers to propose policy, but act, for example as advisors to the Prime Minister. This concept measures both aspects of policy-making power: proximity and power. There are four parts of this concept: (1) to identify the institutional setting of the WPA; (2) to assess its position to centers of decision-making power; (3) to determine whether it can propose policy and/or laws, review policy and make recommendations, or enforce laws; and (4) to assess the WPA's overall policy-making authority as a combination of proximity and authority. This latter assessment is not made in the data set but can be made by individual researchers.

Questions

What is the policy-making authority of each WPA active in the policy debate? What is the institutional setting of each WPA active in the debate? Is each WPA close to major power centers in its institutional settings? What policy-making responsibilities does each WPA have?

Operational Definition

For each WPA active at the time of the debate:

1. Describe the institutional setting of the WPA. Which branch of government? Where is it within that branch of government? If it is at a sub-national level, describe its location.
2. Is the WPA close to the center of decision-making power in that institutional setting? (For example, if it is in the Cabinet does it have a top ranking or low ranking position? Is it close to the chief executive of the Government? If a Commission, is it under the aegis of a ministry or a department?
3. To classify, use the following indicators:
    - Close: Part of the top echelon of decision-making institutions, e.g. chief executive, high court, national parliament, etc.

- Moderately close: At a secondary level of the decision-making hierarchy, but not at the top, e.g., within a Ministry or Deputy Ministry. Includes committees/individual advise to Secretary/ Minister
- Distant: At a lower level of the hierarchy that is subservient to other more powerful institutions and actors.

4. What is the policymaking responsibility of the WPA?
    - Propose policy/laws yes/no
    - Review and recommend yes/no
    - Enforce Laws yes/no
5. Once the proximity and responsibility are coded for all debates, assess the overall policy-making authority as a combination of the two.

Variable Construction Notes

1. This measure, formerly proximity, presents difficult comparison problems given the variations in policy making systems across the countries in the study, particularly the differences between parliamentary, presidential and semi presidential systems. Also, WPAs are found in all branches and many different levels of government. This new version of the proximity characteristic in the model is intended to develop a valid measure to examine whether WPAs with more formal decision-making power are more successful in assisting WMAs in policy debates.
2. The notions of institutional setting and proximity to decision-making power were used to allow for different rules of the game in each country and for the different levels where WPAs are found.
3. We added the policymaking authority to examine whether the specific policy role of the agency had any impact on success. Also, it would be useful for other researchers to know the specific policy making authority.
4. We can fine-tune this measure later as long as we are able to collect the basic policy authority data on each WPA. This information can be collected from national directories and the Internet as well as the expert researchers.
5. Once proximity and responsibility are coded, we will have to develop indicators; however they cannot be ordinal since policymaking responsibility is not ordinal, unless all of the WPAs close to power and have policy proposing and review and recommend responsibilities. In any, case we will have to wait until we get the first two coded.
6. Kathy Teghtsoonian in an e-mail after Turin suggested measuring overall policy making authority through a matrix combining the range of values of proximity and responsibility.
7. There may be conceptual confusion here between policy responsibility and policy authority. Another name for this concept? Let's try policy-making capacity. Changes have been made accordingly throughout.

Variables in the Appendices/Dataset:

C10A_1

WPA INSTITUTIONAL SETTING

SEE APPENDIX C10A_1 FOR A DESCRIPTION OF EACH WPA'S INSTITUTIONAL SETTING

VAR C10_1A
NUMERIC
WPA1 PROXIMITY TO CENTER OF POWER
DURING THE DEBATE, HOW CLOSE WAS WPA1 TO THE CENTER OF DECISION MAKING POWER IN THE ABOVE INSTITUTIONAL SETTING?
0. DISTANT
1. MODERATELY CLOSE
2. CLOSE

VAR C10_2A
NUMERIC
WPA1 PROPOSE POLICY
DURING THE DEBATE, DID WPA1 HAVE THE RESPONSIBILITY TO MAKE POLICY PROPOSALS TO THE CENTER OF DECISION MAKING POWER?
0. NO
1. YES

VAR C10_3A
NUMERIC
WPA1 REVIEW AND RECOMMEND
DURING THE DEBATE, DID WPA1 HAVE THE RESPONSIBILITY TO REVIEW AND RECOMMEND POLICY PROPOSALS TO THE CENTER OF DECISION MAKING POWER?
0. NO
1. YES

VAR C10_4A
NUMERIC
WPA1 ENFORCE LAW
DURING THE DEBATE, DID WPA1 HAVE THE RESPONSIBILITY TO ENFORCE LAWS?
0. NO
1. YES

VAR C10_1B
NUMERIC
WPA1 PROXIMITY TO CENTER OF POWER
DURING THE DEBATE, HOW CLOSE WAS WPA2 TO THE CENTER OF DECISION MAKING POWER IN THE ABOVE INSTITUTIONAL SETTING?
0. DISTANT
1. MODERATELY CLOSE
2. CLOSE

VAR C10_2B
NUMERIC
WPA2 PROPOSE POLICY

CONCEPT 11. WPA – ADMINISTRATIVE RESOURCES

DURING THE DEBATE, DID WPA2 HAVE THE RESPONSIBILITY TO MAKE POLICY PROPOSALS TO THE CENTER OF DECISION MAKING POWER?

0. NO
1. YES

VAR C10_3B
NUMERIC
WPA2 REVIEW AND RECOMMEND
DURING THE DEBATE, DID WPA2 HAVE THE RESPONSIBILITY TO REVIEW AND RECOMMEND POLICY PROPOSALS TO THE CENTER OF DECISION MAKING POWER?

0. NO
1. YES

VAR C10_4B
NUMERIC
WPA2 ENFORCE LAWS
DURING THE DEBATE, DID WPA2 HAVE THE RESPONSIBILITY TO ENFORCE LAWS?

0. NO
1. YES

VAR C10_1C
NUMERIC
WPA3 PROXIMITY TO CENTER OF POWER
DURING THE DEBATE, HOW CLOSE WAS WPA3 TO THE CENTER OF DECISION MAKING POWER IN THE ABOVE INSTITUTIONAL SETTING?

0. DISTANT
1. MODERATELY CLOSE
2. CLOSE

VAR C10_2C
NUMERIC
WPA2 PROPOSE POLICY
DURING THE DEBATE, DID WPA3 HAVE THE RESPONSIBILITY TO MAKE POLICY PROPOSALS TO THE CENTER OF DECISION MAKING POWER?

0. NO
1. YES

VAR C10_3C
NUMERIC
WPA3 REVIEW AND RECOMMEND
DURING THE DEBATE, DID WPA3 HAVE THE RESPONSIBILITY TO REVIEW AND RECOMMEND POLICY PROPOSALS TO THE CENTER OF DECISION MAKING POWER?

0. NO
1. YES

VAR C10_4C
NUMERIC
WPA3 ENFORCE LAWS
DURING THE DEBATE, DID WPA3 HAVE THE RESPONSIBILITY TO ENFORCE LAWS?
0. NO
1. YES

CONCEPT 11 .WPA – ADMINISTRATIVE RESOURCES

Variables in the Appendices/Dataset:

C11_1. Staff (nominal, interval)
C11_2. Administrative Divisions (nominal, interval)
C11_3. Field Offices (nominal, interval)
C11_4. Separate Budget (nominal, interval)
C11_5. Subsidies for Women's Groups (nominal, interval)
C11_6. Research Resources (nominal, interval)

Nominal Definition

Administrative resources are the variety of structural and financial instruments available to government offices. Some WPAs have extensive staff, separate administrative divisions, field offices, subsidies earmarked for women's groups, significant operating budgets and their own research resources; others may be part-time committees or individuals. This study assesses whether WPAs with more administrative resources, such as administrative staff, divisions, and offices as well as financial resources are more effective. Studies of WPAs have indicated that administrative capacity may be an important factor in overall success. (Rai, 2003; Stetson and Mazur 1995, Weldon 2002 and Cockburn 1991). In order to determine the influence of each factor this study separates the administrative capacity of a given WPA from its position in the decision-making hierarchy and its policy orientation. Some studies group all of these under a single, quite fluid, concept of institutional power and authority (Cockburn 1991 and Weldon 2002).

Question

What is the extent of administrative resources available to the WPAs active in the policy debate?

Operational Definition

For each WPA in debate determine the highest point of resources during the debate for that year.

1. Is there a separate staff? If yes how many full-time positions?
2. Are there separate administrative divisions at the national level, if so how many?
3. Are there separate field offices at the sub-national level, if so, how many?
4. Is there a separate budget for the WPA? If yes: what percentage of total government budget for that year (%), percentages based on actual figures or best estimates
5. Are there subsidies available to women's organizations, if so, what percentage of total WPA budget, percentages based on actual figures or best estimates?
6. Are there resources, budget and/or staff, allocated for research, if so, what percentage of total budget and staff for the WPA?

Variable Construction Notes

1. In examining the hypotheses for this variable in the qualitative findings on abortion and training, there was no distinct association between high administrative capacity and WPA activities. This may have been due to the way the variable was measured given the strong empirical evidence in other research of the importance of administrative capacity. Of course, it may also be due to the impact of other variables such as policy authority and government in power. To be more confident of the findings, it is important to be more rigorous in measuring this variable and to provide more complete information to rule out the possibility of an invalid measure. Even if

administrative capacity is not important, it will be useful for non-RNGS users to have this descriptive information on the WPAs in this study.

2. Consultants agreed that these indicators should be as precise as possible; some preferred developing ordinal level measurements. We have replaced the old system of comparing WPAs administrative capacity in each country by providing interval data. We recognize that some of this information will be too difficult to gather, but at the very least we will be able to say whether a WPA had a given type of administrative resource or not.
3. The research resources variable was suggested by Diane Sainsbury.
4. At Turin, we discussed the difficulty of gathering such detailed information about staff and budgets. We agreed use the qualitative studies as much as possible, accept researchers' judgments in lieu of quantitative figures, and to reassess measurements for budget after worksheets are filled and at Leiden.
5. At Leiden, it was agreed to keep the items in the worksheets and researchers will fill them in the best they can given their limits in time and other research resources.

Variables in Dataset

VAR C11_1A
STRING
WPA1 SOURCE YEAR
YEAR FOR WHICH DATA WERE COLLECTED

VAR C11_1B
STRING
WPA2 SOURCE YEAR
YEAR FOR WHICH DATA WERE COLLECTED

VAR C11_1C
STRING
WPA3 SOURCE YEAR
YEAR FOR WHICH DATA WERE COLLECTED

VAR C11_1AA
NUMERIC
WPA1 STAFF
DID WPA1 HAVE FULL-TIME STAFF RESOURCES DURING THE DEBATE?
0. NO
1. YES

VAR C11_1BA
NUMERIC
WPA1 NO. OF FULL TIME STAFF
HOW MANY FULL-TIME STAFF POSITIONS DID WPA1 HAVE DURING THE DEBATE?
1 -99
999. NOT APPLICABLE

CONCEPT 11. WPA – ADMINISTRATIVE RESOURCES

VAR C11_2AA
NUMERIC
WPA1 SEPARATE DIVISIONS
DID WPA1 HAVE SEPARATE ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISIONS AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL DURING THE DEBATE?
0. NO
1. YES

VAR C11_2BA
NUMERIC
WPA1 NO. OF SEPARATE DIVISIONS
HOW MANY SEPARATE ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISIONS DID THE WPA1 HAVE AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL DURING THE DEBATE?
1 -99
999. NOT APPLICABLE

VAR C11_3AA
NUMERIC
WPA1 FIELD OFFICES
DID WPA1 HAVE SEPARATE FIELD OFFICES AT THE SUB-NATIONAL LEVEL DURING THE DEBATE?
0. NO
1. YES

VAR C11_3BA
NUMERIC
WPA1 NO. OF FIELD OFFICES
HOW MANY FIELD OFFICES DID THE WPA1 HAVE AT THE SUB-NATIONAL LEVEL DURING THE DEBATE?
1 -99
999. NOT APPLICABLE

VAR C11_4AA
NUMERIC
WPA1 SEPARATE BUDGET
WAS THERE A SEPARATE BUDGET FOR THE WPA1 DURING THE DEBATE?
0. NO
1. YES

VAR C11_4BA
NUMERIC
WPA1 BUDGET PERCENT TOTAL GOVERNMENT BUDGET
WHAT PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL GOVERNMENT BUDGET WAS ALLOTTED TO THE WPA1 AS A SEPARATE BUDGET?
.0001 -99%
999. NOT APPLICABLE

VAR C11_5AA
NUMERIC
WPA1 SUBSIDIES FOR WOMEN'S GROUPS
DID THE WPA1 MAKE SUBSIDIES AVAILABLE TO WOMEN'S ORGANIZATIONS?
0. NO
1. YES

VAR C11_5BA
NUMERIC
WPA1 BUDGET PERCENTDEVOTED TO SUBSIDIES
WHAT PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL WPA1 BUDGET WAS ALLOTTED TO SUBSIDIES TO WOMEN'S ORGANIZATIONS?
1 -100%
999. NOT APPLICABLE

VAR C11_6AA
NUMERIC
WPA1 RESEARCH STAFF
DID THE WPA1 ALLOT RESOURCES, BUDGET, AND OR STAFF FOR RESEARCH?
0. NO
1. YES

VAR C11_6BA
NUMERIC
WPA1 BUDGET PERCENT DEVOTED TO RESEARCH
WHAT PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL WPA1 BUDGET (STAFF SALARIES INCLUDED) WAS ALLOTTED TO RESEARCH?
1 -100%
999. NOT APPLICABLE

VAR C11_1AB
NUMERIC
WPA2 STAFF
DID WPA2 HAVE FULL-TIME STAFF RESOURCES DURING THE DEBATE?
0. NO
1. YES

VAR C11_1BB
NUMERIC
WPA2 NO. OF FULL TIME STAFF
HOW MANY FULL-TIME STAFF POSITIONS DID WPA2 HAVE DURING THE DEBATE?
1 -99
999. NOT APPLICABLE

VAR C11_2AB

NUMERIC
WPA2 SEPARATE DIVISIONS
DID WPA2 HAVE SEPARATE ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISIONS AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL DURING THE DEBATE?
0. NO
1. YES

VAR C11_2BB
NUMERIC
WPA2 NO. OF SEPARATE DIVISIONS
HOW MANY SEPARATE ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISIONS DID THE WPA2 HAVE AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL DURING THE DEBATE?
1 -99
999. NOT APPLICABLE

VAR C11_3AB
NUMERIC
WPA2 FIELD OFFICES
DID WPA2 HAVE SEPARATE FIELD OFFICES AT THE SUB-NATIONAL LEVEL DURING THE DEBATE?
0. NO
1. YES

VAR C11_3BB
NUMERIC
WPA2 NO. OF FIELD OFFICES
HOW MANY FIELD OFFICES DID THE WPA2 HAVE AT THE SUB-NATIONAL LEVEL DURING THE DEBATE?
1 -99
999. NOT APPLICABLE

VAR C11_4AB
NUMERIC
WPA2 SEPARATE BUDGET
WAS THERE A SEPARATE BUDGET FOR THE WPA2 DURING THE DEBATE?
0. NO
1. YES

VAR C11_4BB
NUMERIC
WPA2 BUDGET PERCENT TOTAL GOVERNMENT BUDGET
WHAT PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL GOVERNMENT BUDGET WAS ALLOTTED TO THE WPA2 AS A SEPARATE BUDGET?
.0001 -99%
999. NOT APPLICABLE

CONCEPT 11. WPA – ADMINISTRATIVE RESOURCES

VAR C11_5AB
NUMERIC
WPA2 SUBSIDIES FOR WOMEN'S GROUPS
DID THE WPA2 MAKE SUBSIDIES AVAILABLE TO WOMEN'S ORGANIZATIONS?
0. NO
1. YES

VAR C11_5BB
NUMERIC
WPA2 BUDGET PERCENT DEVOTED TO SUBSIDIES
WHAT PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL WPA2 BUDGET WAS ALLOTTED TO SUBSIDIES TO WOMEN'S ORGANIZATIONS?
1 -100%
999. NOT APPLICABLE

VAR C11_6AB
NUMERIC
WPA2 RESEARCH STAFF
DID THE WPA2 ALLOT RESOURCES, BUDGET, AND OR STAFF FOR RESEARCH?
0. NO
1. YES

VAR C11_6BB
NUMERIC
WPA2 BUDGET PERCENT DEVOTED TO RESEARCH
WHAT PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL WPA2 BUDGET (STAFF SALARIES INCLUDED) WAS ALLOTTED TO RESEARCH?
1 -100%
999. NOT APPLICABLE

VAR C11_1AC
NUMERIC
WPA3 STAFF
DID WPA3 HAVE FULL-TIME STAFF RESOURCES DURING THE DEBATE?
0. NO
1. YES

VAR C11_1BC
NUMERIC
WPA3 NO. OF FULLTIME STAFF
HOW MANY FULL-TIME STAFF POSITIONS DID WPA3 HAVE DURING THE DEBATE?
1 -99
999. NOT APPLICABLE

VAR C11_2AC
NUMERIC

WPA3 SEPARATE DIVISIONS

DID WPA3 HAVE SEPARATE ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISIONS AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL DURING THE DEBATE?

0. NO
1. YES

VAR C11_2BC
NUMERIC
WPA3 NO. OF SEPARATE DIVISIONS

HOW MANY SEPARATE ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISIONS DID THE WPA3 HAVE AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL DURING THE DEBATE?

1 -99
999. NOT APPLICABLE

VAR C11_3AC
NUMERIC
WPA3 FIELD OFFICES

DID WPA3 HAVE SEPARATE FIELD OFFICES AT THE SUB-NATIONAL LEVEL DURING THE DEBATE?

0. NO
1. YES

VAR C11_3BC
NUMERIC
WPA3 NO. OF FIELD OFFICES

HOW MANY FIELD OFFICES DID THE WPA3 HAVE AT THE SUB-NATIONAL LEVEL DURING THE DEBATE?

1 -99
999. NOT APPLICABLE

VAR C11_4AC
NUMERIC
WPA3 SEPARATE BUDGET

WAS THERE A SEPARATE BUDGET FOR THE WPA3 DURING THE DEBATE?

0. NO
1. YES

VAR C11_4BC
NUMERIC
WPA3 BUDGET PERCENT TOTAL GOVERNMENT BUDGET

WHAT PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL GOVERNMENT BUDGET WAS ALLOTTED TO THE WPA3 AS A SEPARATE BUDGET?

.0001 -99%
999. NOT APPLICABLE

VAR C11_5AC

NUMERIC

WPA3 SUBSIDIES FOR WOMEN'S GROUPS

DID THE WPA3 MAKE SUBSIDIES AVAILABLE TO WOMEN'S ORGANIZATIONS?

0. NO
1. YES

VAR C11_5BC

NUMERIC

WPA3 BUDGET PERCENT DEVOTED TO SUBSIDIES

WHAT PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL WPA3 BUDGET WAS ALLOTTED TO SUBSIDIES TO WOMEN'S ORGANIZATIONS?

1 -100%
999. NOT APPLICABLE

VAR C11_6AC

NUMERIC

WPA3 RESEARCH STAFF

DID THE WPA3 ALLOT RESOURCES, BUDGET, AND OR STAFF FOR RESEARCH?

0. NO
1. YES

VAR C11_6BC

NUMERIC

WPA3 BUDGET PERCENT DEVOTED TO RESEARCH

WHAT PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL WPA3 BUDGET (STAFF SALARIES INCLUDED) WAS ALLOTTED TO RESEARCH?

1 -100%
999. NOT APPLICABLE

CONCEPT 12. WPA – WMA LEADERSHIP

Variables in the Appendices/Dataset:

C12A_1. WPA Leadership (text appendices)
C12_1. Leader's WMA activities (nominal)
C12_2. Feminist leadership (nominal)

Nominal Definition

WPA/Women's movement leadership refers to whether heads of WPAs active in policy debates were actors in the women's movement or feminist movement or active in women movement groups or feminist groups prior to taking office. Leadership is quite important in determining the direction of a given WPA. Directors with ties to women's movements may have different priorities and leadership styles than individuals who have not developed those ties over the years. And, their activity may or may not be feminist depending on the core ideas expressed by the actors. Beyond the policy orientation and policy agenda of a given policy office, an agency's leadership often selects a particular issue of focus that dictates the major policy orientation of the WPA. In studies of WPAs and femocrats (e.g., Stetson and Mazur 1995 and Eisenstein 1996), political allegiance and ties of an individual were found to have an impact in the direction of the agency. In France, for example, Yvette Roudy's political background as Socialist Party feminist was an important factor in the policy priorities of the Ministry of Women's Rights that she headed for six years (Mazur 1995).

Other concepts

Women's movement actors are the individuals, informal organizations and formal organizations that are inspired by movement thinkers to act to advance what they see as women's interests.

Feminist movement actors are individuals, informal organizations and formal organizations that are inspired by feminist ideas:

Questions

Was the WPA head a Women's Movement actor or active in a WMA group prior to taking office? Was the WPA head a feminist movement actor or active in a feminist group prior to taking office?

Operational Definition

1. Examine the background of the WPA head and determine whether the head ever belonged to any organized WMAs or was an individual WMA prior to taking office. For the most comprehensive list of WMAs, across all areas, for each debate period, see C. 16 Priority.
2. If WPA head had experience with WMAs, then assess the extent to which her activity or the organization was feminist, that is, espousing feminist discourse.

Variable Construction Notes

1. Consultants did not think we would have reliable measure if researchers made judgments about the political backgrounds of WPA leaders without any specific criteria.
2. The operational definition allows for cases where WPA leaders may not actually say they are feminist, but still advance political positions that are clearly in support of

WMA micro-frames that are feminist. Several of the consultants asserted that some prominent leaders will not self-identify as feminist.

3. If the researchers are unable to do this work, it is possible that we can try to find out this information on the web through political biography searches.
4. This concept was f*eminist leadership* in the qualitative studies. However, given difficulties of the cross-case operational definition of feminism, the concept was changed at Turin to focus only on women's movement experience of the leadership. This can be revisited at Leiden to include a feminist component.
5. The Directors at Leiden agreed to include a feminist component to the variable.

Variables in the Appendices/Dataset:

C12A_1

WPA LEADER(S) NAME; YEARS IN WPA; WOMEN'S MOVEMENT ACTIVITY

NAME, YEARS IN WPA, NAME OF WMA INVOLVED WITH, YEARS ACTIVE, AND ACTIVITIES IN WM, SEE APPENDIX C12A_1.

VAR C12_1A

NUMERIC

WPA1 LEADER WMA ACTIVITIES

DID THE WPA1 HEAD EVER BELONG TO A WOMEN'S MOVEMENT ORGANIZATION, OR WERE THEY EVER A WOMEN'S MOVEMENT INDIVIDUAL ACTOR PRIOR TO TAKING A LEADERSHIP ROLE IN THE WPA?

0. NO
1. YES

VAR C12_2A

NUMERIC

WPA1 FEMINIST LEADERSHIP

DID THE WPA1 HEAD EVER BELONG TO A FEMINIST WOMEN'S MOVEMENT ORGANIZATION, OR WERE THEY EVER A FEMINIST WOMEN'S MOVEMENT INDIVIDUAL ACTOR PRIOR TO TAKING A LEADERSHIP ROLE IN THE WPA?

0. NO
1. YES
999. NOT APPLICABLE

VAR C12_1B

NUMERIC

WPA2 LEADER WMA ACTIVITIES

DID THE WPA2 HEAD EVER BELONG TO A WOMEN'S MOVEMENT ORGANIZATION, OR WERE THEY EVER A WOMEN'S MOVEMENT INDIVIDUAL ACTOR PRIOR TO TAKING A LEADERSHIP ROLE IN THE WPA?

0. NO
1. YES

VAR C12_2B

NUMERIC

WPA2 FEMINIST LEADERSHIP

DID THE WPA2 HEAD EVER BELONG TO A FEMINIST WOMEN'S MOVEMENT ORGANIZATION, OR WERE THEY EVER A FEMINIST WOMEN'S MOVEMENT INDIVIDUAL ACTOR PRIOR TO TAKING A LEADERSHIP ROLE IN THE WPA?

0. NO
1. YES
999. NOT APPLICABLE

VAR C12_1C

NUMERIC

WPA3 LEADER WMA ACTIVITIES

DID THE WPA3 HEAD EVER BELONG TO A WOMEN'S MOVEMENT ORGANIZATION, OR WERE THEY EVER A WOMEN'S MOVEMENT INDIVIDUAL ACTOR PRIOR TO TAKING A LEADERSHIP ROLE IN THE WPA?

0. NO
1. YES

VAR C12_2C

NUMERIC

WPA3 FEMINIST LEADERSHIP

DID THE WPA3 HEAD EVER BELONG TO A FEMINIST WOMEN'S MOVEMENT ORGANIZATION, OR WERE THEY EVER A FEMINIST WOMEN'S MOVEMENT INDIVIDUAL ACTOR PRIOR TO TAKING A LEADERSHIP ROLE IN THE WPA?

0. NO
1. YES
999. NOT APPLICABLE

CONCEPT 13. WMA – STAGE

Variables in the Appendices/Dataset:

C13A_1 WMA Stage and Evidence (text appendices)
C13_1. WMA Stage (nominal)

Nominal Definition

The concept of stage assumes a cycle of movement change over time; stage is the particular moment in the cycle at a given time. The stage of the women's movement is is one of the characteristics that may explain variations in women's movement actors' success vis-à-vis the state. There is some expectation that movements may be more successful at some stages than others. The literature does not provide many guides to measuring this type of change.

Tarrow (1983; 1989; 1998) writes about cycles of movements, defining them in terms of expansion of contestation against authority. Cycles of action involve heightened conflict across the society, diffusion of collective action; innovation in terms of contentious activities, new or transformed action frames. He then goes on to add that cycles of movements are not usually studied because the focus of researchers is on organizations. This study focuses on organizations to identify women's movement actors; therefore, using Tarrow's approach to cycles would not be appropriate. Instead, the project used a combined measure of organization numbers and activism as illustrated by the study of the USA movement by Rosenfeld and Ward 1996. They found three stages: abeyance/emergence, growth, and consolidation/decline. Here these are modified to account for distinctions between abeyance/emergence and consolidation and decline: emerging/reemerging/growth; consolidation, decline.

Research findings from the issue networks (Haussman and Sauer 2006; Lovenduski 2005; Mazur 2001; McBride Stetson 2001; Outshoorn 2004) reveal no patterns in movement success or WPA effectiveness associated with particular stages of the movement. Perhaps this is because stage assumes a cyclical pattern of change, and thus biases the results. We find stages because we assume they are there and force the observations into one of the categories. The measures here can be compared with an alternate approach to the study of WMA change through Concepts 21 and 22: WMA STRENGTH/ MOBILIZATION and WMA STRENGTH/ INSTITUTIONALIZATION

Question

What is the stage of the development of the WM during the debate?

Operational Definition

Country researchers map the women's movement from1970 to 2000 by using the following categories of information; validity is based on citations from literature on women's movement in that country as found in the appendices:

- *Growth (Emerging/Re-emerging/ Growth).* Formation of new organizations; re habilitation of older organizations toward new goals; Expansion in numbers of organizations, activities.
- *Consolidation*. Organizations have structure, endurance and regular support; institutionalized in community and government arenas.
- *Decline (Abeyance).* Decrease in organizations members and activities over the period. Latent organizational activity primarily by individuals.

CONCEPT 13. WMA – STAGE

For each stage category, coders compare evidence provided by authors to assure reliability in the application of the definition. Where there are discrepancies between debates in the same time periods in the same country, the coders consult additional sources to come to agreement on the stage classification. Where the authors are recognized experts on women's movements in their countries, coders use these authors' judgments as constituting face validity of the measure. The evidence which is included in the appendix for each debate may be drawn from other debates during the same period.

Variable Construction Notes

1. Consultants generally didn't like this measure. However, mapping the women's movement according to these categories, if researchers agree, is extremely useful for the analysis of all debates.
2. The coders will check the evidence provided by researchers before coding to see if it's adequate to support the conclusion.
3. If this doesn't work out, we can decide to drop this from the distributed data set and retain the STRENGTH Concepts 21 and 22.
4. At Turin, we decided to use this measure as a fallback if gathering information for measuring the institutionalization and mobilization concepts does not work. The new worksheet developed on women's movements actors, therefore includes information on stage as well as the new strength concepts developed to replace it.
5. During coding of this variable, we agreed to change the original 4 categories to 3 by collapsing emerging and growth stages because the definitions did not clearly distinguish between these two categories.
6. Three categorical variables were transposed into a single nominal variable with three choices at consultant Andrew Appleton's suggestion. The categorical variables were left in the dataset.

Variables in the Appendices/Dataset:

C13A_1

DATES, EVIDENCE, AND CITATION FOR WOMEN'S MOVEMENT STAGE

FOR DATES, EVIDENCE, AND CITATIONS FOR WOMEN'S MOVEMENT STAGE SEE APPENDIX C13A_1.

VAR C13_1

NUMERIC

WOMEN'S MOVEMENT STAGE

AT WHAT STAGE OF DEVELOPMENT WAS THE WOMEN'S MOVEMENT DURING THE DEBATE?

1. GROWTH
2. CONSOLIDATION
3. DECLINE

CONCEPT 14. WMA-ORGANIZATIONAL CLOSENESS TO LEFT

Variable

C14_1. Organizational closeness to the Left (ordinal)

Nominal Definition

Organizational Closeness of Women's Movement Actors to the Left refers to formal alliances between women movement actors and Left-wing political parties and trade unions associated with the Left; it may be very close, close, moderately close, or not close. This concept allows examination of the relation between the women's movement actors and Left parties and trade unions and refers to all women's movement actors at the time of the debate, not just those active in the debate. This measure shows one aspect of alliances with the Left, the other being ideological closeness. Organizational closeness looks at the structural and process overlap between women's movement actors and the Left parties and unions. It builds on information located in the LOCATION (C 18) concept that shows whether or not representatives of women's movement discourse are found during a debate in formal organizations such as unions or parties. However, it also allows for measuring the *degree* of organizational affiliation. Analysts could combine this concept with GOVERNING MAJORITY in Concept 25, based on the expectation that the movement actors would be more influential if they are inside the Left parties and unions and the Left parties are in power.

Left parties refer to those more likely to promote agendas that emphasize greater political, social, and economic equality than parties of the right, in party systems when party positions can be placed on a continuum ranging from Left to Right.

Question

To what extent do movement actors form alliances or organizations within Left-wing parties and trade unions?

Operational Definition

Obtain information on the Left political parties and unions to determine if they have (a) women's sections and/or (b) women's movement actors in positions of leadership. Code the debate as follows:

- *Very Close:* Women's movement actors formally ally with or form organizations within national political parties and/or national trade union confederations of the Left and actors have internal power positions in the Left-wing parties.
- *Close:* groups form organizations within national political parties and/or national trade union confederations of the Left. They do not have internal power positions in the parties or unions.
- *Moderately Close*: Some movement actors ally with or work with political parties and/or trade unions of the Left, but do not form formal organizations within national parties/national trade union confederations (although individual unions may have some women's commissions) and do not have leadership positions.
- *Not Close:* There are no connections between WMAs and trade unions/ political parties.

Variable Construction Notes

1. In the RNGS model, Closeness to the Left was both organizational and ideological; consultants advised us to separate these dimensions.

2. Before the APSA workshop, Dorothy McBride sorted the classifications on the original closeness variable from the case studies in the abortion and job training books and found these classifications lacked reliability; different standards were used across the cases for classifying as close, very close, etc. Therefore it is necessary to gather the data from the researchers and code across the cases.
3. The worksheet needs to give the descriptive information on the debates; the coders will make the conclusions using the operational definitions and the measurements.
4. The ten party debates are coded Not Applicable (999) on this variable because the arena is restricted to the left party only.
5. The five regional debates are coded Not Applicable on this variable because this variable measures at the national level.

Variables in Dataset

VAR C14_1

NUMERIC

WOMEN'S MOVEMENT ACTOR ORGANIZATIONAL CLOSENESS TO LEFT

TO WHAT EXTENT WERE ALL WMA'S AT THE TIME OF THE DEBATE CLOSE TO THE LEFT IN TERMS OF FORMING ALLIANCES OR ORGANIZATIONS WITHIN LEFT WING PARTIES AND TRADE UNIONS AND WMAS IN LEADERSHIP POSITIONS?

0. NOT CLOSE
1. MODERATELY CLOSE
2. CLOSE
3. VERY CLOSE

999 NOT APPLICABLE

CONCEPT 15. WMA-IDEOLOGICAL CLOSENESS TO LEFT

Variable

C15_1. Ideological closeness to the Left (ordinal)

Nominal Definition

Ideological Closeness of Women's Movement Actors to the Left means whether ideas, discourse, and/or demands of these actors are adopted by Left-wing political parties and trade unions associated with the Left; it may be very close, close, moderately close, or not close. This concept allows examination of the relation between the women's movement actors and Left parties and trade unions and refers to all women's movement actors, not just those active in the debate.

This measure provides one aspect of an alliance of the movement with the Left, the other being organizational closeness. Ideological closeness looks at the overlap between ideas and demands of women's movement actors and those of the Left. Analysis of it could be combined with PE-GOVERNING MAJORITY (Concept 24) based on the expectation that the movement actors would be more influential if the Left parties and unions have adopted their ideas and the Left parties are in power. Left parties refers to those more likely to promote agendas that emphasize greater political, social, and economic equality than parties of the right, in party systems when party positions can be placed on a continuum ranging from Left to Right.

Question

To what extent do Left wing political parties and trade unions associated with the Left adopt goals, demands, and discourse presented by women's movement actors?

Operational Definition

Obtain information on the Left political parties and unions to determine if they have (a) incorporated WMA goals into their platforms and (b) adopted movement goals in the specific policy debate. Then code as follows:

- *Very Close:* Ideas from the movement on several issues as well as the policy debate issue are taken up and promoted by Left wing parties in party platforms; trade unions adopt policy goals of women's movement actors.
- *Close:* goals of the movement related to the policy debate or movement ideas on several issues (one or the other) are taken up by Left political parties and trade unions.
- *Moderately Close*: Goals of some movement actors on the policy debate are taken up by either political parties or trade unions or some trade unions or parties include WMA goals from the policy debate in their platform.
- *Not Close:* No goals of movement actors are taken up or promoted by Left parties or unions.

Variable Construction Notes

1. In the RNGS model, Closeness to the Left was both organizational and ideological; consultants advised us to separate these dimensions.
2. Before the APSA workshop, Dorothy McBride sorted the classifications on the original closeness variable from the case studies in the abortion and job training books and found these classifications lacked reliability; different standards used across the cases for

classifying as close, very close, etc. Therefore, it is necessary to gather the data from the researchers and code across the cases.

3. The ten party debates are coded Not Applicable (999) on this variable because the arena is restricted to the left party only.
4. The five regional debates are coded Not Applicable on this variable because this variable measures at the national level.

Variables in Dataset

VAR C15_1

NUMERIC

WOMEN'S MOVEMENT ACTORS IDEOLOGICAL CLOSENESS TO LEFT

DURING THE DEBATE, TO WHAT EXTENT HAD POLITICAL PARTIES AND TRADE UNIONS ASSOCIATED WITH THE LEFT ADOPTED WMA GOALS?

0. NOT CLOSE
1. MODERATELY CLOSE
2. CLOSE
3. VERY CLOSE

999 NOT APPLICABLE

CONCEPT 16. WMA – PRIORITY

Variables in the Appendices/Dataset:

C16A_1. List of Policy Agendas for WMAs for the Period of the Debate (text appendices)

C16_1. Priority of issue to all WMAs (nominal)

Nominal Definition

Priority of issue to the movement agenda indicates the attention devoted to each policy debate by women's movement organizational actors. The RNGS model hypothesizes that women's movement actors will be more successful on issues that are among the top priority issues on the agenda of the movement actors as a whole. This concept focuses on the agendas of collective actors, not individuals, and encompasses all these actors, not just those active in the policy debate.

Question

Is the policy debate issue one of the top 5 issues on the agenda of WM organizational actors taken together?

Operational Definition

Based on researchers' knowledge of all organizational WMAs for the period during the debate, determine the top five priority issues for all WMAs. Compare the debate issue with the list of priority issues.

Variable Construction Notes

1. Consultants advised to find ways of counting this variable and rely less on researcher judgment; thus we propose restricting the study to movement organizations and autonomous groups and getting information on the top 5 priority items on their agendas. Then the measure can involve locating the priorities in an ordinal list, permitting a reliable ordinal scale of measurement.
2. We will have to consolidate worksheets to include all the information we need on women's movement actors in one place which is easy to figure out. Right now we are just putting in the information needed to code the variable.
3. Gathering information on this variable is likely to take a lot of work for the researchers. The alternative is to go with researcher judgment, but that measure would not be very reliable. And, considering the central place that this variable has in explaining WM success in the RNGS findings so far, it is worth considering the most reliable way possible to measure this.
4. We did not discuss this variable in the group meeting at Turin due to a lack of time. However, some expressed concern that it might be an impossible goal to gather information on all the organizations. Another concern was that it treated all organizations of equal weight despite size and activism. Researchers will be asked to gather as much of this information as possible, but may want to focus on the largest and most active of the organizations, making a note to that effect on the worksheet.
5. It was agreed at Leiden 2003 that the original plan to determine priority from a survey of organizations would not work because information does not exist in secondary sources in many countries. Thus we moved to asking researchers to give their list of top priority issues without ranking them. After the WMA worksheets were completed, researchers

were able to determine the top five issues and produced valid evidence for their selections. In some cases we had to rely only on researcher judgment. This has face validity given the expertise of the authors on the women's movement actors in their countries.

Variable/ Appendix in Dataset

C16A_1

TOP FIVE ISSUES ON POLICY AGENDAS FOR ALL WOMEN'S MOVEMENT ACTORS DURING THE PERIOD OF THE DEBATE

SEE APPENDIX C16A_1 FOR THE LIST OF TOP FIVE ISSUES ON THE POLICY AGENDA FOR ALL WMA DURING THE PERIOD OF THE DEBATE.

VAR C16_1

NUMERIC

WMA PRIORITY

WAS THE POLICY DEBATE ISSUE AMONG THE TOP 5 ISSUES ON THE POLICY AGENDA OF THE WMA'S TAKEN TOGETHER DURING THE PERIOD OF THE DEBATE?

0. NOT ON THE AGENDA
1. ON THE AGENDA

CONCEPT 17. WMA – COHESION

Variables in the Appendices/Dataset:

For a WMA micro-frames see appendices for C1A_1
C17_1. Proportion of WMA in agreement (interval)

Nominal Definition

Cohesion of the movement actors around the issue refers to the agreement of movement actors on micro-frames during the policy process. More specifically, cohesion measures the extent to which WMAs active on the issue share a common micro-frame and agree on policy proposals. The RNGS model proposes that women's movement actors will be more successful in influencing policy outcomes if they are united/cohesive in their presentation of micro-frames. Micro-frames consist of the definition of problems and list of policy proposals. WMAs advocate micro-frames that they wish to include in the sub-system issue frame for the policy debate. If successful in this strategy, the definition of the policy problem would include elements of the women's movement actors' micro-frames.

Question

To what extent do WM actors involved in the policy debate agree on micro-frames articulated for that debate?

Operational Definition

1. Using data gathered for the LOCATION concept, list all the movement representatives active on the issue.
2. Identify the micro-frames on the issue advanced by each actor during the debate (See Concept 1 POLICY RESPONSE).
3. Identify the micro-frame which has the most agreement among the women's movement actors. Indicate the proportion of actors who agree on that micro-frame.

Variable Construction Notes

1. Consultants suggested we remove researcher and coder problems by moving toward a numerical measure of cohesion, based on a body of information gathered on the new worksheets about women's movement actors. It means there will be several types of information to be gathered about each women's movement actor identified in the debate, including individuals.

Variables in Dataset

VAR C17_1
NUMERIC
PERCENTAGE OF WMA IN AGREEMENT
WHAT IS THE HIGHEST PROPORTION OF WMA ACTOR(S) INVOLVED IN THE POLICY DEBATE THAT AGREED ON A SINGLE MICRO-FRAME?
0. NONE
1 -100%

CONCEPT 18. WMA LOCATION

Variables (all nominal)

C18_1a. Individuals in women's movement informal or formal organizations
C18_1b. Relation to policy sub-system
C18_2a. Individuals in Non women's movement informal or formal organization
C18_2b. Relation to policy sub-system
C18_3a. Informal women's movement organizations
C18_3b. Relation to policy sub-system
C18_4a. Formal women's movement organizations
C18_4b. Relation to policy sub-system
C18_5a. Informal organizations inside women's movement organizations
C18_5b. Relation to policy sub-system
C18_6a. Formal organizations inside women's movement organizations
C18_6b. Relation to policy sub-system
C18_7a. Informal organizations inside non women's movement organizations
C18_7b. Relation to policy sub-system
C18_8a. Formal organizations inside non women's movement organizations
C18_8b. Relation to policy sub-system.

Nominal Definition

Given that the RNGS project defines the WM in terms of discourse about gender consciousness and studies it through the individual and organizational actors who represent those ideas and discourse, location refers to the sites from which these actors operate. Women's movement actors may be individuals, informal organizations and formal organizations, all articulating women's movement ideas, aspirations and identities. The locations where they are found may be of two types: (1) women's movement organizations whose primary goals are to promote women's movement ideas, aspirations and identities (excluding women's policy agencies); and (2) non-women's movement organizations whose primary goal is other than to promote women's movement ideas, aspirations and identities. Both types of organizations may be informal or formal. In addition, some organizations (not individuals) may not be found inside another organization's structure, but may operate on their own. These are considered freestanding (for more on conceptualization of location, See Appendix 4).

For the RNGS project, women's movement actors closest to the policy debate sub-system have the potential to be more effective than actors distant from it.

Question

From which locations do WMAs operate within the policy debate? Which sites are inside and which sites are outside the policy sub-system in the policy debate?

Operational Definition

Step 1: Identify WMAs participating in the policy debate:

- *Individuals*: single persons who do not claim to represent any organized or collective entity.
- *Informal organizations*, also called collective action are group activities through loosely organized means, such as demonstrations, consciousness raising groups, and clubs.

- *Formal organizations* are group activities through written rules and policies, such as lobbying organizations, professional organizations, and reform organizations.

Step 2: Identify the Location where these WMAs are situated during the debate:

- *Women's movement* organizations or sub-organizations (sections of political parties, for example) are those whose primary mission is to promote women's movement ideas, aspirations and identities.
- *Non women's movement* organizations are those whose primary mission is other than to promote women's movement ideas, aspirations and identities. Such as political parties, government institutions and agencies; lobbying organizations.

Step 3: Combine information from Steps 1 and 2 into classification of WMA according to form and location:

- Individuals in women's movement informal or formal organizations
- Individuals in Non women's movement informal or formal organizations.
- Free standing informal women's movement organizations
- Free standing formal women's movement organizations
- Informal organizations inside women's movement organizations
- Formal organizations inside women's movement organizations;
- Informal organizations inside non women's movement organizations
- Formal organizations inside non women's movement organizations

Step 4: Determine whether any of the sites where WM actors are present are inside the policy sub-system on the policy debate. Use author's definition of policy sub-system on the structure of the policy sub-system and overall sub-system actors in each country analysis.

Variable Construction Notes

1. In the first iteration, this was measured as "Close/Not Close". Consultants recommended being more precise with Inside/Outside the policy sub-system. This was possible because the policy sub-system is pretty well defined.
2. This concept uses the taxonomy of WMA Form and Locations developed for the project. It seeks to provide a set of generic categories that can be used across the countries and the cases.
3. For organizations that are not part of another organizational structure, we added the "freestanding" category to the measure after Turin.

Variables in Dataset

VAR C18_1A
NUMERIC
INDIVIDUALS LOCATED IN WM ORGANIZATIONS
DURING THE DEBATE, WERE THE WM INDIVIDUALS ACTIVE IN THE DEBATE LOCATED IN WOMEN'S MOVEMENT ORGANIZATION (FORMAL OR INFORMAL)?
0. NO
1. YES

CONCEPT 18. WMA LOCATION

VAR C18_1B
NUMERIC
WM INDIVIDUALS IN SUB-SYSTEM
WAS THIS LOCATION INSIDE THE POLICY SUB-SYSTEM?
0. OUTSIDE
1. INSIDE
999. NOT APPLICABLE

VAR C18_2A
NUMERIC
INDIVIDUALS IN NON WM ORGANIZATIONS
DURING THE DEBATE, WERE THE WM INDIVIDUALS ACTIVE IN THE DEBATE LOCATED IN A NON- WOMEN'S MOVEMENT ORGANIZATION (FORMAL OR INFORMAL)?
0. NO
1. YES

VAR C18_2B
NUMERIC
NON WM INDIVIDUALS IN SUB-SYSTEM
WAS THIS LOCATION INSIDE THE POLICY SUB-SYSTEM?
0. OUTSIDE
1. INSIDE
999. NOT APPLICABLE

VAR C18_3A
NUMERIC
FREE-STANDING INFORMAL WM ORGANIZATION
WERE THERE FREE-STANDING INFORMAL WOMEN'S MOVEMENT ORGANIZATIONS I NVOLVED IN THE DEBATE?
0. NO
1. YES

VAR C18_3B
NUMERIC
FREE-STANDING INFORMAL WM ORG IN SUB-SYSTEM
WAS THIS LOCATION INSIDE THE POLICY SUB-SYSTEM?
0. OUTSIDE
1. INSIDE
999. NOT APPLICABLE

VAR C18_4A
NUMERIC
FREE-STANDING FORMAL WM ORGANIZATION
WERE THERE FREE-STANDING FORMAL WOMEN'S MOVEMENT ORGANIZATIONS INVOLVED IN THE DEBATE?

0. NO
1. YES

VAR C18_4B
NUMERIC
FREE-STANDING FORMAL WM ORG IN SUB-SYSTEM
WAS THIS LOCATION INSIDE THE POLICY SUB-SYSTEM?
0. OUTSIDE
1. INSIDE
999. NOT APPLICABLE

VAR C18_5A
NUMERIC
INFORMAL ORG IN WM ORGANIZATION
WERE THERE INFORMAL ORGANIZATIONS, INSIDE WOMEN'S MOVEMENT ORGANIZATIONS INVOLVED IN THE DEBATE?
0. NO
1. YES

VAR C18_5B
NUMERIC
INFORMAL ORG WM ORG IN SUB-SYSTEM
WAS THIS LOCATION INSIDE THE POLICY SUB-SYSTEM?
0. OUTSIDE
1. INSIDE
999. NOT APPLICABLE

VAR C18_6A
NUMERIC
FORMAL ORG IN WM ORGANIZATION
WERE THERE FORMAL ORGANIZATIONS INSIDE WOMEN'S MOVEMENT ORGANIZATIONS INVOLVED DURING THE DEBATE?
0. NO
1. YES

VAR C18_6B
NUMERIC
FORMAL ORG IN WM ORG IN SUB-SYSTEM
WAS THIS LOCATION INSIDE THE POLICY SUB-SYSTEM?
0. OUTSIDE
1. INSIDE
999. NOT APPLICABLE

VAR C18_7A
NUMERIC
INFORMAL ORG IN NON-WM ORGANIZATION

CONCEPT 18. WMA LOCATION

WERE THERE INFORMAL ORGANIZATIONS INSIDE NON- WOMEN'S MOVEMENT ORGANIZATIONS INVOLVED DURING THE DEBATE?

0. NO
1. YES

VAR C18_8B
NUMERIC
INFORMAL ORG IN NON-WM ORG IN SUB-SYSTEM
WAS THIS LOCATION INSIDE THE POLICY SUB-SYSTEM?

0. OUTSIDE
1. INSIDE
999. NOT APPLICABLE

VAR C18_8A
NUMERIC
FORMAL ORG IN NON-WM ORGANIZATION
WERE THERE FORMAL ORGANIZATIONS INSIDE NON- WOMEN'S MOVEMENT ORGANIZATIONS INVOLVED DURING THE DEBATE?

0. NO
1. YES

VAR C18_8B
NUMERIC
FORMAL ORG IN NON-WM ORG IN SUB-SYSTEM
WAS THIS LOCATION INSIDE THE POLICY SUB-SYSTEM?

0. OUTSIDE
1. INSIDE
999. NOT APPLICABLE

CONCEPT 19. WMA – FEMINIST ACTIVISM

Variables (all nominal)

C19_1. Informal organizations
C19_2. Formal organizations:
C19_3. Individuals in women's movement informal or formal organizations
C19_4. Individuals in Non women's movement informal or formal organizations
C19_5. Informal organizations inside women's movement organizations
C19_6. Formal organizations inside women's movement organizations
C19_7. Informal organizations inside non women's movement organizations
C19_8. Formal organizations inside non women's movement organizations

Nominal Definition

Feminist movements (actors and ideas) are a sub category of women's movements. Feminist movement actors are distinguished by their feminism. Like the women's movements their ideas include identity with women as a group; explicitly gendered language about women; and representation of women as women in public life. In addition there are specific feminist ideas.

To be considered feminist, discourse must include all of these elements: identity with women; be explicitly gendered; represent women; improve the status of women; challenge gender hierarchies.

Any WM actors presenting feminist micro-frames in the debate constitute feminist activism. Types of women's movement actors are defined in Step 1 of C2 A_1 LOCATION. Micro-frames of these are defined in Concept 5-WMA/WPA FIT. Given that not all women's movement actors are feminist, we identify whether women's movement actors based on their micro-frames.

Question

Which women's movement actors articulate feminist micro-frames during the debate?

Operational Definition

1. Locate Women's Movement Actors active in the debate (C2 A_1)
2. List micro-frames for each from WPA/WMA data (C1A_1; C1A_2.
3. Apply definition of feminist positions to determine which WMA frames put forward in the debate are feminist.
4. Locate WMA with feminist micro-frames during the debate

Variable Construction Notes

1. In the draft codebook there were two options; one relied on researchers' judgments of feminist activism. The consultants recommended against this option and in favor of measuring each actor.
2. The inductively developed feminist micro-frames on the issues are derived from a sorting of the discourse of those actors identified by the authors as feminist in their country. In sorting through the first two issues, we found common agreement across a majority of cases on those feminist views identified in Appendix 3 (see note 4).
3. The worksheet needs to give the descriptive information on the debates; the coders will make the conclusions using the operational definitions and the measurements.

4. In Leiden, we dropped the approach described in Note 2 (above) and agreed on the core ideas that distinguish feminist discourse from other women's movement discourse.

Variables in Dataset

VAR C19_1
NUMERIC
INFORMAL ORGS AND FEM MICRO-FRAMES
DURING THE DEBATE, DID INFORMAL WOMEN'S MOVEMENT ORGANIZATIONS ARTICULATE FEMINIST MICRO-FRAMES?
0. NO
1. YES

VAR C19_2
NUMERIC
FORMAL ORGS AND FEM MICRO-FRAMES
DURING THE DEBATE, DID FORMAL WOMEN'S MOVEMENT ORGANIZATIONS ARTICULATE FEMINIST MICRO-FRAMES?
0. NO
1. YES

VAR C19_3
NUMERIC
INDIVIDUALS IN WM ORG AND FEM MICRO-FRAME
DURING THE DEBATE, DID WM INDIVIDUALS, LOCATED INSIDE WOMEN'S MOVEMENT ORGANIZATIONS (FORMAL OR INFORMAL), ARTICULATE FEMINIST MICRO-FRAMES?
0. NO
1. YES

VAR C19_4
NUMERIC
INDIVIDUALS IN NON-WM ORG AND FEM MICRO-FRAMES
DURING THE DEBATE, DID WM INDIVIDUALS, LOCATED INSIDE NON- WOMEN'S MOVEMENT ORGANIZATIONS (FORMAL OR INFORMAL), ARTICULATE FEMINIST MICRO-FRAMES?
0. NO
1. YES

VAR C19_5
NUMERIC
INFORMAL WM ORGS AND FEM MICRO-FRAMES
DURING THE DEBATE, DID INFORMAL ORGANIZATIONS, LOCATED INSIDE WOMEN'S MOVEMENT ORGANIZATIONS, ARTICULATE FEMINIST MICRO-FRAMES?

0. NO
1. YES

VAR C19_6
NUMERIC
FORMAL WM ORGS AND FEM MICRO-FRAMES
DURING THE DEBATE, DID FORMAL ORGANIZATIONS, LOCATED INSIDE WOMEN'S MOVEMENT ORGANIZATIONS, ARTICULATE FEMINIST MICRO-FRAMES?
0. NO
1. YES

VAR C19_7
NUMERIC
INFORMAL ORG IN NON-WM ORGS AND FEM MICRO-FRAMES
DURING THE DEBATE, DID INFORMAL ORGANIZATIONS, LOCATED INSIDE NON-WOMEN'S MOVEMENT ORGANIZATIONS, ARTICULATE FEMINIST MICRO-FRAMES?
0. NO
1. YES

VAR C19_8
NUMERIC
FORMAL ORG IN NON-WM ORGS AND FEM MICRO-FRAMES
DURING THE DEBATE, DID FORMAL ORGANIZATIONS, LOCATED INSIDE NON-WOMEN'S MOVEMENT ORGANIZATIONS, ARTICULATE FEMINIST MICRO-FRAMES?
0. NO
1. YES

CONCEPT 20. PE – COUNTERMOVEMENT

Variables in the Appendices/Dataset:

C20A_1. Countermovement Strength (text appendices)
C20_1. Countermovement Strength in Debate (ordinal)

Nominal Definition

The countermovement refers to the actors who are actively working against the women's movement actors' micro-frames in the policy debate. This may include other women's movement actors. The proposition of the RNGS model is that variations in the strength of countermovements would explain variations in success of movement actors in the policy debate. In the original RNGS model, countermovement was part of the women's movement characteristics cluster of explanatory variables. However, in subsequent research, researchers agreed that it is conceptually part of the policy environment, not a characteristic of women's movements. Nevertheless, we approached the measurement of this concept the same way as we do the women's movement, by focusing on the actors who represent the discourse of the countermovement. The more actors involved from more sites, the greater the strength.

Question

What is the strength of the countermovement in the policy debate?

Operational Definition

Use author's assessment based on the following indicators:

- *Strong*: prevalent and proactive movement aimed against issue or issues taken up by different parts of the women' movement.
- *Moderate*: countermovement less active against women's movement issues.
- *Weak*: nearly moribund or non existent.
- *None*

Variable Construction Notes

1. This first draft was based on authors' conclusions. The consultants were divided on this variable in its first draft. In general, they have advised RNGS not to code authors' conclusions, but to be more systematic and code from the data itself. Thus we broke down this concept in a way that was similar to the unpacking of the women's movement concept.
2. Information on the micro-frames of the countermovement actors is useful for coders to assess the degree of opposition to the women's movement frames. We can discuss whether we want to use this information in coding. It may decrease reliability, or it may be a way to check for researchers' assessment of countermovement.
3. Might be able to compare the number of countermovement actors in the debate with the number of women's movement actors as another indicator of strength.
4. Kathy T. commented after Turin that the countermovement should be defined in terms of ideas just as the women's movement is. This is implied in the definition, but there remains a question as to whether the women's movement is different from other types of social movements which combine ideas with activism in their definitions.
5. Turin meeting also suggested that some of those working against the women's movement micro-frames inserting gendered ideas to advance the status of women in the policy process may be opposed by other actors working from gender consciousness. For that to

matter in the measurement of this concept they would have to be part of a large group of actors in opposition.

6. Originally there was another option in the codebook for gathering data and measuring countermovement strength: List the actors in opposition to women's movement actors and their locations in the policy debate: Individuals; Informal Organizations; Formal Organizations; For each actor, list countermovement micro-frame; Select actors whose micro-frames are in opposition to the women's movement actors' micro-frames. Strength equals number of countermovement actors in sites.
7. From the beginning there was doubt that this approach will work to characterize the countermovement strength. For one thing, it treats all actors of equal weight; whereas some organizations may mobilize many people and still count as only one actor.
8. At Leiden 2003, we agreed to code according to the author's assessment according to the indicators of the countermovement strength only. At some point coders will sort the cases to see if there are similarities across the debates and countries.
9. In Moscow, 12/05, the coders agreed to keep the information on countermovement that is currently in the appendices, but not to include this information in the codebook or the final coding worksheet. Most of the appendices do not have information on the countermovement actors' micro-frames and locations.

Variables in the Appendices/Dataset:

C20A_1

WOMEN'S MOVEMENT COUNTERMOVEMENT ACTORS/STRENGTH

RESEARCHER ASSESSMENTS OF THE RELATIVE STRENGTH OF THE COUNTERMOVEMENT IN THE POLICY DEBATE OR THE LIST OF COUNTERMOVEMENT ACTORS IN THE POLICY DEBATE ARE INCLUDED APPENDIX C20A_1

VAR C20_1

NUMERIC

COUNTERMOVEMENT STRENGTH

WHAT WAS THE RESEARCHER'S ASSESSMENT OF COUNTERMOVEMENT STRENGTH AGAINST THE WOMEN'S MOVEMENT POSITION(S) DURING THE POLICY DEBATE?

0. NONE
1. WEAK
2. MODERATE
3. STRONG

CONCEPT 21. WOMEN'S MOVEMENT STRENGTH—MOBILIZATION

Variables:

C21_1a. Mobilization Potential (interval) *SEE NOTE*
C21_1b. Activism (ordinal)

NOTE: There is no data reported for Concept 21_1a, Mobilization Potential, due to lack of validity and reliability in available opinion polls and surveys across all countries and periods in the study. The raw opinion poll data initially collected for this variable is available at http://libarts.wsu.edu/polisci/rngs under the "Quantitative Phase—Dataset."

Nominal definition

Women's Movement mobilization means the degree of participation of women as activists outside the state to further movement discourse and policy goals in relation to the level of support for these goals among women in the population.

1. *Mobilization potential* refers to the degree to which women have sympathy for and/or contribute to organizations supporting movement goals
2. *Women's movement goals*.—There are two types of women's movement goals: the first is general ideas about the gender relationships that are expressed by leading women's movement actors; the second are specific policy issues that are on the agenda of the movement as expressed by WMAs.
3. *Public sympathy and support*.—The public refers to women in the general population of a country during the time of a debate; Sympathy and support means the women's agreement with the general gender ideas and specific policy ideas that compose women's movement goals.
4. *Active participation* refers to the extent to which the mobilization potential which is realized through activism in mobilization structures.

Background:

This new variable allows the project to examine the effect of differences in the strength of women's movement activism in different periods on their success. The idea is that when more movement activists are involved they are likely to have a greater impact on the state across a number of issue areas. This is paired with a second concept of women's movement strength, institutionalization, (Concept 22). One question is not settled in the literature: Is the movement which has mobilized more of its supporters the most successful or can a movement be equally successful when it is highly consolidated within organizations and institutions, that is, represented by a small number of actors placed in powerful positions inside policy making arena?

The nominal and operational definitions of women's movement mobilization are based on a review of social movement and women's movement literature. (Cress and Snow 1996; Taylor 1994; McCarthy & Wolfson 1994; Buechler 1993; Diani & Eyerman 1992; Morris & Mueller 1992; Kuumba 2001; Meyer, Whittier & Robnett; Ferree & Hess 2000; Weldon 2003; Rosenfeld & Ward 1996; Klandermans 1993). Scholars agree that social movements are difficult phenomena to pin down empirically in one country let alone comparatively. And, as Klandermans asserts, comparative study requires researchers to develop standards of comparison, that is, a set of common criteria that will produce similar forms of information in

different countries and at different periods of time. Given this challenge, RNGS has already developed conceptual tools for defining (1) women's movement discourse and (2) forms—what we call women's movement actors--through which people feminist women's movement discourse in public life. In defining mobilization, we add a third component of the movement, which involves the degree of women's political participation or activism in these forms during a period of time. Mobilization is a form of activism that takes place outside the state and distinguishes it from consolidation which refers to activism inside policy subsystems and state institutions (see Concept 22).

The goal was to develop a set of indicators of women's movement mobilization which can be used to compare activism cross-nationally and at different time periods. It is useful to distinguish between *mobilization potential*; *mobilization structures;* and *active participation*. *Mobilization potential* refers to the degree to which women have sympathy for and/or contribute to organizations supporting movement goals. (Kriesi in Diani & Eyerman) or as Kandermans (1993) asserts--the proportion of individual members of a society willing to support the movement. *Mobilization structures* are means—formal and informal structures--by which individuals join with others to take steps to further the goals of the movement. *Active participation* refers to the extent to which the mobilization potential which is realized through activism in mobilization structures.

Questions:

1. As indicated by opinion polls: what is the sympathy and support for women's movement goals among women in proportion to the total female population? *Unfortunately, information on support among women for movement goals is not available across all the countries and periods of the study.*
2. What is the activism of women through the following major mobilization structures?
    a. informal networks
    b. protests
    c. local movement communities and cultural centers
    d. formation of new organizations
    e. policy campaigns

Operational Definition for Variable 1--Mobilization Potential

NOTE: Although we were unable to find data to reliably measure mobilization potential we include the operational definition here for researchers who may be more successful in designing studies to measure mobilization potential cross nationally and over time.

1. Periodization: Take all debates in the country and sort according to dates; determine 2-4 periods between 1966 and 2004 which cover all debates.
2. For each country/period, develop a list of general and specific women's movement policy ideas. For the standard of *general* goals, use any one of the following:
    - The opinion that there is something wrong with the current status of women or groups of women because they are, for example, poor, powerless, underpaid, mistreated, harassed or exploited. Thus, the means and goals are justified because they will *advance the status of women and help them overcome their condition*.
    - The ideas seek to *achieve justice and equality* for women and men. Thus, rhetoric about gender equality and gender equity becomes an indicator of women's movement general goals.

- Ideas that include challenges to the mechanisms that maintain inequalities between women and men.

3. For each country/period, researchers will assemble results from public opinion surveys of women conducted in the country either by national or international polling agencies that show all the questions the may reflect support/sympathy for any of the women's movement goals as defined in 2 above.
4. Researchers will assess the validity of the survey results as a reflection of opinion about these general and policy ideas and select those results that are most representative of the public sympathy and support for movement goals.
NOTE: Researchers obtained these survey results but the assessment of their validity and reliability led to the decision not to proceed further in operationalization.
5. If more than one question is selected covering the country/period, the average of the responses will be computed. The result will be recorded in the dataset as "mobilization potential."

List of surveys consulted (for survey results on selected questions for each country and period see RNGS codebook website):

INTERNATIONAL:
Eurobarometer
Comparative Elections Survey
European Values Survey
International Social Survey Program
NATIONAL:
USA –National Elections Survey
British Elections Survey
British Social Attitudes
France – SOFRES, IFOP
Netherlands – National Elections Survey NKO
Sweden Swedish Elections Survey

Operational Definition for Variable 2--Activism
Develop scale for degree of WMA activism from one to ten based on the range of results produced from the women's movement actor worksheets. The scale values are a composite of data on the five mobilization structures; thus there may be variation in the data for each structure for cases with the same scale value. The procedure involved using the following steps:

1. Summarize the information from the worksheets through each major mobilization structure for each country/period (hereafter called cases);
2. Using summary sheets for each case that do not identify the country or period, coders separately sort the cases as high, medium and low;
3. Coders compare classifications and agree on solutions to any differences, then sort the cases from 1 to 10, forming the WMA activism scale (see below);
4. To assess inter-case reliability, coders compare the supporting data for cases with similar values (all the 1's, 2's, etc);

CONCEPT 21. WOMEN'S MOVEMENT ACTOR STRENGTH – MOBILIZATION

Variable Construction Notes:

1. In the draft codebook we had mobilization and institutionalization as two dimensions of a new concept: Women's Movement STRENGTH. Consultants recommended we separate these dimensions and rely less on researchers' individual judgment and seek more detailed information that we could count in the code process.
2. Researchers may have to gather new data; we can rely on estimates from secondary scholarly research on movements in various countries.
3. The worksheet needs to give the descriptive information on the debates; the coders will make the conclusions using the operational definitions and the measurements.
4. At Turin, country directors were skeptical about getting this information. On the advice of Laurel we agreed to triangulate sources of information to attempt to get adequate information to measure this concept. We will continue to seek information on the stage concept as well. Laurel will provide us with an analysis of cross-national measures and databases on women's movements for our final assessment of how to measure this variable at Turin.
5. It was agreed at Leiden 2003 that the original plan to measure mobilization would fail because the information does not exist in secondary sources in many countries. It was agreed to try the scale approach based on narratives from the country teams describing as much information as they can get about different types of mobilization during each period.
6. Efforts to complete worksheets have led us to drop the organizational membership component in measuring mobilization potential. (12/03)
7. In Moscow 12/05, the coders reviewed the coverage of available survey data with gender equality questions. None of the surveys covered all the periods with the same question. Therefore we agreed to select question that were most comparable and to average the opinions results across the questions.
8. In Moscow 12/05, the coders decided not to use the Eurobarometer, or any other sources of survey data on comparable questions, for missing opinion data in the early periods (1970s) because the questions produced much higher support for WM goals than WVS questions. In those cases where the period ended within 2-3 years of the 1981 surveys we used the 1981 data.
9. In Moscow, 12/05, The Activism Scale was developed from the completed worksheets for 23 of the Country/periods. It shows the patterns of activity in mobilization structures from these cases *after* they were sorted into the categories and given scores. Then, a questionnaire was developed with representative array of patterns (5 for each structure) and sent to the other researchers who had not yet completed the more extensive worksheet. They were able to select the type of activity that most represented each period for their country. On the basis of these responses, coders assign a score for the total pattern of activity that most closely resembles the cases already classified.
10. In Turin, 2007, researchers decided not to use the WVS surveys to measure mobilization potential for three reasons: 1) there were too many missing cases due to lack of coverage in all countries in all periods; 2) there were problems of validity with the questions available in all surveys because they did not really measure support for women's movement goals; 3) there are problems with the reliability of the WVS surveys in many countries, particularly when comparing the results of questions on women's movement

related issue questions in the WVS to national level surveys on similar types of questions; WVS showed 10-30% higher support than the national level surveys.

11. Subsequent to the Turin meeting, we revised operationalization of C 21_A *movement potential* based on a reconceptualization of the relation between the fundamental characteristics of the concept, especially *sympathy for women's movement goals* and its empirical indicators.
12. After repeated efforts to obtain survey data that would adequately represent sympathy for women's movement goals across all countries and periods, we decided not to proceed further and to report the decision and the reasons for it in the RNGS codebook under Concept 21.

Variables in Dataset:

C21-1A
NUMERIC
WMA MOBILIZATION-MOBILIZATION POTENTIAL
DURING THE PERIOD OF THE DEBATE, WHAT IS THE PROPORTION OF WOMEN SUPPORTING WOMEN'S MOVEMENT GOALS?
1-100% ***NO DATA ENTERED***

C21-1B
NUMERIC
WMA MOBILIZATION-ACTIVISM
DURING THE PERIOD OF THE DEBATE, WHERE DID THE WOMEN'S MOVEMENT FALL ON THE ACTIVISM SCALE?
1-10

CONCEPT 22. WMA STRENGTH – INSTITUTIONALIZATION

Variable

C22_1. Degree of WMA Institutionalization (ordinal)

Nominal Definition

This concept allows the project to examine the effect of differences in the patterns of political activity by women's movements as a whole in different periods on their success. The idea is that when the movement activists act through strong movement organizations and from within non-movement organizations, especially government institutions, they are likely to have a greater impact on the state across a number of issue areas. There are a variety of types of actors: individuals, informal organizations, and formal organizations. These in turn operate in different places such as legislatures, formal lobbies, bureaucracies and parties. One question is not settled in the literature: Is the movement which has mobilized the largest number of participants the most successful or can a movement be equally successful when it is institutionalized through representation in formal organizations and institutions, for example represented by a small number of actors placed in powerful positions inside policy making arena?

Women's movement actors, like social movements actors, may adopt a strategy of working within a variety of other state institutions. Based on Ferree and Mueller (2002), only actors inside institutions with links to women's movement formal or informal organizations, not independent individuals who happen to use feminist rhetoric, would be considered women's movement actors. Ferree and Mueller point out: "When social movements move into institutions, they move not as individuals trying to 'make it' as tokens for the success of their groups, but as organized collective entities that are trying to change the institution's goals, decision–making or modes of operation, whether or not they end up successful, expelled or co-opted." (22) When existing women's organizations adopt WM ideas in their work, they also can be included as a form of institutionalization.

Women's movement institutionalization means degree of presence of movement activists representing ideas and agendas of the collective women's movement inside social, political, and authoritative institutions for example, legislatures, well-established lobby coalitions, bureaucratic and legislative commissions, political parties, unions, interest groups, academia, media, and formal campaigns. It is expected that a case will not be high on both institutionalization (22) and mobilization (21) although with separate coding we can see if such cases exist.

Question

What is the highest level WM actor institutionalization during the period when policy debate occurred?

Operational Definition

1. Use the periodization for each country (see Appendix 1) List the degree of presence of individuals and organizations with links to movement mobilization structures (see Concept 21) inside the following formal institutions for each period.
    - legislatures
    - bureaucracies
    - political parties
    - unions

- interest groups and lobbies
- academia.

2. Country teams will describe the degree of presence in these various institutions based on secondary sources. These are not expected to be numerical figures, except for legislatures. For each of the above institutions, there will be a paragraph describing available information for the period.
3. Determine degree of presence in terms of a scale from 1-10 based on the range across the countries and periods. To develop this scale the coders took the following steps:
    - For each institution, coders use information from WMA worksheets to develop rankings of WMA presence – Low, Medium and High (see below).
    - Each case (country/period) received a score: Low = 1; Medium = 2; High = 3. The scores for all institutions were summed to achieve a "presence" score ranging from 6 to 18. These scores were decimalized and placed from 1-10 for coding.

INSTITUTIONALIZATION MEASURES:

Legislatures

LOW:	0-4% WMA in national parliament
MEDIUM	7-11%
HIGH	15 and above

Bureaucracies/Higher Civil Service

LOW	None, few, or up to 4 persons
MEDIUM	Some – 6-13 persons; or 3%-5%
HIGH	15% – 40%

Political Parties

LOW	Few connections; informal connections; declining connections; a few leaders
MEDIUM:	Sections have some connections; feminists work through parties to gain goals;
HIGH	Long established women's sections with close ties to WMAs AND WMAs work through parties to successfully achieve goals

Trade Unions

LOW	No or very few WMA entering unions; no policy or organizational shifts in the trade union and no presence of unions at WM events outside of the group.
MEDIUM	One or several WMAs enter, with some success policy and organizational success and presence at women's movement event; indicates a first incursion of WMAs with some results, usually setting-up real changes down the road, but not any significant and systematic presence in leadership positions.
HIGH	Significant numbers of WMAs enter and have real political clout on policies and through women's sections; women in leadership positions in the unions; rank and file women get involved with women's strikes; unions are participating in women's events.

Interest Groups and Lobbies

LOW	No interest groups or several minor interest groups, lobbies or campaigns actively working with the state.
MEDIUM	5-10 active interest groups, lobbies or campaigns actively working with the state OR 1 or 2 groups/campaigns that address a broad sweep of issues- with significant activity in policy formation: agenda setting, problem definition, formulation, implementation.
HIGH	10 or more single issues groups and over 5 broad based groups with regular and systematic activities on policy formation.

Academia

LOW	None or isolated classes at a few universities- none or very few women's sections in academic groups.
MEDIUM	Offering of classes on a regular basis at most universities, individual women's studies faculty appointments, research positions on gender, some women's sections in academic associations.
HIGH	Presence of women's studies programs/curricula at many universities; permanent research programs set-up; women's studies departments/units, women's sections of academic groups and women's studies associations.

Variable Construction Notes

1. In the draft codebook we had mobilization and institutionalization as two dimensions of a new concept: Women's Movement STRENGTH. Consultants recommended we separate these dimensions and rely less on researchers' individual judgment and seek more detailed information that we could count in the code process.
2. Researchers may have to gather new data; we can rely on estimates from secondary scholarly research on movements in various countries.
3. The last request for proportion of an institution that is composed of women's movement actors is difficult perhaps but it would give us a more valid measure of cross debate and cross national differences in institutionalization.
4. The worksheet needs to give the descriptive information on the debates; the coders will make the conclusions using the operational definitions and the measurements.
5. Along with Mobilization and Priority concepts, this entails a lot of work on the movement as a whole during the debates. RNGS will discuss whether it is possible from published and other sources to find this data. Alternative would be to go with author's judgment and evidence.
6. At Turin, country directors were skeptical about getting this information. On the advice of Laurel we agreed to triangulate sources of information to attempt to get adequate information to measure this concept. We will continue to seek information on the stage concept as well.
7. At Leiden 2003, the country directors agreed to provide descriptive information on women's movement actor presence in each institution based on secondary sources for each period. These will be scaled by the coders.
8. In Moscow 2005, coders reviewed information on WMA worksheets and agreed that the definitions of "media" did not obtain information about WMA presence in mainstream

institutionalized media. This category was eliminated from the institutionalization measure.

9. In Moscow 2005, coders agreed to change the data set to provide a single measure of "degree of WMA presence" in mainstream institutions instead of measures for each institution. This will coincide with the single measure for WMA activism. The following variables were eliminated: C22_1A-C22_1K, plus C22_2, C22_3A through C22_3K. Only variable for institutionalization is C22_1 Women's Movement Actor Strength-Institutionalization, a measure from 1-10.

Variables in Dataset

C22_1

NUMERIC

WMA INSTITUTIONALIZATION

DURING THE DEBATE, WHAT WAS THE PRESENCE OF WOMEN'S MOVEMENT ACTORS IN LEGISLATURES, BUREAUCRACIES, POLITICAL PARTIES, TRADE UNIONS, LOBBIES AND ACADEMIA USING THE FOLLOWING SCALE?

1-10

CONCEPT 23. PE – SUB-SYSTEM STRUCTURE

Variables in the Appendices/Dataset:

C23A_1. Sub-system actors (text appendices)
C23_1. Presence of rules (nominal)
C23_2. Closed to occasional participants (nominal)
C23_3. Chain of command (nominal)
C23_4. Sub-system Structure (ordinal)

Nominal Definition

The Policy Environment is second cluster of independent variables in the RNGS model. The Policy Environment (PE) is adapted from the more general, and oft-criticized (e.g., Gamson and Meyer 1996), system-wide concept of Political Opportunity Structure. PE focuses attention on the possibilities for social movement influence in a particular policy area in a particular period of time. There are four aspects of the Policy Environment which may affect the state's response to the women's movement: *policy sub-system structure; issue frame fit* (C24)*; governing majority* (C25)*;* and *strength of countermovement* (C20_1). The constellation of state and societal actors involved with the formation of state action in a given issue area is the policy sub-system. The policy sub-system houses the decision-making activities in a particular policy area during a particular policy cycle. First identified by Ernest F. Griffith in 1939, policy sub-systems exist around functional areas of policy and consist of "whirlpools of special social interests and problems" (cited in Anderson 1994, 74). There are two significant aspects of the policy sub-system that can account for variations in movement success and WPA effectiveness: (1) structure of the sub-system and (2) fit of the dominant conceptual framework used by sub-system actors with women's movement and/or WPA goals.

Building from the concept of iron triangles and taking Heclo's (1978) notion of issue networks into account, Anderson (1994, 75) suggests that different types of policy sub-systems can be arranged along a continuum based on levels of organization and openness, what this study refers to as policy sub-system structure. At one end of the continuum are found more closed and structured policy sub-systems like iron triangles, "…with their limited participation, resistance to external influences and preoccupation with material interest" (Ibid). Here there is usually a single community of policy actors. At the opposite end of the spectrum policy sub-systems would take on the shape of an issue network "with its amorphousness, wide and changing participation, issue experts, unclearness about who is in control" (Ibid). Based on its organization, participation and power balance, therefore, a sub-system may be open (a network), moderately closed (a community), and closed (an institution). From this taxonomy, openness of policy sub-system structure is based on the pattern formed by three different elements: presence of common rules; extent to which occasional participants can get access to the sub-system; and chain of command.

Questions

Which policy actors are involved with the policy debate issue at the time of the debate? Is there a set of common rules that govern this constellation of actors? Is the sub-system closed to occasional participants? Is there an established chain of command that typically dictates the interactions of the actors involved with this policy debate? From these three components, what is the overall structure of the policy sub-system at the time of the debate?

CONCEPT 23. PE – SUB-SYSTEM STRUCTURE

Operational Definition

1. List the state and non state actors that are involved with the policy issue in the policy debate.
2. Is there a set of common rules or conventions that govern interactions among the actors? (yes/no)
3. Is the policy sub-system closed to occasional participants? (yes/no)
4. Is there a chain of command that dictates the interactions between the policy actors? (yes/no)
5. Calculate the overall structure from the three measures above and classify the structure of the sub-system with the following indicators:
   - Closed: Yes on all three
   - Moderately Closed: Yes on 2
   - Moderately Open: Yes on 1
   - Open: No on all three

Variable Construction Notes

1. The three-way measure of structure was based on our original operational definition of PE structure for the qualitative part of the study. Here we are able to base the conclusions about structure on more reliable measures.
2. The information supplied by the researchers about each policy sub-system will be important for coding this concept and also for other researchers using the dataset.

Variables in the Appendices/Dataset:

C23A_1

LIST OF POLICY ACTORS IN SUB-SYSTEM

ALL POLICY ACTORS INVOLVED WITH THE POLICY DEBATE ARE LISTED IN APPENDIX C23A_1.

VAR C23_1

NUMERIC

PRESENCE OF RULES

DURING THE DEBATE, WAS THERE A COMMON SET OF RULES THAT GOVERNED THE CONSTELLATION OF ACTORS IDENTIFIED AS THE POLICY SUB-SYSTEM?

0. NO
1. YES

VAR C23_2

NUMERIC

OCCASIONAL PARTICIPANTS

DURING THE DEBATE, WAS THE CONSTELLATION, (IDENTIFIED AS THE POLICY SUB-SYSTEM) CLOSED TO OCCASIONAL PARTICIPANTS.

0. NO
1. YES

VAR C23_3

NUMERIC

CHAIN OF COMMAND

DURING THE DEBATE, WAS THERE A CHAIN OF COMMAND THAT TYPICALLY DICTATED THE INTERACTION OF THE CONSTELLATION OF ACTORS?

0. NO
1. YES

VAR C23_4

NUMERIC

SUB-SYSTEM STRUCTURE

BASED ON THE SUB-SYSTEM RULES, CHAIN OF COMMAND, AND ACTOR STABILITY, TO WHAT DEGREE WAS THE OVERALL STRUCTURE OF THAT SUB-SYSTEM DURING THE DEBATE OPEN OR CLOSED?

0. OPEN
1. MODERATELY OPEN
2. MODERATELY CLOSED
3. CLOSED

CONCEPT 24. PE – ISSUE FRAME FIT

Variables in the Appendices/Dataset:

C24_1. Sub-system issue frame fit (ordinal)
C25_2. Sub-system issue frame mixed fit (nominal)

Nominal Definition

Issue frame fit is the compatibility of the micro-frame of the women's movement actors with the issue frame that initially shapes the debate in the policy sub-system.

Issue frame fit is based on the concept of "goodness of fit" developed by Risse, Cowles and Caporaso (2001) in their study of the Europeanization of national policy. In this study, national level policies were examined in terms of the degree to which national-level policies "fit" EU policies. The extent of the "goodness of fit" determines, in turn, the "adaptational pressures" placed on member states to change their policies (pp 6-7).

Issue frames can be welcoming to the women's movement activists or hostile. Here, it is important to determine to what degree the issue frame forwarded in each debate actually fits the goals of the women's movements actors presented in the debate on that particular issue and, where relevant, the WPAs. Research shows that the support of non feminist decision makers, sometimes "male allies" (Eisenstein 1996), for women's movement demands is an important factor in policy success (e.g. Mazur 2002). At the same time, movement activists will find it extremely difficult to influence debate frames when the issue frame is opposed to the movement's views. Occasionally, especially when a new policy problem emerges, the actors will not agree on a common set of norms and perspectives. In those cases, the policy debate itself may be not only about a policy proposal but over the proper frame in which to deal with it. Whatever frame is found on a given debate, researchers should compare it to the women's movement actors' micro-frames on the policy to determine the issue frame fit.

Other terms:

An issue frame is the definition of meaning of a specific policy area, e.g., employment, health, environment, etc. used by actors in the policy sub-system in a given policy debate.

Policy sub-system is the constellation of state and societal actors involved with the formation of state action in a given issue area.

A micro-frame is the position specific actors seek to insert into the issue frame to change the definition of the issue and policy content. It also forms the core identity of the group in question.

Women's Movement Actors are the individuals, informal organizations and formal organizations who are inspired by movement thinkers to act to advance what they see as women's interests.

Question

Does (do) the women's movement actors' micro-frame(s) fit with the issue frame(s) that initially shapes the policy debate in the policy sub-system? If not, what are the types of differences?

Operational Definition

1. Take the issue frame at the beginning of the debate in the policy sub-system already recorded in C. 3 Gendering Issue frame, v. 1

2. Take the micro-frame of each WMA in the debate from C. 5 WPA/WM fit v. 1.
3. Assess the degree to which any aspect of issue frame fits the micro-frame of **any** of the WMAs with the following indicators:
   - *Matching*: Issue frame that initially shapes the debate is expressed in terms that are similar to movement goals as expressed by activists. If the issue frame 2-sided, if WMA micro-frame is similar to one side of the debate, it may be considered matching.
   - *Compatible*: Issue frame that initially shapes the debate is expressed in terms that are not similar but not in direct opposition to movement goals as expressed by activists.
   - *Threatening*: Issue frame that initially shapes the debate is expressed in terms that are in conflict with (oppose) movement goals the debate as expressed by activists.
   - *Mixed*: Issue frame that initially shapes the debate is expressed in terms that are compatible with goals of some women's movement actors but challenge or threaten goals of other women' s movement actors.

Variable Construction Notes

1. Diane suggested we add a fourth category to distinguish between issue frames that may ignore WMAs micro-frames from those that are indirect conflict.
2. We may need to develop a different strategy in cases where the WMAs in the debate have clashing micro-frames.
3. Is the scale appropriate? Especially placing "Threatening" as 0?
4. After Turin we added the "mixed" category to take care of situation where WMAs have clashing micro-frames in the debate.

Variables in the Appendices/Dataset:

VAR C24_1
NUMERIC
ISSUE FRAME FIT
TO WHAT DEGREE DID THE WOMEN'S MOVEMENT ACTORS MICRO-FRAME(S) FIT WITH THE ISSUE FRAME(S) THAT INITIALLY SHAPED THE POLICY DEBATE IN THE POLICY SUB-SYSTEM?

0. THREATENING
1. COMPATIBLE
2. MATCHING
999. NOT APPLICABLE

VAR C24_2
NUMERIC
MIXED FIT
WAS THE ISSUE FRAME(S) THAT INITIALLY SHAPED THE POLICY DEBATE IN THE POLICY SUB-SYSTEM MIXED – IN THAT IT WAS COMPATIBLE WITH SOME GOALS OF SOME WOMEN'S MOVEMENT ACTORS BUT CHALLENGING OR THREATENING TO THE GOALS OF OTHER WOMEN'S MOVEMENT ACTORS?

0. NO
1. YES

CONCEPT 25. PE – GOVERNING MAJORITY

Variables in the Appendices/Dataset:

C25A_1. List of parties in the governing majority (text appendices)
C25_1. Location of governing majority on the left-right spectrum (nominal)

Nominal Definition

Along with the policy sub-system, the governing majority (GM) when the policy debate is under consideration has the potential to affect the policy environment. Many scholars hypothesize that women's movements are more effective when parties of the Left are in power (e.g., Bashevkin 1998; Beckwith 1985). Others argue that Christian Democrat parties can be important obstacles to women-friendly reform (O'Connor, Orloff and Shaver 1999). This concept is designed to test whether party in power makes a difference in WM/WPA successes. Governing majority indicates the political parties/ party in power at the time of the debate. The governing majority may be composed of one party or a coalition; in presidential and semi-presidential systems, the governing majority may reflect different party majorities in the legislative and executive institution. This concept identifies the partisan composition of the governing majority and assesses whether it is left or right-wing within the context of the ideological spectrum of each country.

Questions

What is the partisan composition of the governing majority at the time of the debate? What is the location of GM on the left-right continuum for that country?

Operational Definition

1. List the political parties/ party in the governing majority.
2. Situate the governing majority on a left-right continuum for each country at the time of the debate along the following range, defined in terms of the spectrum for that country.
   - Left
   - Center
   - Right
3. Debates that that place inside political parties are coded Not Applicable on this measure.

Variable Construction Notes

1. Formerly Left-wing Party in Power, we have shifted to a concept that examines the variations in the governing majority.
2. Anne Shola Orloff at our APSA roundtable drew our attention to the blocking role of Christian Democrat parties, particularly in abortion, and so we are proposing a new measure that allows us to identify the parties (y) in the governing majority and classify in terms of a left-right continuum, if applicable.
3. The consultants were concerned about developing a definition of left-wing control that would travel. In particular, the issue was the Democratic Party in the USA can be considered a party of the left in comparison to left-wing parties in Europe. One consultant suggested that we develop a measure that defines the left in terms of its connections to trade unions.

4. The measure we develop here eschews setting up universal definitions of any right-left continuum. Instead researchers are asked to describe the ideological continuum for the major political parties.
5. Although the information on the governing majority does not have to be supplied by the researcher, it would be important that an assessment of the national left-right continuum be supplied.
6. We may eventually opt to examine only the dominant party in power rather than attempting to classify the parties along a left-right continuum.
7. We need to decide how to handle cases where there is a majority change in the middle of the debate, are there any?
8. At first, the researchers wanted to include detailed information about presidential systems in a different category from parliamentary systems. However, the only cases that fell in the presidential cases were the 13 US debates. We decided to focus on the composition of governing majorities taking all the governing institutions together and have one measure.

Variables in the Appendices/Dataset:

C25A_1

LIST OF PARTIES IF SINGLE GOVERNING MAJORITY

POLITICAL PARTY OR PARTIES IN THE GOVERNING MAJORITY ARE DEFINED IN APPENDIX C25A_1.

VAR C25_1

NUMERIC

GOVERNING MAJORITY ON LEFT-RIGHT SPECTRUM

AT THE TIME OF THE DEBATE, WHERE WAS THE GOVERNING MAJORITY ON A LEFT-RIGHT CONTINUUM?

0. RIGHT
1. CENTER
2. LEFT
999. NOT APPLICABLE

CONCEPT 26. EXTRA-NATIONAL LINKAGES

Variables in the Appendices/Dataset:

C26A_1. List of TANs by Name (text appendices)
C26_1. WM Participation in Transnational Advocacy Network (nominal)
C26_2. CEDAW Membership (nominal)
C26A_3. CEDAW requirements (text appendices)
C26_4. CEDAW/WM goals (nominal)
C27_5. CEDAW Exceptions (nominal)
C28_6. Shadow reports (*eliminated from data set*)
C28_7. EU Membership (nominal)
C28_8. National Compliance with EU directive (nominal)
C28_9. National Compliance with EU recommendations (nominal)
C28_10. National Compliance with EU regulations (nominal)
C28_11. National Compliance with EU soft law (nominal)
C28_12. EU/WM goals (nominal)
C28_13. ECJ Out of compliance order in effect (nominal)

Nominal Definition

In the span of the time for this data set – 1970-2000 – there has been an increase in the communication between extra-national entities and policy sub-systems on domestic policy debates. Extra-national linkages are present when a nation-state is subject to policy directives/recommendations on the debate issue from governmental organizations that lie outside of nation-state boundaries and/or when the women's movement activists participate in transnational advocacy networks.

Many studies of state feminism and women's policy show that extra-national linkages have an important impact on state action, often promoting feminist policy responses (e.g., Liebert 2002; McBride Stetson and Mazur 1995; Meyer and Prügl 1999). Certainly the case of gender equality policy in the European Union has been the clearest success story of an extra-national policy impetus making a difference in the development of women's policy and machineries at the national level, at least in some of the member countries. This concept pertains to the hypothesis that influences beyond the state matter in the development of state feminism.

A national government may be subject to directives or recommendations from extra-national organizations in several ways that may vary over time, cross nationally, and across issue areas. The degree to which these international policy orders are binding, of course, depends on the relative authority of the international organization. The United Nations Convention for Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) sets standards for its signatories. Although most countries in the data set are now members, they have joined at different times. In addition, there are "exceptions" to CEDAW provisions negotiated by political leaders that vary by country. The other area of international policy initiative is from the European Union that exerts much greater authority on member nation-states given its supra-national nature. Most countries in the study today are members, but they joined at different times. In addition, directives, regulations and recommendations and their content vary over time. Transnational policy networks include "those relevant actors working internationally on an issue, who are bound together by shared values, a common discourse, and dense exchanges of information and services." (Risse & Sikkuk 1999, 18). Tarrow (2002) emphasizes "the links

among non-state actors across national boundaries." According to this definition they are the international counterparts to the women's movement actors in national policy arenas. Information on such international connections may be used to examine longitudinal and cross-policy patterns of influence. Participation in these networks assumes some socialization of strategies and ideas from the transnational group to the national activists.

Questions

During the policy debate, do women's movement actors participate in transnational advocacy networks promoting women's interests? Is the country a signatory of the CEDAW treaty? What does the CEDAW require in the issue area and does it coincide with women's movement demands? Are there exceptions the country has negotiated? Is the country subject to EU directives, recommendations and/or regulations pertaining to the issue being debated? Is national policy in line with EU directives, recommendations and/or regulations at the time of the debate? Does the directive coincide with women's movement demands/micro-frames? Is the country under an "out of compliance" order from the European Court of Justice in the issue being debate?

Operationalization

1. Identify transnational advocacy networks (TAN) on the issue and if women's movement actors are involved.
2. Is country a member of CEDAW? CEDAW requirements on the issue? Do they coincide with women's movement micro-frames? Are there negotiated exceptions to these requirements?
3. Is country a member of EU? What are EU directives, recommendations or regulations on the issue? To what degree is national policy in line with EU directives, recommendations or regulations in that area?
4. Do EU directives, regulation, recommendation (and any other soft law) coincide with WM micro-frames?
5. Is there an ECJ non-compliance order in effect in the issue area during the debate?

Variable Construction Notes

1. Some of the information needed to code these variables will be on worksheets for other concepts. Research assistant can obtain CEDAW and EU information from UN and EU sources.
2. Consultants and roundtable discussants at APSA 2002 all advised looking at international dimensions in the state feminism model. Such information should also be of use to other researchers, particularly given the rising importance of international influences and transnational feminism on women's policy development at the national level.
3. Turin directors suggested more information on the extra national influences be tried in the data set.
4. We eliminated the CEDAW shadow reports to the UN because we are unable to obtain any information about them.

Variables in the Appendices/Dataset:

C26A_1

LIST OF TRANSATIONAL ADVOCACY NETWORKS

CONCEPT 26. EXTRA-NATIONAL LINKAGES

THE LIST OF TRANSNATIONAL ADVOCACY NETWORKS (TANS) ACTIVE DURING THE DEBATE IS INCLUDED IN APPENDIX C26A_1.

VAR C26_1
NUMERIC
WMA PARTICIPATION IN TAN
DURING THE POLICY DEBATE, DID WOMEN'S MOVEMENT ACTORS PARTICIPATE IN TRANSNATIONAL ADVOCACY NETWORKS PROMOTING WOMEN'S INTERESTS?
0. NO
1. YES

VAR C26_2
NUMERIC
CEDAW MEMBERSHIP
DID THE POLICY DEBATE OCCUR IN A COUNTRY WHERE THE UNITED NATION'S CONVENTION AGAINST DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN WAS RATIFIED AT THE TIME OF THE DEBATE?
0. NO
1. YES

26A_3
CEDAW REQUIREMENTS ON POLICY ISSUE
FOR THE REQUIREMENTS IN CEDAW PERTAINING TO THE POLICY DEBATE ISSUE SEE APPENDIX 26A_3.

VAR C26_4
NUMERIC
CEDAW/WMA GOALS
DID THE CEDAW REQUIREMENTS COINCIDE WITH THE WOMEN'S MOVEMENT GOALS?
0. NO
1. YES
999. NOT APPLICABLE

VAR C26_5
NUMERIC
CEDAW EXCEPTIONS
AT THE TIME OF THE DEBATE, DID THE COUNTRY HAVE ANY NEGOTIATED EXCEPTIONS TO THE REQUIREMENTS WITH THE CEDAW GOALS?
0. NO
1. YES
999. NOT APPLICABLE

VAR C26_7
NUMERIC
EU MEMBERSHIP

CONCEPT 26. EXTRA-NATIONAL LINKAGES

DID THE POLICY DEBATE OCCUR IN A COUNTRY THAT WAS A MEMBER OF THE EUROPEAN UNION AT THE TIME OF THE DEBATE?

0. NO
1. YES

VAR C26_8
NUMERIC
COMPLIANCE WITH EU DIRECTIVES
WAS NATIONAL POLICY IN LINE WITH EUROPEAN UNION DIRECTIVES AT THE TIME OF THE DEBATE?

0. NO
1. YES
999. NOT APPLICABLE

VAR C26_9
NUMERIC
COMPLIANCE WITH EU RECOMMENDATIONS
WAS NATIONAL POLICY IN LINE WITH EUROPEAN UNION RECOMMENDATIONS AT THE TIME OF THE DEBATE?

0. NO
1. YES
999. NOT APPLICABLE

VAR C26_10
NUMERIC
COMPLIANCE WITH EU REGULATIONS
WAS NATIONAL POLICY IN LINE WITH EUROPEAN UNION REGULATIONS AT THE TIME OF THE DEBATE?

0. NO
1. YES
999. NOT APPLICABLE

VAR C26_11
NUMERIC
COMPLIANCE WITH EU SOFT LAW
WAS NATIONAL POLICY IN LINE WITH EUROPEAN UNION SOFT LAW AT THE TIME OF THE DEBATE?

0. NO
1. YES
999. NOT APPLICABLE

VAR C26_12
NUMERIC
EU/WMA GOALS
DID THE EUROPEAN UNION DIRECTIVES COINCIDE WITH THE WOMEN'S MOVEMENT DEMANDS/MICRO-FRAMES?

0. NO
1. YES
999. NOT APPLICABLE

VAR C26_13
NUMERIC
ECJ COMPLIANCE ORDER
WAS THE COUNTRY UNDER AN "OUT OF COMPLIANCE" ORDER FROM THE EUROPEAN COURT OF JUSTICE IN THE ISSUE BEING DEBATED?
0. NO
1. YES
999. NOT APPLICABLE

CONCEPT 27. LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT

Variable

C27_1. Level of Government (nominal)

Nominal definition

The level of government refers to the place in the constitutional structure where a debate occurs. The national level is the most sovereign level. The regional level refers to policymaking in constituent governments of federal systems. The local level pertains to municipal or city government. The purpose of this concept is to permit researchers to identify those debates that occur in other than national arenas. The project has no research questions or hypotheses set forth to test the significance of this concept.

Operational definition

The researchers describe the policy sub-system for each debate (Concept 23). This information includes the level of government.

Variable in Dataset

VAR C27_1

NUMERIC

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT

AT WHAT LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT DID THE DEBATE TAKE PLACE? (SELECT ONE)

1. NATIONAL
2. REGIONAL
3. LOCAL

CONCEPT 28 PARTY DEBATES

Variables

C28_1 Party Debate

Nominal Definition

The RNGS project description set forth guidelines for selection of debates. STEP 1 was to locate the policy sub-system. To do this, the researcher must determine which institutions in the political system make the most important decisions about this issue. For example, in approaching the issue of prostitution or job training, researchers would look across the political system to see where the major, defining decisions that regulate prostitution or provision of job training programs are made. It could be national or regional level, parliament or the cabinet, one ministry or several, state agencies or parties or social partners, or a combination. In coming to a decision about this question, researchers should cite evidence to support the conclusion, probably a scholarly source. The most important decisions can take place at a variety of different government levels and in a variety of different organizations, state and non-state. In some countries, major policy decisions were made in the political parties and trade unions.

Following this selection process, for the most part researchers focused on state institutions and arenas. However, in cases political parties were the locus of decision making. In those cases, the researchers studied debates in parties, not the state. The purpose of this concept is to allow users of the dataset to identify those debates that took place in political parties.

Operational Definition and Measurement:

Debates where the decision is taken by a political party body are "party debates."

Variable in Dataset

VAR C28_1

NUMERIC

IS THE DEBATE A PARTY DEBATE?

1. Yes
2. No

CONCEPT 29. COUNTRY-SPECIFIC FACTORS

Variables (all interval)

C29_2. Percentage of Women in Lower House of Parliament (IPU Data)
C29_3a. Labor Force Participation Rate for women (15-64)
C29_3b. Percentage of Work Force that are women
C29_4. Gender-based Pay Gap
C29_5. National Population
C29_6. Economic Prosperity/Growth
C29_7. Ratio of women in tertiary education

Nominal Definition

The general status of women refers to the combination of economic and political roles and environment in which women's movement actors seek to influence public policy. Most studies of the political status of women and women's movement examine findings in terms of the general status of women in politics and society (see for example, Norris 1987; Weldon 2002, Gornick et al. 1997).

The idea is that success of women's movements in gaining access to state power may be easier where population shows greater support for equalizing the status of women and men and where women compose a larger part of the workforce. More immediate for policy makers, a higher presence of women in elected legislative office may also ease the way for women's movement actors as well as provide allies for activist women's policy agencies. Smaller populations may facilitate movement actor organizing and access. It may be likely that those societies with greater general prosperity would also provide an environment more conducive to ready response to women's movement demands to improve women's political status. Finally, a higher percentage of women in tertiary education provides the basis for greater activism. In this study, these are contextual variables that can be used as control variables in testing hypotheses explaining patterns of women's movement actor success and women's policy agency activities.

Operational Definition and Sources

Using time frame of debate, collect data from public sources. Where possible, average the figures over the years of the debate.

SOURCES:

1. Percentage of Women in Lower House of Parliament (IPU Data)
Source: IPU. 1995. Women in Parliaments 1945-1995: A World Statistical Survey. Series: Reports and Documents No. 23. Geneva: IPU. For Years 1997-2003, IPU website.

2. Participation of Women in the Paid Work Force – (OECD Data)
Source: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.
http://www1.oecd.org/scripts/cde/members/lfsindicatorsauthenticate.asp and
http://www1.oecd.org/scripts/cde/members/lfsdataauthenticate.asp.

3. Gender-based Pay Gap (UN-Gender Development Index)
Source: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. Annex to OECD (2001), Society at a Glance OECD Social Indicators Table B4. From
http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/61/28/1875507.xls

4. National Population
Source: The World Bank Group. http://devdata.worldbank.org/genderstats/query/default.htm

5. Economic Prosperity/Growth
Source: Alan Heston, Robert Summers and Betina Aten. Penn World Table Version 6.1, Center for International Comparisons at the University of Pennsylvania (CICUP), October 2002. Data retrieved from http://pwt.econ.upenn.edu/php_site/pwt61_form.php

6. Ratio of women in tertiary education
Source: The World Bank Group. Retrieved April 2004 from http://devdata.worldbank.org/genderstats/query/default.htm

Variable Coding Notes
1. When the data set was organized, Concept 28_1 included information on public support for women's equality. However, we have been unable to find surveys which cover the periods of the debates and provide cross-national validity and reliability. Therefore these variables are not included in the data set. Scholars using the data may wish to add information from other sources not provided here.

Variables in Dataset
VAR C29_2
NUMERIC
PERCENTAGE OF WOMEN IN LOWER HOUSE OF PARLIAMENT
THE PRIMARY SOURCE FOR THIS DATA IS THE INTER-PARLIAMENTARY UNION (IPU). 1995. WOMEN IN PARLIAMENTS 1994-1995: A WORLD STATISTICAL SURVEY. SERIES: REPORTS AND DOCUMENTS NO.23. GENEVA: IPU. (FOR YEARS 1997 - 2003, DATA IS AVAILABLE VIA THE IPU WEBSITE.) WHEN THE PERCENTAGE FLUCTUATES OVER THE DEBATE PERIOD, THE AVERAGE HAS BEEN SELECTED.
0-100%

VAR C29_3A
NUMERIC
LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION RATE FOR WOMEN (15-64)
THE PERCENTAGE OF WOMEN 15 - 64 IN THE PAID LABOR FORCE. (BASED ON THE ANNUAL AVERAGE FOR THE PERIOD OF THE DEBATE).
0-100%

VAR C29_3B
NUMERIC
PERCENT OF WORK FORCE THAT ARE WOMEN
THE PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL LABOR FORCE THAT IS FEMALE (BASED ON THE ANNUAL AVERAGE FOR THE PERIOD OF THE DEBATE).
0-100%

CONCEPT 29. COUNTRY-SPECIFIC FACTORS

VAR C29_4
NUMERIC
GENDER-BASED PAY GAP
WOMEN'S MEDIAN FULL TIME EARNING AS PERCENTAGE OF MALE MEDIAN FULL TIME EARNINGS (BASED ON THE ANNUAL AVERAGE FOR THE PERIOD OF THE DEBATE).
0-100%

VAR C29_5
NUMERIC
NATIONAL POPULATION
THE NATIONAL POPULATION, BASED ON THE ANNUAL AVERAGE FOR THE PERIOD OF THE DEBATE.

VAR C29_6
NUMERIC
GDP PER CAPITA
THE GROSS DOMESTIC PRODUCT, PER CAPITA, FOR THE PERIOD OF THE DEBATE. (THIS NUMBER IS BASED ON AN ANNUAL AVERAGE).

VAR C29_7
NUMERIC
RATIO OF WOMEN IN TERTIARY EDUCATION
THE NUMBER OF WOMEN PER 100 MEN IN TERTIARY EDUCATION. (THIS NUMBER IS BASED ON AN ANNUAL AVERAGE).

CONTENTS OF TEXT APPENDICES

Text appendices for the variables listed below in a separate document attached to this dataset called TEXT APPENDICES are included in the dataset for each debate, listed in the order of the observations in the dataset. The template below shows the information included in each debate appendix, with Concept numbers indicated.

Debate ID:
Title:
Women's Policy Agency (s) – WPA or Quasi WPA (s) – QUAWPA:
Dates of coding:

C1A_1— Women's Movement Actors (WMA) Issue Definition and Policy Goals
C1A_2— WMA Issue Definition and Policy Goals That Are Feminist
C1A_5— Major Stipulations of Policy Outcome
C2A_1— WMA Form, Location, and Activities During the Debate
C2A_2— Information on Beginning of Policy Debate
C3A_1— Issue Frame at the Beginning of the Debate
C3A_2— List of Gendered Ideas in the Issue Frame at the Beginning of the Debate
C3A_3— Issue Frame at the End of the Debate
C3A_4— List of Gendered Ideas in the Issue Frame at the End of the Debate
C4A_4— Micro Frames of WPA/QUAWPA (s) by Acronym
C5A_3— WPA Feminist Micro Frames
C8A_1— WPA Formal/Informal Policy Orientation and Policy Agenda
C10A_1—Institutional Setting of WPA
C12A_1—WPA Leadership
C13A_1—WMA Stage and Evidence
C16A_1—List of Policy Agendas of WMAs for the Period of the Debate
C20A_1—Countermovement Strength
C23A_1—List of Policy Actors in Sub-System
C25A_2—List of Parties if Single Governing Majority
C25A_3—List of Parties if Split Governing Majority: Executive
C25A_4—List of Parties if Split Governing Majority: Legislature
C26A_1—List of Trans-national Advocacy Networks by Name
C26A_3—CEDAW Provision on the Policy Issue Under Debate

IV. FREQUENCY TABLES

Frequency Tables

COUNTRY ID

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	AUSTRIA	10	7.7	7.7	7.7
	BELGIUM	7	5.4	5.4	13.1
	CANADA	10	7.7	7.7	20.8
	FINLAND	11	8.5	8.5	29.2
	FRANCE	15	11.5	11.5	40.8
	GERMANY	7	5.4	5.4	46.2
	IRELAND	6	4.6	4.6	50.8
	ITALY	12	9.2	9.2	60.0
	NETHERLANDS	10	7.7	7.7	67.7
	SPAIN	12	9.2	9.2	76.9
	SWEDEN	7	5.4	5.4	82.3
	UNITED KINGDOM	10	7.7	7.7	90.0
	UNITED STATES	13	10.0	10.0	100.0
	Total	130	100.0	100.0	

DEBATE ISSUE ID

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	ABORTION	32	24.6	24.6	24.6
	JOB TRAINING	23	17.7	17.7	42.3
	PROSTITUTION	30	23.1	23.1	65.4
	POLITICAL REPRESENTATION	33	25.4	25.4	90.8
	HOT ISSUE	12	9.2	9.2	100.0
	Total	130	100.0	100.0	

YEAR POLICY DEBATE BEGINS

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1966	2	1.5	1.5	1.5
	1967	1	.8	.8	2.3
	1969	2	1.5	1.5	3.8
	1970	3	2.3	2.3	6.2
	1971	3	2.3	2.3	8.5
	1972	3	2.3	2.3	10.8
	1974	2	1.5	1.5	12.3
	1975	2	1.5	1.5	13.8
	1976	2	1.5	1.5	15.4
	1977	3	2.3	2.3	17.7
	1978	1	.8	.8	18.5
	1979	4	3.1	3.1	21.5
	1980	2	1.5	1.5	23.1
	1981	8	6.2	6.2	29.2
	1982	1	.8	.8	30.0
	1983	4	3.1	3.1	33.1
	1984	5	3.8	3.8	36.9
	1985	5	3.8	3.8	40.8
	1986	3	2.3	2.3	43.1
	1987	3	2.3	2.3	45.4
	1988	2	1.5	1.5	46.9
	1989	7	5.4	5.4	52.3
	1990	4	3.1	3.1	55.4
	1991	9	6.9	6.9	62.3
	1992	6	4.6	4.6	66.9
	1993	6	4.6	4.6	71.5
	1994	4	3.1	3.1	74.6
	1995	5	3.8	3.8	78.5
	1996	4	3.1	3.1	81.5
	1997	10	7.7	7.7	89.2
	1998	7	5.4	5.4	94.6
	1999	3	2.3	2.3	96.9
	2000	3	2.3	2.3	99.2
	2002	1	.8	.8	100.0
	Total	130	100.0	100.0	

Frequency Tables

YEAR POLICY DEBATE ENDS

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1969	1	.8	.8	.8
	1971	1	.8	.8	1.5
	1972	2	1.5	1.5	3.1
	1973	2	1.5	1.5	4.6
	1974	1	.8	.8	5.4
	1975	4	3.1	3.1	8.5
	1976	1	.8	.8	9.2
	1977	2	1.5	1.5	10.8
	1978	4	3.1	3.1	13.8
	1979	4	3.1	3.1	16.9
	1980	1	.8	.8	17.7
	1981	4	3.1	3.1	20.8
	1982	4	3.1	3.1	23.8
	1983	3	2.3	2.3	26.2
	1984	4	3.1	3.1	29.2
	1985	7	5.4	5.4	34.6
	1986	5	3.8	3.8	38.5
	1987	3	2.3	2.3	40.8
	1988	2	1.5	1.5	42.3
	1989	3	2.3	2.3	44.6
	1990	4	3.1	3.1	47.7
	1991	3	2.3	2.3	50.0
	1992	7	5.4	5.4	55.4
	1993	8	6.2	6.2	61.5
	1994	5	3.8	3.8	65.4
	1995	3	2.3	2.3	67.7
	1996	4	3.1	3.1	70.8
	1997	6	4.6	4.6	75.4
	1998	5	3.8	3.8	79.2
	1999	10	7.7	7.7	86.9
	2000	6	4.6	4.6	91.5
	2001	3	2.3	2.3	93.8
	2002	4	3.1	3.1	96.9
	2003	3	2.3	2.3	99.2
	2004	1	.8	.8	100.0
	Total	130	100.0	100.0	

Frequency Tables

C1_4

POLICY TYPE

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NON-DECISION	34	26.2	26.2	26.2
	DECISION	96	73.8	73.8	100.0
	Total	130	100.0	100.0	

C1_6

POLICY FIT TO WMA MICRO FRAME

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	THREATENING	12	9.2	12.0	12.0
	INCOMPATIBLE	17	13.1	17.0	29.0
	COMPATIBLE	34	26.2	34.0	63.0
	MATCHING	37	28.5	37.0	100.0
	Total	100	76.9	100.0	
Missing	NOT APPLICABLE	30	23.1		
Total		130	100.0		

C1_7

POLICY CONTENT MIXED

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	100	76.9	77.5	77.5
	YES	29	22.3	22.5	100.0
	Total	129	99.2	100.0	
Missing	NOT APPLICABLE	1	.8		
Total		130	100.0		

Frequency Tables

C1_8

POLICY FIT TO WMA FEM MICRO FRAME

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	THREATENING	20	15.4	20.0	20.0
	INCOMPATIBLE	22	16.9	22.0	42.0
	COMPATIBLE	24	18.5	24.0	66.0
	MATCHING	34	26.2	34.0	100.0
	Total	100	76.9	100.0	
Missing	NOT APPLICABLE	30	23.1		
Total		130	100.0		

C2_1

WMA PARTICIPATION AT BEGINNING OF DEBATE

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	79	60.8	60.8	60.8
	YES	51	39.2	39.2	100.0
	Total	130	100.0	100.0	

C2_2

DEGREE OF WMA PRESENCE AT BEGINNING OF DEBATE

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	79	60.8	60.8	60.8
	5	20	15.4	15.4	76.2
	10	11	8.5	8.5	84.6
	15	3	2.3	2.3	86.9
	20	5	3.8	3.8	90.8
	25	3	2.3	2.3	93.1
	28	1	.8	.8	93.8
	30	3	2.3	2.3	96.2
	35	1	.8	.8	96.9
	40	3	2.3	2.3	99.2
	50	1	.8	.8	100.0
	Total	130	100.0	100.0	

C2_3

WMA PARTICIPATION AT END OF DEBATE

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	55	42.3	42.3	42.3
	YES	75	57.7	57.7	100.0
	Total	130	100.0	100.0	

C2_4

DEGREE OF WMA PRESENCE AT END OF DEBATE

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	55	42.3	42.3	42.3
	1	1	.8	.8	43.1
	5	35	26.9	26.9	70.0
	10	15	11.5	11.5	81.5
	15	4	3.1	3.1	84.6
	20	6	4.6	4.6	89.2
	25	3	2.3	2.3	91.5
	28	1	.8	.8	92.3
	30	3	2.3	2.3	94.6
	35	2	1.5	1.5	96.2
	40	3	2.3	2.3	98.5
	45	1	.8	.8	99.2
	50	1	.8	.8	100.0
	Total	130	100.0	100.0	

Frequency Tables

C2_5

WMA FEM MICRO FRAME IN SUB SYSTEM

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	12	9.2	16.9	16.9
	YES	59	45.4	83.1	100.0
	Total	71	54.6	100.0	
Missing	NOT APPLICABLE	59	45.4		
Total		130	100.0		

C3_1

ISSUE FRAME GENDERED AT BEGINNING OF DEBATE

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	77	59.2	59.2	59.2
	YES	53	40.8	40.8	100.0
	Total	130	100.0	100.0	

C3_2

ISSUE FRAME GENDERED AT END OF DEBATE

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	41	31.5	31.5	31.5
	YES	89	68.5	68.5	100.0
	Total	130	100.0	100.0	

Frequency Tables

C3_3a

FRAME EVOLVED FROM NON-GENDERED TO GENDERED

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	92	70.8	70.8	70.8
	YES	38	29.2	29.2	100.0
	Total	130	100.0	100.0	

C3_3b

FRAME EVOLVED FROM GENDERED TO MORE GENDERED

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	106	81.5	81.5	81.5
	YES	24	18.5	18.5	100.0
	Total	130	100.0	100.0	

C3_3c

FRAME GENDERED SIMILARLY THROUGHOUT DEBATE

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	111	85.4	85.4	85.4
	YES	19	14.6	14.6	100.0
	Total	130	100.0	100.0	

C3_3d

FRAME EVOLVED FROM GENDERED TO LESS GENDERED

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	123	94.6	94.6	94.6
	YES	7	5.4	5.4	100.0
	Total	130	100.0	100.0	

C3_3e

FRAME EVOLVED FROM GENDERED TO NON-GENDERED

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	127	97.7	97.7	97.7
	YES	3	2.3	2.3	100.0
	Total	130	100.0	100.0	

Frequency Tables

C3_3f

FRAME NON-GENDERED SIMILARLY THROUGHOUT DEBATE

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	91	70.0	70.0	70.0
	YES	39	30.0	30.0	100.0
	Total	130	100.0	100.0	

C3_4a

FRAME FEMINIST AT BEGINNING OF DEBATE

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	24	18.5	45.3	45.3
	YES	29	22.3	54.7	100.0
	Total	53	40.8	100.0	
Missing	NOT APPLICABLE	77	59.2		
Total		130	100.0		

C3_4b

FRAME FEMINIST AT END OF DEBATE

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	35	26.9	39.8	39.8
	YES	53	40.8	60.2	100.0
	Total	88	67.7	100.0	
Missing	NOT APPLICABLE	42	32.3		
Total		130	100.0		

C4_2

NUMBER OF WPA IN DEBATE

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NONE	47	36.2	37.9	37.9
	ONE	65	50.0	52.4	90.3
	MORE THAN ONE	12	9.2	9.7	100.0
	Total	124	95.4	100.0	
Missing	System	6	4.6		
Total		130	100.0		

Frequency Tables

C4_3

NUMBER OF QUAWPAIN DEBATE

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NONE	111	85.4	89.5	89.5
	ONE	12	9.2	9.7	99.2
	MORE THAN ONE	1	.8	.8	100.0
	Total	124	95.4	100.0	
Missing	System	6	4.6		
Total		130	100.0		

C4_5a

WPA1 ADVANCED GENDERED MICRO-FRAME

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	33	26.2	27.6	27.6
	YES	90	68.5	72.4	100.0
	Total	123	94.6	100.0	
Missing	System	7	5.4		
Total		130	100.0		

C4_6a

WPA1 ADVANCED FEMINIST MICRO-FRAME

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	38	29.2	42.2	42.2
	YES	52	40.0	57.8	100.0
	Total	90	69.2	100.0	
Missing	NOT APPLICABLE	33	25.4		
	System	7	5.4		
	Total	40	30.8		
Total		130	100.0		

Frequency Tables

C4_7a

WPA1 GENDERED THE DEBATES

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	74	56.9	60.2	60.2
	YES	49	37.7	39.8	100.0
	Total	123	94.6	100.0	
Missing	System	7	5.4		
Total		130	100.0		

C4_5b

WPA2 ADVANCED GENDERED MICRO-FRAME

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	24	18.5	64.9	64.9
	YES	13	10.0	35.1	100.0
	Total	37	28.5	100.0	
Missing	System	93	71.5		
Total		130	100.0		

C4_6b

WPA2 ADVANCED FEMINIST MICRO-FRAME

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	4	3.1	30.8	30.8
	YES	9	6.9	69.2	100.0
	Total	13	10.0	100.0	
Missing	NOT APPLICABLE	24	18.5		
	System	93	71.5		
	Total	117	90.0		
Total		130	100.0		

Frequency Tables

C4_7b

WPA2 GENDERED THE DEBATE

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	30	23.1	81.1	81.1
	YES	7	5.4	18.9	100.0
	Total	37	28.5	100.0	
Missing	System	93	71.5		
Total		130	100.0		

C4_5c

WPA3 ADVANCED GENDERED MICRO-FRAME

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	4	3.1	100.0	100.0
Missing	System	126	96.9		
Total		130	100.0		

C4_6c

WPA3 ADVANCED FEMINIST MICRO-FRAME

		Frequency	Percent
Missing	NOT APPLICABLE	4	3.1
	System	126	96.9
	Total	130	100.0

C4_7c

WPA3 GENDERED THE DEBATE

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	4	3.1	100.0	100.0
Missing	System	126	96.9		
Total		130	100.0		

Frequency Tables

C5_4

WPA/WMA MICRO-FRAME FIT

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	THREATENING	2	1.5	2.4	2.4
	INCOMPATIBLE	5	3.8	6.1	8.5
	COMPATIBLE	27	20.8	32.9	41.5
	MATCHING	48	36.9	58.5	100.0
	Total	82	63.1	100.0	
Missing	NOT APPLICABLE	41	31.5		
	System	7	5.4		
	Total	48	36.9		
Total		130	100.0		

C5_5

MIXED MICRO-FRAME FIT

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	82	63.1	91.1	91.1
	YES	8	6.2	8.9	100.0
	Total	90	69.2	100.0	
Missing	NOT APPLICABLE	33	25.4		
	System	7	5.4		
	Total	40	30.8		
Total		130	100.0		

C5_6

WPA/WMA FEMINIST MICRO-FRAME FIT

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	THREATENING	5	3.8	6.4	6.4
	NOT FEMINIST	33	25.4	42.3	48.7
	MATCHING	40	30.8	51.3	100.0
	Total	78	60.0	100.0	
Missing	NOT APPLICABLE	45	34.6		
	System	7	5.4		
	Total	52	40.0		
Total		130	100.0		

Frequency Tables

C6_1a

WPA1 TYPE

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	MINISTRY	41	31.5	33.3	33.3
	ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE	34	26.2	27.6	61.0
	COMMISSION IN EXEC BRANCH	18	13.8	14.6	75.6
	JUDICIAL BODY	1	.8	.8	76.4
	ADVISORY COUNCIL	14	10.8	11.4	87.8
	LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL	2	1.5	1.6	89.4
	QUAWPA	13	10.0	10.6	100.0
	Total	123	94.6	100.0	
Missing	System	7	5.4		
Total		130	100.0		

C6_1b

WPA2 TYPE

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	MINISTRY	10	7.7	27.0	27.0
	ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE	7	5.4	18.9	45.9
	COMMISSION IN EXEC BRANCH	12	9.2	32.4	78.4
	JUDICIAL BODY	4	3.1	10.8	89.2
	ADVISORY COUNCIL	3	2.3	8.1	97.3
	QUAWPA	1	.8	2.7	100.0
	Total	37	28.5	100.0	
Missing	System	93	71.5		
Total		130	100.0		

Frequency Tables

C6_1c

WPA3 TYPE

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	MINISTRY	1	.8	25.0	25.0
	ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE	1	.8	25.0	50.0
	COMMISSION IN EXEC BRANCH	2	1.5	50.0	100.0
	Total	4	3.1	100.0	
Missing	System	126	96.9		
Total		130	100.0		

C7_1a

WPA1 TYPE OF APPOINTMENT

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	POLITICAL	99	76.2	80.5	80.5
	BUREAUCRATIC	5	3.8	4.1	84.6
	LAY-PANEL	8	6.2	6.5	91.1
	MIXED	11	8.5	8.9	100.0
	Total	123	94.6	100.0	
Missing	System	7	5.4		
Total		130	100.0		

C7_1b

WPA2 TYPE OF APPOINTMENT

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	POLITICAL	35	26.9	94.6	94.6
	BUREAUCRATIC	1	.8	2.7	97.3
	LAY-PANEL	1	.8	2.7	100.0
	Total	37	28.5	100.0	
Missing	System	93	71.5		
Total		130	100.0		

C7_1c

WPA3 TYPE OF APPOINTMENT

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	POLITICAL	4	3.1	100.0	100.0
Missing	System	126	96.9		
Total		130	100.0		

C8_3a

WPA1 POLICY ORIENTATION

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	SINGLE ISSUE	12	9.2	9.8	9.8
	MULTI-ISSUE	93	71.5	75.6	85.4
	CROSS-SECTIONAL	18	13.8	14.6	100.0
	Total	123	94.6	100.0	
Missing	System	7	5.4		
Total		130	100.0		

C8_3b

WPA2 POLICY ORIENTATION

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	SINGLE ISSUE	7	5.4	18.9	18.9
	MULTI-ISSUE	29	22.3	78.4	97.3
	CROSS-SECTIONAL	1	.8	2.7	100.0
	Total	37	28.5	100.0	
Missing	System	93	71.5		
Total		130	100.0		

C8_3c

WPA3 POLICY ORIENTATION

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	MULTI-ISSUE	4	3.1	100.0	100.0
Missing	System	126	96.9		
Total		130	100.0		

C9_1a

DEBATE ISSUE IN WPA1'S POLICY ORIENTATION

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	4	3.1	3.3	3.3
	YES	119	91.5	96.7	100.0
	Total	123	94.6	100.0	
Missing	System	7	5.4		
Total		130	100.0		

Frequency Tables

C9_1b

DEBATE ISSUE IN WPA2'S POLICY ORIENTATION

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	5	3.8	13.5	13.5
	YES	32	24.6	86.5	100.0
	Total	37	28.5	100.0	
Missing	System	93	71.5		
Total		130	100.0		

C9_1c

DEBATE ISSUE IN WPA3'S POLICY ORIENTATION

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	YES	4	3.1	100.0	100.0
Missing	System	126	96.9		
Total		130	100.0		

C10_1a

WPA1'S PROXIMITY TO CENTER OF POWER

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	DISTANT	14	10.8	11.4	11.4
	MODERATELY CLOSE	44	33.8	35.8	47.2
	CLOSE	65	50.0	52.8	100.0
	Total	123	94.6	100.0	
Missing	System	7	5.4		
Total		130	100.0		

C10_2a

WPA1 PROPOSE POLICY

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	57	43.8	46.3	46.3
	YES	66	50.8	53.7	100.0
	Total	123	94.6	100.0	
Missing	System	7	5.4		
Total		130	100.0		

Frequency Tables

C10_3a

WPA1 REVEIW AND RECOMMEND

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	13	10.0	10.6	10.6
	YES	110	84.6	89.4	100.0
	Total	123	94.6	100.0	
Missing	System	7	5.4		
Total		130	100.0		

C10_4a

WPA1 ENFORCE LAW

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	91	70.0	74.0	74.0
	YES	32	24.6	26.0	100.0
	Total	123	94.6	100.0	
Missing	System	7	5.4		
Total		130	100.0		

C10_1b

WPA2'S PROXIMITY TO CENTER OF POWER

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	DISTANT	2	1.5	5.4	5.4
	MODERATELY CLOSE	13	10.0	35.1	40.5
	CLOSE	22	16.9	59.5	100.0
	Total	37	28.5	100.0	
Missing	System	93	71.5		
Total		130	100.0		

C10_2b

WPA2 PROPOSE POLICY

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	25	19.2	67.6	67.6
	YES	12	9.2	32.4	100.0
	Total	37	28.5	100.0	
Missing	System	93	71.5		
Total		130	100.0		

Frequency Tables

C10_3b

WPA2 REVIEW AND RECOMMEND

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	5	3.8	13.5	13.5
	YES	32	24.6	86.5	100.0
	Total	37	28.5	100.0	
Missing	System	93	71.5		
Total		130	100.0		

C10_4b

WPA2 ENFORCE LAW

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	22	16.9	59.5	59.5
	YES	15	11.5	40.5	100.0
	Total	37	28.5	100.0	
Missing	System	93	71.5		
Total		130	100.0		

C10_1c

WPA3'S PROXIMITY TO CENTER OF POWER

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	MODERATELY CLOSE	1	.8	25.0	25.0
	CLOSE	3	2.3	75.0	100.0
	Total	4	3.1	100.0	
Missing	System	126	96.9		
Total		130	100.0		

C10_2c

WPA3 PROPOSE POLICY

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	2	1.5	50.0	50.0
	YES	2	1.5	50.0	100.0
	Total	4	3.1	100.0	
Missing	System	126	96.9		
Total		130	100.0		

Frequency Tables

C10_3c

WPA3 REVIEW AND RECOMMEND

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	YES	4	3.1	100.0	100.0
Missing	System	126	96.9		
Total		130	100.0		

C10_4c

WPA3 ENFORCE LAW

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	3	2.3	75.0	75.0
	YES	1	.8	25.0	100.0
	Total	4	3.1	100.0	
Missing	System	126	96.9		
Total		130	100.0		

C11_1a

WPA1 SOURCE YEAR

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1969	2	1.5	1.6	1.6
	1971	2	1.5	1.6	3.3
	1972	2	1.5	1.6	4.9
	1973	2	1.5	1.6	6.5
	1974	1	.8	.8	7.3
	1975	5	3.8	4.1	11.4
	1976	1	.8	.8	12.2
	1977	2	1.5	1.6	13.8
	1978	1	.8	.8	14.6
	1979	2	1.5	1.6	16.3
	1980	3	2.3	2.4	18.7
	1981	5	3.8	4.1	22.8
	1983	2	1.5	1.6	24.4
	1984	14	10.8	11.4	35.8
	1985	3	2.3	2.4	38.2

	1986	2	1.5	1.6	39.8
	1987	2	1.5	1.6	41.5
	1988	2	1.5	1.6	43.1
	1990	5	3.8	4.1	47.2
	1991	9	6.9	7.3	54.5
	1992	3	2.3	2.4	56.9
	1993	12	9.2	9.8	66.7
	1994	3	2.3	2.4	69.1
	1995	7	5.4	5.7	74.8
	1996	7	5.4	5.7	80.5
	1997	4	3.1	3.3	83.7
	1998	2	1.5	1.6	85.4
	1999	2	1.5	1.6	87.0
	2000	2	1.5	1.6	88.6
	2001	3	2.3	2.4	91.1
	2002	11	8.5	8.9	100.0
	Total	123	94.6	100.0	
Missing	System	7	5.4		
Total		130	100.0		

C11_1b

WPA2 SOURCE YEAR

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1975	1	.8	2.6	2.6
	1980	1	.8	2.6	5.3
	1981	1	.8	2.6	7.9
	1982	1	.8	2.6	10.5
	1983	3	2.3	7.9	18.4
	1984	1	.8	2.6	21.1
	1985	1	.8	2.6	23.7
	1987	4	3.1	10.5	34.2
	1990	1	.8	2.6	36.8
	1991	2	1.5	5.3	42.1
	1992	4	3.1	10.5	52.6
	1993	1	.8	2.6	55.3
	1994	1	.8	2.6	57.9
	1995	2	1.5	5.3	63.2
	1996	7	5.4	18.4	81.6
	1999	3	2.3	7.9	89.5
	2002	3	2.3	7.9	97.4
	2003	1	.8	2.6	100.0
	Total	38	29.2	100.0	
Missing	System	92	70.8		
Total		130	100.0		

Frequency Tables

C11_1c

WPA3 SOURCE YEAR

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1973	1	.8	25.0	25.0
	1980	1	.8	25.0	50.0
	1996	1	.8	25.0	75.0
	1998	1	.8	25.0	100.0
	Total	4	3.1	100.0	
Missing	System	126	96.9		
Total		130	100.0		

C11_1aa

WPA 1 STAFF

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	12	9.2	9.8	9.8
	YES	111	85.4	90.2	100.0
	Total	123	94.6	100.0	
Missing	System	7	5.4		
Total		130	100.0		

C11_1ba

WPA 1 NUMBER OF FULL-TIME STAFF

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	4	3.1	3.6	3.6
	2	11	8.5	10.0	13.6
	3	11	8.5	10.0	23.6
	4	1	.8	.9	24.5
	5	10	7.7	9.1	33.6
	7	1	.8	.9	34.5
	8	5	3.8	4.5	39.1
	10	6	4.6	5.5	44.5
	11	2	1.5	1.8	46.4

Frequency Tables

	13	1	.8	.9	47.3
	19	1	.8	.9	48.2
	20	7	5.4	6.4	54.5
	24	1	.8	.9	55.5
	25	2	1.5	1.8	57.3
	26	3	2.3	2.7	60.0
	28	4	3.1	3.6	63.6
	40	1	.8	.9	64.5
	43	1	.8	.9	65.5
	45	2	1.5	1.8	67.3
	50	4	3.1	3.6	70.9
	75	4	3.1	3.6	74.5
	80	2	1.5	1.8	76.4
	103	1	.8	.9	77.3
	104	1	.8	.9	78.2
	121	2	1.5	1.8	80.0
	141	1	.8	.9	80.9
	150	7	5.4	6.4	87.3
	166	1	.8	.9	88.2
	200	7	5.4	6.4	94.5
	212	1	.8	.9	95.5
	229	4	3.1	3.6	99.1
	277	1	.8	.9	100.0
	Total	110	84.6	100.0	
Missing	MISSING	1	.8		
	NOT APPLICABLE	12	9.2		
	System	7	5.4		
	Total	20	15.4		
Total		130	100.0		

Frequency Tables

C11_2aa

WPA1 SEPARATE DIVISIONS

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	61	46.9	49.6	49.6
	YES	62	47.7	50.4	100.0
	Total	123	94.6	100.0	
Missing	System	7	5.4		
Total		130	100.0		

C11_2ba

WPA1 NUMBER OF SEPARATE DIVISIONS

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	11	8.5	17.7	17.7
	2	3	2.3	4.8	22.6
	3	11	8.5	17.7	40.3
	4	4	3.1	6.5	46.8
	5	11	8.5	17.7	64.5
	6	4	3.1	6.5	71.0
	7	13	10.0	21.0	91.9
	8	1	.8	1.6	93.5
	9	3	2.3	4.8	98.4
	10	1	.8	1.6	100.0
	Total	62	47.7	100.0	
Missing	MISSING	1	.8		
	NOT APPLICABLE	60	46.2		
	System	7	5.4		
	Total	68	52.3		
Total		130	100.0		

C11_3aa

WPA1 FIELD OFFICES

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	98	75.4	79.7	79.7
	YES	25	19.2	20.3	100.0
	Total	123	94.6	100.0	
Missing	System	7	5.4		
Total		130	100.0		

C11_3ba

WPA1 NUMBER OF FIELD OFFICES

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NONE	2	1.5	7.4	7.4
	3	2	1.5	7.4	14.8
	5	1	.8	3.7	18.5
	6	1	.8	3.7	22.2
	9	3	2.3	11.1	33.3
	10	2	1.5	7.4	40.7
	22	1	.8	3.7	44.4
	23	1	.8	3.7	48.1
	27	2	1.5	7.4	55.6
	88	5	3.8	18.5	74.1
	100	1	.8	3.7	77.8
	118	2	1.5	7.4	85.2
	119	4	3.1	14.8	100.0
	Total	27	20.8	100.0	
Missing	NOT APPLICABLE	96	73.8		
	System	7	5.4		
	Total	103	79.2		
Total		130	100.0		

C11_4aa

WPA1 SEPARATE BUDGET

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	33	25.4	27.5	27.5
	YES	87	66.9	72.5	100.0
	Total	120	92.3	100.0	
Missing	MISSING	3	2.3		
	System	7	5.4		
	Total	10	7.7		
Total		130	100.0		

Frequency Tables

C11_4ba

WPA1 BUDGET PERCENT OF TOTAL GOVERNMENT BUDGET

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00010	56	43.1	66.7	66.7
	.00100	8	6.2	9.5	76.2
	.00600	1	.8	1.2	77.4
	.01000	4	3.1	4.8	82.1
	.01200	9	6.9	10.7	92.9
	.01300	1	.8	1.2	94.0
	.02500	1	.8	1.2	95.2
	.10000	2	1.5	2.4	97.6
	.12000	1	.8	1.2	98.8
	5.00000	1	.8	1.2	100.0
	Total	84	64.6	100.0	
Missing	MISSING	6	4.6		
	NOT APPLICABLE	33	25.4		
	System	7	5.4		
	Total	46	35.4		
Total		130	100.0		

C11_5aa

WPA1 SUBSIDIES FOR WOMEN'S GROUPS

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulativ e Percent
Valid	NO	65	50.0	55.1	55.1
	YES	53	40.8	44.9	100.0
	Total	118	90.8	100.0	
Missing	MISSING	5	3.8		
	Sy stem	7	5.4		
	Total	12	9.2		
Total		130	100.0		

Frequency Tables

C11_5ba

WPA1 BUDGET PERCENT DEVOTED TO SUBSIDIES

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00000	1	.8	2.1	2.1
	2.90000	4	3.1	8.3	10.4
	5.00000	10	7.7	20.8	31.3
	10.00000	2	1.5	4.2	35.4
	13.00000	4	3.1	8.3	43.8
	15.00000	5	3.8	10.4	54.2
	20.00000	1	.8	2.1	56.3
	25.00000	1	.8	2.1	58.3
	39.00000	2	1.5	4.2	62.5
	40.00000	1	.8	2.1	64.6
	45.00000	1	.8	2.1	66.7
	50.00000	5	3.8	10.4	77.1
	60.00000	4	3.1	8.3	85.4
	63.00000	1	.8	2.1	87.5
	66.00000	2	1.5	4.2	91.7
	84.00000	1	.8	2.1	93.8
	87.00000	2	1.5	4.2	97.9
	90.00000	1	.8	2.1	100.0
	Total	48	36.9	100.0	
Missing	MISSING	10	7.7		
	NOT APPLICABLE	65	50.0		
	System	7	5.4		
	Total	82	63.1		
Total		130	100.0		

C11_6aa

WPA1 RESEARCH STAFF

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	58	44.6	49.2	49.2
	YES	60	46.2	50.8	100.0
	Total	118	90.8	100.0	
Missing	MISSING	5	3.8		
	System	7	5.4		
	Total	12	9.2		
Total		130	100.0		

C11_6ba

WPA1 BUDGET PERCENT DEVOTED TO RESEARCH

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00600	1	.8	1.9	1.9
	1.00000	3	2.3	5.8	7.7
	1.80000	1	.8	1.9	9.6
	3.70000	4	3.1	7.7	17.3
	4.60000	3	2.3	5.8	23.1
	5.00000	18	13.8	34.6	57.7
	5.60000	1	.8	1.9	59.6
	6.00000	1	.8	1.9	61.5
	10.00000	10	7.7	19.2	80.8
	12.00000	1	.8	1.9	82.7
	15.00000	4	3.1	7.7	90.4
	25.00000	2	1.5	3.8	94.2
	50.00000	2	1.5	3.8	98.1
	75.00000	1	.8	1.9	100.0
	Total	52	40.0	100.0	
Missing	MISSING	11	8.5		
	NOT APPLICABLE	60	46.2		
	System	7	5.4		
	Total	78	60.0		
Total		130	100.0		

C11_1ab

WPA2 STAFF

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	5	3.8	13.9	13.9
	YES	31	23.8	86.1	100.0
	Total	36	27.7	100.0	
Missing	MISSING	1	.8		
	System	93	71.5		
	Total	94	72.3		
Total		130	100.0		

C11_1bb

WPA2 NUMBER OF FULL-TIME STAFF

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	3	8	6.2	26.7	26.7
	5	3	2.3	10.0	36.7
	8	1	.8	3.3	40.0
	9	1	.8	3.3	43.3
	11	1	.8	3.3	46.7
	13	5	3.8	16.7	63.3
	20	2	1.5	6.7	70.0
	43	1	.8	3.3	73.3
	75	1	.8	3.3	76.7
	121	3	2.3	10.0	86.7
	200	3	2.3	10.0	96.7
	212	1	.8	3.3	100.0
	Total	30	23.1	100.0	
Missing	MISSING	1	.8		
	NOT APPLICABLE	6	4.6		
	System	93	71.5		
	Total	100	76.9		
Total		130	100.0		

C11_2ab

WPA2 SEPARATE DIVISIONS

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	23	17.7	63.9	63.9
	YES	13	10.0	36.1	100.0
	Total	36	27.7	100.0	
Missing	MISSING	1	.8		
	System	93	71.5		
	Total	94	72.3		
Total		130	100.0		

Frequency Tables

C11_2bb

WPA2 NUMBER OF SEPARATE DIVISIONS

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	3	2.3	23.1	23.1
	3	1	.8	7.7	30.8
	4	2	1.5	15.4	46.2
	5	1	.8	7.7	53.8
	7	4	3.1	30.8	84.6
	8	1	.8	7.7	92.3
	10	1	.8	7.7	100.0
	Total	13	10.0	100.0	
Missing	MISSING	1	.8		
	NOT APPLICABLE	23	17.7		
	System	93	71.5		
	Total	117	90.0		
Total		130	100.0		

C11_3ab

WPA2 FIELD OFFICES

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	28	21.5	77.8	77.8
	YES	8	6.2	22.2	100.0
	Total	36	27.7	100.0	
Missing	MISSING	1	.8		
	System	93	71.5		
	Total	94	72.3		
Total		130	100.0		

Frequency Tables

C11_3bb

WPA2 NUMBER OF FIELD OFFICES

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NONE	1	.8	11.1	11.1
	2	2	1.5	22.2	33.3
	3	1	.8	11.1	44.4
	10	1	.8	11.1	55.6
	21	1	.8	11.1	66.7
	88	3	2.3	33.3	100.0
	Total	9	6.9	100.0	
Missing	MISSING	1	.8		
	NOT APPLICABLE	27	20.8		
	System	93	71.5		
	Total	121	93.1		
Total		130	100.0		

C11_4ab

WPA2 SEPARATE BUDGET

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	6	4.6	16.7	16.7
	YES	30	23.1	83.3	100.0
	Total	36	27.7	100.0	
Missing	MISSING	1	.8		
	System	93	71.5		
	Total	94	72.3		
Total		130	100.0		

C11_4bb

WPA2 BUDGET PERCENT TOTAL GOVERNMENT BUDGET

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00010	22	16.9	73.3	73.3
	.00100	1	.8	3.3	76.7
	.01200	3	2.3	10.0	86.7
	.05000	3	2.3	10.0	96.7
	5.00000	1	.8	3.3	100.0
	Total	30	23.1	100.0	
Missing	MISSING	1	.8		
	NOT APPLICABLE	6	4.6		
	System	93	71.5		
	Total	100	76.9		
Total		130	100.0		

Frequency Tables

C11_5a

WPA2 SUBSIDIES FOR WOMEN'S GROUPS

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	29	22.3	80.6	80.6
	YES	7	5.4	19.4	100.0
	Total	36	27.7	100.0	
Missing	MISSING	1	.8		
	System	93	71.5		
	Total	94	72.3		
Total		130	100.0		

C11_5bb

WPA2 BUDGET PERCENT DEVOTED TO RESEARCH

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.80000	1	.8	7.1	7.1
	2.00000	2	1.5	14.3	21.4
	4.50000	1	.8	7.1	28.6
	4.60000	1	.8	7.1	35.7
	5.00000	7	5.4	50.0	85.7
	10.00000	2	1.5	14.3	100.0
	Total	14	10.8	100.0	
Missing	MISSING	1	.8		
	NOT APPLICABLE	22	16.9		
	System	93	71.5		
	Total	116	89.2		
Total		130	100.0		

C11_6ab

WPA2 RESEARCH STAFF

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	22	16.9	61.1	61.1
	YES	14	10.8	38.9	100.0
	Total	36	27.7	100.0	
Missing	MISSING	1	.8		
	System	93	71.5		
	Total	94	72.3		
Total		130	100.0		

Frequency Tables

C11_6bb

WPA2 BUDGET PERCENT DEVOTED TO RESEARCH

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.80000	1	.8	7.1	7.1
	2.00000	2	1.5	14.3	21.4
	4.50000	1	.8	7.1	28.6
	4.60000	1	.8	7.1	35.7
	5.00000	7	5.4	50.0	85.7
	10.00000	2	1.5	14.3	100.0
	Total	14	10.8	100.0	
Missing	MISSING	1	.8		
	NOT APPLICABLE	22	16.9		
	System	93	71.5		
	Total	116	89.2		
Total		130	100.0		

C11_1ac

WPA3 STAFF

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	YES	4	3.1	100.0	100.0
Missing	System	126	96.9		
Total		130	100.0		

C11_1bc

WPA3 NUMBER OF FULL-TIME STAFF

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	8	1	.8	25.0	25.0
	13	1	.8	25.0	50.0
	50	1	.8	25.0	75.0
	200	1	.8	25.0	100.0
	Total	4	3.1	100.0	
Missing	System	126	96.9		
Total		130	100.0		

Frequency Tables

C11_2ac

WPA3 SEPARATE DIVISIONS

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	2	1.5	50.0	50.0
	YES	2	1.5	50.0	100.0
	Total	4	3.1	100.0	
Missing	System	126	96.9		
Total		130	100.0		

C11_2bc

WPA3 NUMBER OF SEPARATE DIVISIONS

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	3	1	.8	50.0	50.0
	7	1	.8	50.0	100.0
	Total	2	1.5	100.0	
Missing	NOT APPLICABLE	2	1.5		
	System	126	96.9		
	Total	128	98.5		
Total		130	100.0		

C11_3ac

WPA3 FIELD OFFICES

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	2	1.5	50.0	50.0
	YES	2	1.5	50.0	100.0
	Total	4	3.1	100.0	
Missing	System	126	96.9		
Total		130	100.0		

C11_3bc

WPA3 NUMBER OF FIELD OFFICES

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	22	1	.8	50.0	50.0
	88	1	.8	50.0	100.0
	Total	2	1.5	100.0	
Missing	NOT APPLICABLE	2	1.5		
	System	126	96.9		
	Total	128	98.5		
Total		130	100.0		

C11_4ac

WPA3 SEPARATE BUDGET

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	YES	4	3.1	100.0	100.0
Missing	System	126	96.9		
Total		130	100.0		

C11_4bc

WPA3 BUDGET PERCENT TOTAL GOVERNMENT BUDGET

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.00010	2	1.5	50.0	50.0
	.00600	1	.8	25.0	75.0
	.01200	1	.8	25.0	100.0
	Total	4	3.1	100.0	
Missing	System	126	96.9		
Total		130	100.0		

C11_5ac

WPA3 SUBSIDIES FOR WOMEN'S GROUPS

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	3	2.3	75.0	75.0
	YES	1	.8	25.0	100.0
	Total	4	3.1	100.0	
Missing	System	126	96.9		
Total		130	100.0		

C11_5bc

WPA3 BUDGET PERCENT DEVOTED TO SUBISIDIES

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	20.00000	1	.8	100.0	100.0
Missing	NOT APPLICABLE	3	2.3		
	System	126	96.9		
	Total	129	99.2		
Total		130	100.0		

Frequency Tables

C11_6ac

WPA3 RESEARCH STAFF

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	2	1.5	50.0	50.0
	YES	2	1.5	50.0	100.0
	Total	4	3.1	100.0	
Missing	System	126	96.9		
Total		130	100.0		

C11_6bc

WPA3 BUDGET PERCENT DEVOTED TO RESEARCH

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	5.00000	1	.8	50.0	50.0
	10.00000	1	.8	50.0	100.0
	Total	2	1.5	100.0	
Missing	NOT APPLICABLE	2	1.5		
	System	126	96.9		
	Total	128	98.5		
Total		130	100.0		

C12_1a

WPA1 LEADER WMA ACTIVITIES

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	39	30.0	31.7	31.7
	YES	84	64.6	68.3	100.0
	Total	123	94.6	100.0	
Missing	System	7	5.4		
Total		130	100.0		

C12_2a

WPA1 FEMINIST LEADERSHIP

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	64	49.2	52.0	52.0
	YES	59	45.4	48.0	100.0
	Total	123	94.6	100.0	
Missing	System	7	5.4		
Total		130	100.0		

Frequency Tables

C12_1b

WPA2 LEADER WMA ACTIVITIES

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	20	15.4	54.1	54.1
	YES	17	13.1	45.9	100.0
	Total	37	28.5	100.0	
Missing	System	93	71.5		
Total		130	100.0		

C12_2b

WPA2 FEMINIST LEADERSHIP

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	25	19.2	67.6	67.6
	YES	12	9.2	32.4	100.0
	Total	37	28.5	100.0	
Missing	System	93	71.5		
Total		130	100.0		

C12_1c

WPA3 LEADER WMA ACTIVITIES

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	3	2.3	75.0	75.0
	YES	1	.8	25.0	100.0
	Total	4	3.1	100.0	
Missing	System	126	96.9		
Total		130	100.0		

C12_2c

WPA3 FEMINIST LEADERSHIP

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	4	3.1	100.0	100.0
Missing	System	126	96.9		
Total		130	100.0		

Frequency Tables

C13_1

WOMEN'S MOVEMENT STAGE

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	GROWTH	42	32.3	32.3	32.3
	CONSOLIDATION	66	50.8	50.8	83.1
	DECLINE	22	16.9	16.9	100.0
	Total	130	100.0	100.0	

C14_1

WMA ORGANIZATIONAL CLOSENESS TO LEFT

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NOT CLOSE	1	.8	.9	.9
	MODERATELY CLOSE	2	1.5	1.7	2.6
	CLOSE	31	23.8	27.0	29.6
	VERY CLOSE	81	62.3	70.4	100.0
	Total	115	88.5	100.0	
Missing	NOT APPLICABLE	15	11.5		
Total		130	100.0		

C15_1

WMA IDEOLOGICAL CLOSENESS TO LEFT

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NOT CLOSE	2	1.5	1.7	1.7
	MODERATELY CLOSE	18	13.8	15.7	17.4
	CLOSE	25	19.2	21.7	39.1
	VERY CLOSE	70	53.8	60.9	100.0
	Total	115	88.5	100.0	
Missing	NOT APPLICABLE	15	11.5		
Total		130	100.0		

Frequency Tables

C16_1

WMA PRIORITY

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NOT ON THE AGENDA	42	32.3	32.3	32.3
	ON THE AGENDA	88	67.7	67.7	100.0
	Total	130	100.0	100.0	

C17_1

PERCENTAGE OF WMA IN AGREEMENT

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NONE	1	.8	.8	.8
	50	12	9.2	9.3	10.1
	60	2	1.5	1.6	11.6
	66	1	.8	.8	12.4
	67	1	.8	.8	13.2
	70	2	1.5	1.6	14.7
	75	8	6.2	6.2	20.9
	80	8	6.2	6.2	27.1
	86	1	.8	.8	27.9
	88	1	.8	.8	28.7
	90	6	4.6	4.7	33.3
	98	1	.8	.8	34.1
	100	85	65.4	65.9	100.0
	Total	129	99.2	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.8		
Total		130	100.0		

C18_1a

INDIVIDUALS IN WM ORG

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	123	94.6	94.6	94.6
	YES	7	5.4	5.4	100.0
	Total	130	100.0	100.0	

Frequency Tables

C18_1b

WM INDIVIDUALS IN SUB-SYSTEM

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	2	1.5	28.6	28.6
	YES	5	3.8	71.4	100.0
	Total	7	5.4	100.0	
Missing	NOT APPLICABLE	123	94.6		
Total		130	100.0		

C18_2a

INDIVIDUALS IN NON WM ORG

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	53	40.8	40.8	40.8
	YES	77	59.2	59.2	100.0
	Total	130	100.0	100.0	

C18_2b

NON WM INDIVIDUALS IN SUB-SYSTEM

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	16	12.3	20.8	20.8
	YES	61	46.9	79.2	100.0
	Total	77	59.2	100.0	
Missing	999	53	40.8		
Total		130	100.0		

C18_3a

FREE-STANDING INFORMAL WM ORGANIZATIONS

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	79	60.8	60.8	60.8
	YES	51	39.2	39.2	100.0
	Total	130	100.0	100.0	

Frequency Tables

C18_3b

FREE-STANDING INFORMAL WM ORGANIZATIONS IN SUB-SYSTEM

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	40	30.8	78.4	78.4
	YES	11	8.5	21.6	100.0
	Total	51	39.2	100.0	
Missing	NOT APPLICABLE	79	60.8		
Total		130	100.0		

C18_4a

FREE-STANDING FORMAL WM ORGANIZATIONS

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	58	44.6	44.6	44.6
	YES	72	55.4	55.4	100.0
	Total	130	100.0	100.0	

C18_4b

FREE-STANDING FORMAL WM ORG IN SUB-SYSTEM

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	46	35.4	63.9	63.9
	YES	26	20.0	36.1	100.0
	Total	72	55.4	100.0	
Missing	NOT APPLICABLE	58	44.6		
Total		130	100.0		

C18_5a

INFORMAL ORG IN WM ORG

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	129	99.2	99.2	99.2
	YES	1	.8	.8	100.0
	Total	130	100.0	100.0	

C18_5b

INFORMAL ORG IN WM ORG IN SUB-SYSTEM

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	YES	1	.8	100.0	100.0
Missing	NOT APPLICABLE	129	99.2		
Total		130	100.0		

C18_6a

FORMAL ORG IN WM ORG

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	127	97.7	97.7	97.7
	YES	3	2.3	2.3	100.0
	Total	130	100.0	100.0	

C18_6b

FORMAL ORG IN WM ORG IN SUB-SYSTEM

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	3	2.3	100.0	100.0
Missing	NOT APPLICABLE	127	97.7		
Total		130	100.0		

C18_7a

INFORMAL ORG IN NON WM ORG

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	120	92.3	92.3	92.3
	YES	10	7.7	7.7	100.0
	Total	130	100.0	100.0	

C18_7b

INFORMAL ORG IN NON WM ORG IN SUB-SYSTEM

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	2	1.5	20.0	20.0
	YES	8	6.2	80.0	100.0
	Total	10	7.7	100.0	
Missing	NOT APPLICABLE	120	92.3		
Total		130	100.0		

C18_8a

FORMAL ORG IN NON WM ORG

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	91	70.0	70.0	70.0
	YES	39	30.0	30.0	100.0
	Total	130	100.0	100.0	

Frequency Tables

C18-8b

FORMAL ORG IN NON WM ORG IN SUB-SYSTEM

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	23	17.7	59.0	59.0
	YES	16	12.3	41.0	100.0
	Total	39	30.0	100.0	
Missing	NOT APPLICABLE	91	70.0		
Total		130	100.0		

C19_1

INFORMAL ORG AND FEMINIST MICRO-FRAMES

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	89	68.5	68.5	68.5
	YES	41	31.5	31.5	100.0
	Total	130	100.0	100.0	

C19_2

FORMAL ORG AND FEMINIST MICRO-FRAMES

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	72	55.4	55.4	55.4
	YES	58	44.6	44.6	100.0
	Total	130	100.0	100.0	

C19_3

INDIVIDUALS IN WM ORG AND FEMINIST MICRO-FRAMES

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	123	94.6	94.6	94.6
	YES	7	5.4	5.4	100.0
	Total	130	100.0	100.0	

C19_4

INDIVIDUALS IN NON WM ORG AND FEMINIST MICRO-FRAMES

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	76	58.5	58.5	58.5
	YES	54	41.5	41.5	100.0
	Total	130	100.0	100.0	

Frequency Tables

C19_5

INFORMAL ORG IN WM ORG AND FEMINIST MICRO-FRAMES

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	129	99.2	99.2	99.2
	YES	1	.8	.8	100.0
	Total	130	100.0	100.0	

C19_6

FORMAL ORG IN WM ORG AND FEMINIST MICRO-FRAMES

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	126	96.9	96.9	96.9
	YES	4	3.1	3.1	100.0
	Total	130	100.0	100.0	

C19_7

INFORMAL ORG IN NON WM ORG AND FEMINIST MICRO-FRAMES

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	119	91.5	91.5	91.5
	YES	11	8.5	8.5	100.0
	Total	130	100.0	100.0	

C19_8

FORMAL ORG IN NON WM ORG AND FEMINIST MICRO-FRAMES

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	105	80.8	80.8	80.8
	YES	25	19.2	19.2	100.0
	Total	130	100.0	100.0	

C20_1

COUNTERMOVEMENT STRENGTH

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NONE	66	50.8	50.8	50.8
	WEAK	12	9.2	9.2	60.0
	MODERATE	18	13.8	13.8	73.8
	STRONG	34	26.2	26.2	100.0
	Total	130	100.0	100.0	

Frequency Tables

C21_1a ***no data***

WMA MOBILIZATION POTENTIAL

		Frequency	Percent
Missing	System	130	100.0

C21_1b

WMA ACTIVISM

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	24	18.5	18.5	18.5
	2	24	18.5	18.5	36.9
	3	16	12.3	12.3	49.2
	4	12	9.2	9.2	58.5
	5	4	3.1	3.1	61.5
	6	11	8.5	8.5	70.0
	7	8	6.2	6.2	76.2
	8	12	9.2	9.2	85.4
	9	11	8.5	8.5	93.8
	10	8	6.2	6.2	100.0
	Total	130	100.0	100.0	

C22_1

WMA INSTITUTIONALIZATION

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	LEAST	4	3.1	3.1	3.1
	2	16	12.3	12.3	15.4
	3	13	10.0	10.0	25.4
	4	26	20.0	20.0	45.4
	5	47	36.2	36.2	81.5
	6	9	6.9	6.9	88.5
	7	6	4.6	4.6	93.1
	8	1	.8	.8	93.8
	9	4	3.1	3.1	96.9
	MOST	4	3.1	3.1	100.0
	Total	130	100.0	100.0	

C23_1

PRESENCE OF RULES

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	6	4.6	4.6	4.6
	YES	124	95.4	95.4	100.0
	Total	130	100.0	100.0	

Frequency Tables

C23_2

OCCASIONAL PARTICIPANTS

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	60	46.2	46.2	46.2
	YES	70	53.8	53.8	100.0
	Total	130	100.0	100.0	

C23_3

CHAIN OF COMMAND

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	19	14.6	14.6	14.6
	YES	111	85.4	85.4	100.0
	Total	130	100.0	100.0	

C23_4

SUB-SYSTEM STRUCTURE

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	OPEN	5	3.8	3.8	3.8
	MODERATELY OPEN	13	10.0	10.0	13.8
	MODERATELY CLOSED	44	33.8	33.8	47.7
	CLOSED	68	52.3	52.3	100.0
	Total	130	100.0	100.0	

C24_1

ISSUE FRAME FIT

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	THREATENING	16	12.3	18.0	18.0
	COMPATIBLE	53	40.8	59.6	77.5
	MATCHING	20	15.4	22.5	100.0
	Total	89	68.5	100.0	
Missing	NOT APPLICABLE	40	30.8		
	System	1	.8		
	Total	41	31.5		
Total		130	100.0		

Frequency Tables

C24_2

MIXED FIT

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	89	68.5	69.0	69.0
	YES	40	30.8	31.0	100.0
	Total	129	99.2	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.8		
Total		130	100.0		

C25_1

GOVERNING MAJORITY ON LEFT-RIGHT SPECTRUM

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	RIGHT	41	31.5	31.5	31.5
	CENTER	29	22.3	22.3	53.8
	LEFT	60	46.2	46.2	100.0
	Total	130	100.0	100.0	

C26_1

WMA PARTICIPATION IN TAN

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	74	56.9	57.4	57.4
	YES	55	42.3	42.6	100.0
	Total	129	99.2	100.0	
Missing	999	1	.8		
Total		130	100.0		

C26_2

CEDAW MEMBERSHIP

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	41	31.5	31.5	31.5
	YES	89	68.5	68.5	100.0
	Total	130	100.0	100.0	

Frequency Tables

C26_4

CEDAW/WMA GOALS

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	15	11.5	17.6	17.6
	YES	70	53.8	82.4	100.0
	Total	85	65.4	100.0	
Missing	NOT APPLICABLE	45	34.6		
Total		130	100.0		

C26_5

CEDAW EXCEPTIONS

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	87	66.9	97.8	97.8
	YES	2	1.5	2.2	100.0
	Total	89	68.5	100.0	
Missing	NOT APPLICABLE	41	31.5		
Total		130	100.0		

C26_7

EU MEMBERSHIP

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	44	33.8	33.8	33.8
	YES	86	66.2	66.2	100.0
	Total	130	100.0	100.0	

C26_8

COMPLIANCE WITH EU DIRECTIVE

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	1	.8	20.0	20.0
	YES	3	2.3	60.0	80.0
	99	1	.8	20.0	100.0
	Total	5	3.8	100.0	
Missing	NOT APPLICABLE	125	96.2		
Total		130	100.0		

Frequency Tables

C26_9

COMPLIANCE WITH EU RECOMMENDATION

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	9	6.9	75.0	75.0
	YES	3	2.3	25.0	100.0
	Total	12	9.2	100.0	
Missing	NOT APPLICABLE	118	90.8		
Total		130	100.0		

C26_10

COMPLIANCE WITH EU REGULATIONS

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	3	2.3	25.0	25.0
	YES	9	6.9	75.0	100.0
	Total	12	9.2	100.0	
Missing	NOT APPLICABLE	118	90.8		
Total		130	100.0		

C26_11

COMPLIANCE WITH EU SOFT LAW

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	14	10.8	32.6	32.6
	YES	29	22.3	67.4	100.0
	Total	43	33.1	100.0	
Missing	NOT APPLICABLE	87	66.9		
Total		130	100.0		

C26_12

EU/WMA GOALS

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	2	1.5	5.0	5.0
	YES	38	29.2	95.0	100.0
	Total	40	30.8	100.0	
Missing	NOT APPLICABLE	90	69.2		
Total		130	100.0		

C26_13

Frequency Tables

ECJ COMPLIANCE ORDER

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NO	76	58.5	100.0	100.0
Missing	NOT APPLICABLE	54	41.5		
Total		130	100.0		

C27_1

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	NATIONAL	125	96.2	96.2	96.2
	REGIONAL	3	2.3	2.3	98.5
	LOCAL	2	1.5	1.5	100.0
	Total	130	100.0	100.0	

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1

APPENDIX 1
LIST OF 130 POLICY DEBATES IN DATASET

Job Training (23)

Spain	
National Plan on Job Training	1985
Creation of Coordinating Authority	1985-6
Management of Program Delivery	1990-2
Italy	
Job Training and Unemployment	1983-4
Job Training and Labor Market Reform	1993-7
France	
Youth Training and Placement	1978-80
Representation of Workers Interests	1982-4
Employer Job Training Contribution	1990-91
Job Training and Reinsertion	1993
Job Training and Decentralization	1993
Finland	
Labor Shortages and Unemployment	1969-71
Adult Further Training Reform	1971-5
State Responsibility for Training	1977-87
Training Linked to Unemployment Benefits	1992-3
Ireland	
Youth Unemployment	1981
EU Peripherality	1987-9
Training for Globalization	1995-7
Canada	
Canada Jobs Strategy	1984-85
Social Security Review	1994-6
BC Benefits	1994-6
USA	
Training and Unemployment	1976-8
Reforming Framework Legislation	1980-2
Vocational Training and Worker Productivity	1989-90

APPENDIX 1

Abortion(32)

Austria	
Social Democratic Party Draft Liberalization	1970-2
People's Initiative (anti-abortion) and National Council reaffirmation of legal Abortion	1975-8
Regulation of mifegyne: abortion pill	1998-9
Belgium	
State Commission for Ethical Problems	1974-6
Detiège bill to suspend prosecutions	1981-2
Reform of abortion law	1986-90
Canada	
Reform of abortion criminal code	1966-9
Morgentaler/Daigle cases	1988-89
Bill to reinstate criminal penalties for Abortion	1989-91
France	
Reaffirmation of legal abortion in the First trimester	1979
Reimbursement of abortion expenses	1981-3
Commando-IVG and *Loi Neiertz*	1991-3
Germany	
Legalization of abortion	1969-74
Post-unification liberalization	1990-2
Restoration of limited abortion law	1993-5
Great Britain	
White bill and Lane Committee	1970-5
Corrie bill to restrict abortions	1975-9
Human Fertilisation and Embryology Act: upper limit	1987-90
Ireland	
Constitutional amendment to protect the Unborn	1981-3
X and Maastricht Treaty referendums on Abortion and right to travel	1992
C and Green Paper on abortion policy	1997-9
Italy	
Legalization of abortion	1971-8
Popular referendum to repeal legal Abortion	1980-1
In vitro fertilization and abortion	1996-9
The Netherlands	
First cabinet proposal for limited reform	1971-3
Reform of abortion law	1977-81
Implementation of statute to register/	1981-4

APPENDIX 1

License abortion facilities	
Spain	
Abortion Act	1983-5
Implementation regulations	1986
USA	
Legalizing abortion, *Roe v. Wade*	1970-3
Hyde Amendment	1974-7
Partial Birth Abortion Ban Act	1995-8

APPENDIX 1

Prostitution (30)

Austria	
Penal Code amendment on pimping	1984
Vienna's prostitution law	1991-92
Social insurance for private enterprise	1997
Britain	
Abolition of prison for prostitutes	1979-83
Kerb Crawling as an offense	1984-1985
Maintaining a person in sexual servitude	2000-02
Canada	
Fraser Committee	1983-1985
Anti- communication law	1985
Youth in prostitution	1992-6
Finland	
Repeal of Vagrant Act	1984-6
New Sex Crime Act	1993-8
Helsinki's prostitution law	1995-9
France	
Prostitute rights and law enforcement	1972-5
Public health/AIDS	1989-90
Penal Code reform of pimping and solicitation	1991-2
Italy	
Protection for victims of trafficking	1996-9
Criminalizing clients of underage prostitutes	1998
Funding projects to prevent sex trafficking	1998-9
Netherlands	
Bill 18202 repeal of brothel ban	1983-89
Bill on the trafficking of persons	1989-93
Bill 25417 on repeal of brothel ban	1997-2000
Spain	
Elaboration of the 1995 Penal Code	1994-5
1999 reform of the Penal Code	1997-9
2000 Immigrant Act	1998-2000
Sweden	
First Commission on Prostitution	1981-2
Proposal for violence against women act	1995-8
Law against purchasing sexual services	1997-9
United States	
Sexual exploitation of children	1976-8
Child Sexual Abuse and Pornography Act	1984-6
Trafficking of women and children	1998-2000

APPENDIX 1

Political Representation (33)

Austria	
Cabinet access	1979
Equal treatment for civil servants	1990-92
Gendering public party finances	1994-9
Belgium	
Quota for electoral lists	1992-94
Quota for advisory committees	1996-7
Quota for federal government	1996-8
Finland	
Change in electoral law	1972-5
Gender quotas in SKDL	1986-7
Quotas in Equality Act of 1995	1991-5
France	
Voting system for local councilors	1981-2
Voting system for parliamentary elections	1985-86
Parity Reform	1995-2000
Germany	
Quota in Social Democratic Party	1977-88
Second Equal Rights Law	1989-94
Reform of Nationality Law	1998-9
Italy	
Creation of the Democratic Party of the Left (PDS)	1989-91
Reform of Electoral law for Chamber of Deputies	1991-3
Constitutional Amendment on Equal Access	1999-2003
Netherlands	
Social Democratic Party	1966-77
Equality Policy Plan	1981-5
Corporatism	1989-97
Spain	
Endorsement of 25% quota in PSOE	1987-8
Endorsement of 40% quota in PSOE	1992-7
Bill for mandatory quotas in all parties	1998-2003
Sweden	
More women in politics	1967-72
Quotas for appointed positions	1985-7
Establishment of a women's party	1991-4
United Kingdom	
Reform of Public Bodies	1979-81
Candidate Selection in Labour Party	1993
Parliamentary Working Hours	1997-2002
United States	

APPENDIX 1

ERA ratification in Arkansas	1972-9
Term limits in Michigan	1991-2
National Voter Registration Act	1988-93

APPENDIX 1

Hot Issue (13)

Australia
Feminism and Indigenous Rights in Australia
1997-8

Austria
Family Policy for the Sake of the Children or the Male Breadwinner
1999-2001

Belgium
Speedy Belgians: The New Nationality Law of 2000 and the Impact of the Women's Movement
1999-2000

Canada
New Federalism Comes to the Canadian Health Care System
2000-2004

Finland
Postponing Implementation of Universal Day Care
1991-94

France
35 Hour Work-week Reforms 1997-2000

Germany
Biotechnology Genetics Debate 2000-2

Italy
Debate on the Reform of the State 1997-2001

Netherlands
The 'home care gap': neoliberalism, feminism and the state in the Netherlands
1997-2001

Spain
Unemployment Insurance Reform 2002

Sweden
Child Care Allowance 1991-4

United Kingdom
Constitutional change – House of Lords 1997- 2003

USA
Welfare Reform 1992- 1996

APPENDIX 1

PERIODIZATION

Australia
1976-79
1983-85
1995-2000

Austria
1970-9
1984-5
1990-2000

Belgium
1974-6
1981-90
1992-2000

Canada
1966-9
1983-5
1988-91
1992-2004

Finland
1969-75
1977-87
1992-2000

France
1972-80
1982-85
1989-93
1995-2000

Germany
1969-74
1977-88
1990-2000

Great Britain
1970-79
1979-83
1985-90
1993-2003

Ireland
1980-84
1988-92
1995-2000

Italy
1971-78
1980-84
1989-96
1997-2003

Netherlands
1966-77
1978-85
1989-2000

Spain
1985-88
1990-2000

Sweden
1967-72
1981-87
1991-2000

USA
1970-79
1980-88
1988-92
1995-2002

APPENDIX 1

Debate Periods for Women's Movement Actors

Australia

Prostitution	Hot Issue
1976-79	1997-8
1984	
1995-9	

Austria

Abortion	Prostitution	Political Representation	Hot Issue
1970-2	1984	1979	1999-2001
1975-8	1991-92	1990-92	
1998-9	1997	1994-9	

Belgium

Abortion	Political Representation	Hot Issue
1974-6	1992-94	1999-2000
1981-2	1996-7	
1986-90	1996-98	

Canada

Job Training	Abortion	Prostitution	Hot Issue
1984-85	1966-9	1983-5	2000-04
1994-6	1988-9	1985	
1994-6	1989-91	1992-6	

Finland

Job Training	Prostitution	Political Representation	Hot Issue
1969-71	1984-6	1972-5	1991-4
1971-5	1993-8	1986- 87	
1977-87	1995-99	1991-95	
1992-3			

France

Job Training	Abortion	Prostitution	Political Representation	Hot Issue
1978-80	1979	1972-5	1981-2	1997-2000
1982-84	1981-3	1989-90	1985 -6	
1990-91	1991-3	1991-2	1995-2000	
1993				

APPENDIX 1

1993

Germany

Abortion	Political Representation	Hot Issue
1969-74	1977-88	2000-2002
1990-2	1989-94	
1993-5	1998-9	

Great Britain

Abortion	Prostitution	Political Representation	Hot Issue
1970-75	1979-83	1979-81	1997-2003
1975-9	1984-85	1993	
1987-90	2000-02	1997-2002	

Ireland

Job Training	Abortion
1981	1981-3
1987-9	1992
1995-7	1997-9

Italy

Job Training	Abortion	Prostitution	Political Representation	Hot Issue
1983-4	1971-8	1996-9	1989-91	1997-2001
1993-7	1980-1	1998	1991-3	
	1996-9	1998-9	1999-2003	

Netherlands

Abortion	Prostitution	Political Representation	Hot Issue
1971-3	1983-89	1966-77	1997-2001
1977-81	1989-93	1981-5	
1981-4	1997-2000	1989-97	

Spain

Job Training	Abortion	Prostitution	Political Representation	Hot Issue
1985	1983-5	1994-5	1987-8	2002
1985-6	1986	1997-9	1992-7	
1990-2		1998-2000	1998-2003	

APPENDIX 1

Sweden

Prostitution	Political Representation	Hot Issue
1981-2	1967-72	1991-4
1995-8	1985-7	
1997-9	1991-4	

United States

Job Training	Abortion	Prostitution	Political Representation	Hot Issue
1976-8	1970-3	1976-8	1972-9	
1980-2	1974-7	1984-6	1991-2	
1989-90	1995-8	1998-2000	1988-93	1992-6

APPENDIX 2

APPENDIX 2
GLOSSARY OF TERMS

A

Administrative resources are the variety of structural and financial instruments available to government offices.

Appendix is appended to the coding worksheets for each debate. It includes descriptive information for variables in the project.

C

CEDAW The United Nations Convention for Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women sets standards for its signatories.

Closeness of WMA to the Left:

- *Ideological Closeness of Women's Movement Actors to the Left* means whether ideas, discourse, and/or demands of these actors are adopted by Left-wing political parties and trade unions associated with the Left; it may be very close, close, moderately close, or not close.

- *Organizational Closeness of Women's Movement Actors to the Left* refers to formal alliances between women movement actors and Left-wing political parties and trade unions associated with the Left; it may be very close, close, moderately close, or not close.

Cohesion of the movement actors around the issue refers to the agreement of movement actors on micro-frames during the policy process.

Consolidation of Women's Movement means greater presence of movement activists in strong formal organizations and/or authoritative organizations.

Countermovement refers to the actors who are actively working against the women's movement actors' micro-frames in the policy debate. Countermovement strength is measured with the following indicators:

- *Strong*: prevalent and proactive movement aimed at issue or issues taken up by different parts of the women' movement.
- *Moderate*: countermovement less active against women's movement issues
- *Weak*: nearly moribund or non existent.

APPENDIX 2

E

Extra-national linkages are present when a nation-state is subject to policy directives/ recommendations on the debate issue from governmental organizations that lie outside of nation-state boundaries and/or when the women's movement activists participate in transnational advocacy networks.

F

Feminist discourse – To be considered feminist, discourse must include all of the following core ideas:

1. It expresses explicit identity with women as a group, a form of explicit gender consciousness
2. The language is explicitly gendered, referring to women as distinct from men. Gendered references include the following: images of women and what they are like; how women are different from men; how women are different from each other; the ways gender differences shape identities (see M.F. Katzenstein 1995).
3. The ideas are expressed in terms of representing women as women in public life.
4. Because there is something wrong with the treatment and status of women, goals are presented that will advance the status of women.
5. Views expressed explicitly or implicitly challenge gender hierarchies and forms of women's subordination.

Feminist movements are types of women's movements which express feminist discourse. Women's movement actors may relate to the feminist movement and articulate feminist aspirations and ideas in differing degrees and at different times.

Frame

- An *issue frame* is the definition of meaning of a specific policy area, e.g., employment, health, environment, etc. used by actors in that policy sub-system in a given policy debates.
- A *micro-frame* is the position specific actors seek to insert into the issue frame to change the definition of the issue and policy content.

G

Gendering refers to the process whereby phenomena, such as identities, observations, entities, and processes acquire symbols based on gender (ideas about men and women).

Gendered debates, therefore, are those policy debates framed in terms of ideas about how the problem and proposed solutions will affect women in comparison with men.

APPENDIX 2

Gendering the issue frame means the adoption or maintenance of a gendered issue frame as indicated by comparing the issue frame at the beginning of the debate with the issue frame at the end of the debate.

Governing majority indicates the political parties/ party in power at the time of the debate. In presidential and semi presidential systems there may be two separate governing majorities, one in the chief executive and the other in the legislature.

I

Issue frame is the definition of meaning of a specific policy area, e.g., employment, health, environment, etc. used by actors in that policy sub-system in a given policy debates.

Issue frame fit is the compatibility of the micro-frame of the women's movement actors with the issue frame that initially shapes the debate in the policy sub-system.

L

Left parties refers to those more likely to promote agendas that emphasize greater political, social, and economic equality than parties of the right, in party systems when party positions can be placed on a continuum ranging from Left to Right.

Location of women's movement actors may be of two types refers to the form from which women's movement ideas are presented. The following organizations (not individuals) may be free standing, that is operate on their own. Individuals and organizations may also be situated inside them: (1) women's movement organizations whose primary goals are to promote women's movement ideas, aspirations and identities (excluding women's policy agencies); and (2) non-women's movement organizations whose primary goal is other than to promote women's movement ideas, aspirations and identities. Both organizations may be informal or formal.

M

Micro-frame is the position specific actors seek to insert into the issue frame to change the definition of the issue and policy content. It also forms the core identity of the group in question.

Mobilization of Women's Movement means the degree of participation of women in activities to further movement discourse and policy goals.

APPENDIX 2

N

Non Decisions consist of policy proposals or reports that ended the debate but did not result in any authoritative policy decision that actually changed significantly the direction of policy.

O

Occasional participants are policy actors—individuals, informal and formal organizations—which are not permanent members of a policy sub-system.

P

Period refers to the span of time that includes one or more policy debates in a country. The periodization is determined by grouping the debates with overlapping dates.

Policy agenda indicates whether the issue under discussion in a policy debate is in the policy orientation of a given WPA, either implicitly or explicitly.

Policy-making capacity of a WPA consists of its formal policy responsibility and its proximity to the center of decision-making in a specific institutional setting.

Policy orientation refers to the range of policy areas a given agency formally covers during the period of the debate—single issue, multi-issue, or cross-sectional.

- *Single issue* includes those agency actions restricted to a single area of policy or policy issues.
- *Multi-issue* includes those agencies that may have a remit covering several different policy areas, but not a systematic transversal mission.
- *Cross-sectional* includes agencies that have a mission to systematically cover, audit, or work with any policy area that deals with women's status and condition.

Policy response covers the inclusion of policy goals advanced by women movement actors (WMA) during the debate, as a part of their micro-frames, in the content of the final policy outcome; more specifically, the degree to which the policy content fit the policy goals in the micro-frame of the WMAs that came forward in the debate.

Policy sub-system is the constellation of state and societal actors involved with the formation of state action in a given issue area.

APPENDIX 2

Policy sub-system structure is based on the pattern formed by three different elements: presence of common rules, change in number of actors involved with policy issue over time; chain of command.

Priority of issue to the movement agenda indicates the attention devoted to each policy debate by women's movement organizational actors and may be high, moderate, low or not on the agenda.

Procedural response includes acceptance of women's movement actors as participants into the policy sub-system by the end of the debate.

Q

Quasi Women's Policy Agency or QUAWPA may be found in a government or a political party. In the government a QUAWPA is attached to government institutions and functions in the policy process like a WPA without a formal government directive of establishment. To "function in the policy process like a WPA" means that the QUAWPA is explicitly charged with furthering women's status and rights or promoting sex-based equality by or through an institution that is part of the state. In parties, QUAWPAs are permanent structures in the party organization, formally charged by the party with promoting women's issues within the party, involved with some aspect of party policy making, and given party funds for a budget and permanent offices. Also in the parties, it is the function of the women's organization in the context of party decision making processes that permit its classification as a QUAWPA. The same party women's organization participating in a debate in the state (parliament, Cabinet, commissions) would be classified as a Women's Movement Actor. In cases where the women's party body has a wide membership of women in the party, only the official leadership organization is considered to be a QUAWPA; the members may operate separately as women's movement actors in the same debate.

T

Transnational policy networks include "those relevant actors working internationally on an issue, who are bound together by shared values, a common discourse, and dense exchanges of information and services." (Risse & Sikkuk 1999, 18).

Type of appointment refers to the logic behind the selection of the head of a WPA active in the policy debate. There are three types: political, bureaucratic, and lay panel.

- *Political appointments* are those agency heads who are appointed by a government, administration, parliament, or parties and whose tenure tends to change with the change in government, administration, parliament, etc.
- *Bureaucratic appointments* include agencies with directors that are appointed regardless of partisan circumstances in an administrative logic
- *Lay panel appointments* occur in WPAs that are commissions in executive or legislature and which select their own directors, chairs, or presidents through election or consensus.

APPENDIX 2

Type or Form of WPA refers to the institutional location, e.g. which branch of government, and formal policy-making role of a given WPA.

- *Ministry*: Autonomous office in Cabinet or sub office in ministry
- *Administrative Office:* bureaucratic agency
- *Commission in the Political Executive:* committee appointed by the Prime Minister, President or Government
- *Judicial Body:* commission or office located in the Ministry of Justice
- *Advisory Council:* lay panel advisory to ministries or political executive
- *Legislative Council:* body composed of elected parliamentary representatives
- *Quasi Women's Policy Agency or QUAWPA* is attached to government institutions or political parties and functions in the policy process like WPAs without a formal government directive of establishment.

W

Women's movement refers to the ideas, aspirations, and identities developed from gender consciousness in relation to actors who articulate them in public arenas.

Women's movement actors are the individuals, collective organizations and formal organizations that are inspired by movement thinkers to act to advance what they see as women's movement discourse (see below). Collective women's movement actors are non-state structures and are for the most part women-only groups or individual women.

- *Individuals* are single persons who do not claim to represent any organized or collective entity.
- *Organizations* are groups of individuals who share a common structure for action.
- *Informal organizations*, also called collective action, are group activities through loosely organized means, such as demonstrations, consciousness raising groups, and publics.
- *Formal organizations* are group activities driven by written rules and policies, such as lobbying organizations, professional organizations, and political parties.
- *Women's movement* organizations are those whose primary mission is to promote women's movement ideas, aspirations and identities.
- *Non women's movement* organizations are those whose primary mission is other than to promote women's movement ideas, aspirations and identities.
- *Free standing organizations* are either informal or formal organizations not located within another organization.

Women's Movement Actor Stage assumes a cycle of movement change over time; stage is the particular moment in the cycle at a given time.

- *Growth Emerging/Re-emerging*. Formation of new organizations; rehabilitation of older organizations toward new goals; expansion in numbers of organizations, activities.
- *Consolidation*. Organizations have structure, endurance and regular support; institutionalized in community and government arenas.
- *Decline/Abeyance*. Decrease in organizations members and activities over the period. Latent organizational activity primarily by individuals.

APPENDIX 2

Women's Movement Discourse – women's movement discourse includes all of the following core ideas:

1. It expresses explicit identity with women as a group, a form of explicit gender consciousness.
2. The language is explicitly gendered, referring to women as distinct from men. Gendered references include the following: images of women and what they are like; how women are different from men; how women are different from each other; the ways gender differences shape identities.
3. The ideas are expressed in terms of representing women as women in public life.

Women's Movement Institutionalization means greater presence of movement activists as organized collective entities inside social, political, and authoritative institutions.

Women's Movement Leadership refers to whether heads of WPAs active in policy debates were actors in the women's movement or active in women movement groups.

Women's Movement Mobilization means the degree of participation of women as activists in relation to the potential outside the state to further movement discourse and policy goals.

- *Mobilization potential* refers to the degree to which women have sympathy for and/or contribute to organizations supporting movement goals; the proportion of individual members of a society willing to support the movement.
- *Mobilization structures* are means—formal and informal structures – by which individuals join with others to take steps to further the goals of the movement.
- *Activism or Active participation* refers to degree of participation in women's movement mobilization structures.

Women's Policy Agency – WPA is considered here to be any structure that meets both of the following criteria: (1) any agency/governmental body formally established by government statute or decree; and (2) any agency/governmental body formally charged with addressing women's status and rights or promoting sex-based equality.

WPA gendering variable measures the effectiveness of the WPA in inserting a gendered micro-frame into the issue frame by the end of the debate.

APPENDIX 3

APPENDIX 3
MODULES FOR CODEBOOK CONCEPT ENTRIES

There are three modules that provide the background for the nominal and operational definitions of key concepts in the RNGS project. They also ensure consistency in the methods for developing quantitative measures of the concepts in the Dataset Codebook.

Module I. Women's Movement/Feminist Movement/Women's Movement Actors

This module summarizes the use of women's movement, feminist movement and women's movement actors, concepts that are used throughout the presentation of quantitative measures. For background on RNGS approaches to the comparative definition of women's movements see Stetson & Mazur (2002; 2003a; 2003b). In Leiden 2003, the country directors agreed to conceptual frameworks and working research definitions of women's movement, women's movement discourse, women's movement actors, feminist movement, and feminist movement discourse.

One of the deficiencies of the literature on women's movements is the absence of a research definition of women's movement appropriate to the RNGS cross national and longitudinal project (Beckwith 2000; Molyneux 1998; Stetson & Mazur 2002). A *research definition* involves two components: a nominal or dictionary definition – a description of phenomena that constitute observations of the concept – and an operational definition – a set of procedures to observe the empirical referents, that is, things the concept stands for that can be verified or falsified by observation. The nominal definition must be worded to point the way toward the operational definition within a minimal conceptual distance. Most definitions of social and women's movements in the literature are not amenable to operations to achieve valid and reliable observations. However, in practice, they focus on forms of collective behavior – groups, organizations, protest activities outside government – despite agreement that social movements are more than groups and organizations and activists may be found inside the state (Ferree & Hess 2000; Molyneux 1998; Katzenstein 1998; Santoro & McGuire 1997).

The RNGS working research definition of women's movements has two parts: first, the women's movement means ideas that inspire collective behavior, what Jane Mansbridge (1996) called the "aspirations and understandings that provide conscious goals, cognitive backing and emotional support for each individual's evolving feminist identity." (27). According to Rochon's (1998) definition, movements exist in the relation between the community that produces the discourse and the groups and organizations that advocate them (48). Second, the women's movement is composed of actors who present movement ideas in public and social life. This approach is compatible with the way the concept is used in the literature. It separates what can't be adequately observed—the formation of women's movement discourse—from what can and has been so observed by many researchers – the actors who present the movement ideas in public and social life. Thus, RNGS analytically separates the development of movement discourse from the actors (individuals, organizations) who represent this discourse and observes, describes and gathers data pertaining to the actors. In this study, empirical evidence of the entire discourse and aspirations is not to be collected. What are studied are the *women's movement actors* – individuals, informal organizations and formal organizations which are inspired by movement thinkers to act to advance what they see as women's interests. Our operational definition of

APPENDIX 3

women's movement discourse is used to identify women's movement actors. Among the dimensions of women's movement actors includes framing, characteristics such as cohesion and strength, and impact in the policy process.

To observe women's movement actors, RNGS agreed to the following elements of women's movement discourse:

1. It expresses explicit identity with women as a group, a form of explicit gender consciousness (see Tolleson Rinehart 1992).
2. The language is explicitly gendered, referring to women as distinct from men. Gendered references include the following: images of women and what they are like; how women are different from men; how women are different from each other; the ways gender differences shape identities (see M.F. Katzenstein 1995).
3. The ideas are expressed in terms of representing women as women in public life.

To be identified as women's movement discourse, all three of these elements must be present: identity with women as a group; explicitly gendered language about women; representation of women as women in public life.

Women acting as women, identifying with each other and appealing to a constituency of women through a gender conscious discourse comprise a form of women's political participation. Women's movement actors (all of whom are women) form a variety of relationships, inter-acting and organizing collectively as well as participating individually. Taken together in a particular social context (e.g. community, region, institution, nation state, internationally) these actors and their ideas may be referred to as a women's movement. When women's movement actors are part of a policy sub-system, this is evidence of women's descriptive representation. While men are not, by definition a part of the women's movement, they can support women's movement ideas and in doing so, assume the role of "male allies".

Women's movements have similarities to social movements, but they are not a sub category sharing all their characteristics. Rather, it may be useful to think of the conceptual relationship between women's movements and social movements as partially overlapping, or intersectional. They are similar in that all are forms of gendered collective behavior for social change (Ferree & Mueller 2002). Only women's movements (and men's movements if they exist) are explicitly and consciously gendered. They claim to represent the grievances of women as women. While other movements, such as the labor movement, may be run by and benefit primarily men, their discourse is not presenting grievances *as* men but *as* workers. The women's movement places gender at the center of the mobilization of constituencies. Further, this attention to women, by definition, a demographic component, coincides with descriptive representation. Only movements for racial equality have such a demographic component, but not based on gender. Other movements, including the peace, and environmental movements, are represented in terms of their substantive demands rather than their members. Even the labor movement, while promoting the election and appointment of workers to political office can and has been represented by non workers proclaiming identity or sympathy with workers (lawyers, for example).

In the period under study, the women's movement has become increasingly complex and diverse. Many of the ideas, aspirations, and identities that compose it have become contested among movement thinkers and actors alike. Thus, it is likely that in any policy arena, actors could represent a variety of discourses and often do. Some of these discourses may be

APPENDIX 3

considered *feminist* and thus be derived from the *feminist movement*. Scholars do not agree on clear guidelines for distinguishing between the women's movement and the feminist movement. Some writers distinguish the two in terms of their respective aims. For Beckwith, for example, (2000; 2004) women's movement aims involve women and women's issues but differ from feminist movements in that they do not necessarily involve challenges to patriarchy. Others use the terms interchangeably (Bull, Diamond, and Marsh 2000; Chappell 2002; Ferree 2000; Gelb 2003; Kaplan 1992; Katzenstein and Mueller 1986; Lovenduski 1986; Mansbridge 1996; Mazur 2002; Weldon 2002). The difference between the women's movement and the feminist movement ultimately relates to differences in the ideas, aspirations and identities.

The women's movement finds its genesis in *gender consciousness*. "The recognition that one's relation to the political world is at least partly shaped by being female or male. This recognition is followed by identification with others in the "group" of one's sex, positive affect toward the group, and a feeling of interdependence with the group's fortunes" (Tolleson Rinehart 1992, 32). The varieties of identities, aspirations, ideas, and interpretations of that recognition compose the women's movement. Feminist consciousness is a special kind of gender consciousness. What distinguishes feminist from the more general women's identity and interests is a matter of contention, but it is clear that while all feminists possess gender consciousness, many women with gender consciousness would not be considered, nor consider themselves, feminists. Thus, feminist movements are sub categories of women's movements. All feminist movements are women's movements, but not all women's movement actors express feminist aspirations. Feminist movement is a type of women's movement with a specific feminist discourse.

Feminist movements (actors and ideas) are a sub category of women's movements. Feminist movement actors are distinguished by their *feminism*. Like the women's movements their ideas include identity with women as a group; explicitly gendered language about women; and representation of women as women in public life. In addition there are specific feminist ideas. To observe feminist movement actors, RNGS agreed to the following elements of feminist discourse:

1. It expresses explicit identity with women as a group, a form of explicit gender consciousness (see Tolleson Rinehart 1992).
2. The language is explicitly gendered, referring to women as distinct from men. Gendered references include the following: images of women and what they are like; how women are different from men; how women are different from each other; the ways gender differences shape identities (see M.F. Katzenstein 1995).
3. The ideas are expressed in terms of *representing women as women* in public life.
4. Because there is something wrong with the treatment and status of women, goals are presented that will *advance the status of women*.
5. Views expressed explicitly or implicitly *challenge gender hierarchies and forms of women's subordination*.

To be considered feminist, discourse must include all of these elements: identity with women; be explicitly gendered; represent women; seek to improve the status of women; challenge gender hierarchies.

Women's policy agencies are conceptually different from women's movement actors. Women's Policy Agencies are formal organizations that may espouse women's movement, even feminist

APPENDIX 3

movement, discourse. But their status as formal and official bodies that are part of the state's apparatus distinguish them from other organizations that present such discourse, that is, women's movement actors. Women's movement actors are not official state agencies; in this they share the characteristics of social movement organizations as being, by definition, *non-state* structures. Similarly, individuals who hold positions in women's policy agencies are not women's movement actors. While they may be feminists and may be or have been participants in the women's movement organizations, having a position in a women's policy agency precludes them from being considered part of the women's movement.

Women's movements, like social movements, may adopt a strategy of working within a variety of other state institutions. Based on Ferree and Mueller (2004) only when women's movement actors are represented inside institutions with links to organized collective entities, not as independent individuals who happen to use feminist rhetoric, would they be considered women's movement actors. Ferree and Mueller point out: "When social movements move into institutions, they move not as individuals trying to 'make it' as tokens for the success of their groups, but as organized collective entities that are trying to change the institution's goals, decision–making or modes of operation, whether or not they end up successful, expelled or co-opted." (22)

Module II. Women's Movement Actors: Form and Locations

This module provides taxonomy for classifying WMAs.

Based on the social movement and women's movement literature (see Stetson & Mazur 2002), we construct the following taxonomy of women's movement actors based on categories of FORMS and categories of LOCATION. All actors articulate women's movement ideas, aspirations and identities.

DIMENSIONS FOR TAXONOMIES:

- *Actors*: Individuals and organizations
- *Forms of Organizations*: Informal organizations and formal organizations
- *Missions of Organizations*: Women's movement and non women's movement organizations
- *Locations*: freestanding or within organizations

****Does not include women's policy agencies****

NOMINAL DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED IN TAXONOMIES:

- *Individuals* are single persons who do not claim to represent any organized or collective entity.
- *Organizations* are groups of individuals who share a common structure for action.
- *Informal organizations*, also called collective action, are group activities through loosely organized means, such as demonstrations, consciousness raising groups, and publics.

APPENDIX 3

- *Formal organizations* are group activities driven by written rules and policies, such as lobbying organizations, professional organizations, and political parties.
- *Women's movement* organizations are those whose primary mission is to promote women's movement ideas, aspirations and identities.
- *Non women's movement* organizations are those whose primary mission is other than to promote women's movement ideas, aspirations and identities.
- *Free standing organization* is either an informal or formal organization that is not located within another organization.

A. FORM: In gathering information about characteristics of women's movement actors, use the following list to classify by FORM:

Individuals
Informal Women's Movement Organizations
Formal Women's Movement Organizations

B. LOCATION: In gathering information about characteristics of women's movement actors use the following to classify by location:

Free standing Informal WM organizations
Free standing Formal WM organizations
Informal Non women's movement organizations
Formal Non women's movement organizations

COMBINING FORM AND LOCATION:

	INDIVIDUALS	WM FORMAL ORG	WM INFORMAL ORG
FREE STANDING		X	X
INF. WM ORG	X		X
FORMAL WMO	X	X	X
INF NON WMO	X		X
FORM. NON WMO	X	X	X

There are potentially 12 different patterns. (By definition, women's movement formal organizations cannot be located inside informal organizations)

1. *Free standing Informal Women's Movement Organizations* – Examples: demonstrations; consciousness raising groups; clubs.
2. *Free standing Formal Women's Movement Organizations* – Examples: Lobby organizations; professional organizations.
3. *Individuals in Non Women's Movement Formal Organizations* – Examples: members of commissions, debating in parliament, as a member of a Cabinet; as a member of a political party.
4. *Individuals in Non Women's Movement Informal Organizations* – Examples: leaders of environmental movement demonstrations, grass roots action groups, petition drives.

APPENDIX 3

5. *Individuals in Free Standing Women's Movement Formal Organizations* – Examples: Heads of lobbying organizations; members of organizations.
6. *Individuals in Free Standing Women's Movement Informal Organizations* – Examples: leaders of demonstrations; members of consciousness-raising groups.
7. *Informal Women's Movement Organizations inside Non Women's Movement Informal Organizations* – Examples: part of gay rights movement; environmental demonstrations.
8. *Formal Women's Movement Organizations inside Non Women's Movement Formal Organizations* – Examples: sections of political parties (if not considered a WPA); women's caucus in professional organization; women's studies program in university.
9. *Informal Organizations inside Non Women's Movement Formal Organizations* – Example: protest inside churches and military;
10. *Formal Organizations inside Women's Movement Formal Organizations* – Examples: task force of women's movement interest group; local organization part of national advocacy coalition.
11. *Informal Women's Movement Organization inside Women's Movement Informal Organizations* – Example: part of grass roots mobilization
12. *Informal Wm Organizations inside Women's Movement Formal Organizations* – Example: protest groups inside national women's rights federation.

Module III. Micro-Frame and Issue Frame

This module provides the conceptual and operational background for the concepts that use issue framing or micro-framing: Policy Response (C. 1), Procedural Response (C. 2), Gendering the Issue Frame (C. 3), WPA Gendering (C. 4), WPA/WM Fit (C. 5), WMA Cohesion (C. 17), WMA Feminist Activism (C. 19), and PE- Issue Frame Fit (C. 23)

Framing

This study conceptualizes the policy making process in democratic systems as a conflict of ideas, focusing on issues and the modes of defining problems. Attention is directed to the argument among policy actors over the problems that deserve attention and what should be done about them. This study assumes that the struggle over the definition of public policy is at the center of the political forces in democracies. Society-based groups and state actors line-up around the definition of policy issues in a certain light that often reflects their own positions and aims. Although there are different terms for the competition over political meaning in the policy arena – universe of political discourse, *référentiel*, framing, issue definition – analysts agree on the connection between problem definition and political participation and, eventually, policy outcomes (Schattschneider 1960; Kingdon 1995; Cobb & Elder 1983; Schneider & Ingram 1993; Muller 1990). In this study, we use the term framing to capture the way in which actors define policy issues in terms of problems and policy goals.

Taxonomy of Framing

From the literature, we develop a hierarchy of policy definitions at three levels: general frames, issue frames and micro-frames. At the general level, the definition of policy problems and the actors that are involved occur at the national, or even extra-national arenas; its dynamics affect action and policy content on a wide range of policy issues. This captures Jenson's "universe of political discourse." (1988). An issue frame is the definition of meaning of a specific policy area, e.g., employment, health, environment, etc. used by actors in that policy sub-system in a

APPENDIX 3

given policy debates. Change in an issue frame may or may not affect the larger general frame. The notion of issue frames reflects comparative public policy scholarship that finds that there are no national patterns of policy formation, but that policy formation trends occur within different policy areas (Harrop 1992; Hayward 1992; Heclo 1978).
Note: In the qualitative studies in the RNGS project, this concept was called the dominant frame, meaning the frame used by the majority of policy actors in the sub-system. The same information used to describe the dominant frame can be used to code the issue frame.

The third level of framing occurs at the micro level, that of individuals or organizations, both inside and outside of the state. In other words, any actors within the policy debate, bureaucratic agencies, political parties, interest groups etc, can seek to bring their micro-frames into a specific policy debate. This is similar to the constructivist studies of social movements which have also characterized modes of defining problems as frames which they refer to as structures of organized meanings (Snow and Benford 1992; Gamson 1988). This scholarship on social movement framing informs how specific organizations or actors might have a position on a certain issue that they seek to insert into the issue frame to change policy content. Thus, a micro-frame is the position specific actors seek to insert into the issue frame to change or maintain the definition of the issue and policy content. It may form the core identity of the group in question or be a strategic move that departs from core identities to achieve a policy outcome. Women's movement actors and women's policy agencies develop micro-frames. In this study, the conceptual distinction between the women's movement as a set of ideas and the movement actors who put forward positions on issues based on these ideas reflects this concept of micro-framing. In terms of our analytical focus, women's movement actors with their micro-frames attempt to weigh into the debates at the sub-system level to change the issue frame of a given debate to include their positions in the debate and policy content. Although all organizational WMA actors may develop micro-frames, there may not necessarily be a set of specific policy proposals/ goals, particularly if they are autonomous anti-system groups.

Empirical Indicators
Issue frame – The researcher identifies the constellation of actors that mobilize around a given policy area – the sub-system – in a debate and answers the following three questions.

- What are the ways the policy problem is defined by the actors in the sub-system? What is the wrong, injustice, threat or situation that needs corrective action?
- Who is to blame for the problem, in the view of the sub-system actors in the debate?
- What should be done? What corrective action should be taken?

Issue frames do not always include a list of policy goals since in some cases the frame of an issue may consist of an agreed-upon set of opposing arguments such as, in training, whether to use training contracts to address youth employment, or in abortion a contest over women's rights vs. fetus rights.
NOTE: The same information used to describe the dominant frame in the qualitative studies can be used to operationalize the issue frame.

Micro-frame – The following four questions should establish the specific micro-frame of a WMA.

APPENDIX 3

- What are the ways the policy problem is defined by the WMA? What is the wrong, injustice, threat or situation that needs corrective action?
- Who is to blame for the problem, in the view of the participants to the debate?
- What should be done? What corrective action should be taken?
- List the policy goals/proposals included advanced by the WMA.

Micro-frames necessarily include the definition of an issue and a set of policy goals or proposals that the actors seek to introduce into policy debates and eventually in the outcome of policies.

APPENDIX 4

APPENDIX 4
CODING NOTES

Compiled by DM and AGM as they code debates, 2/29/03, 3/1/03, 8/28/03, 10/03/03, 12/17/03, 3/01-07/04, 8/25/04, 10/14/04, 12/05/05

GENERAL

1. When coding, coder will maintain a Word file of text variables (in most cases copied from worksheets) instead of string variables. Each will be identified by coding sheet number:

C1A_1 – Women's Movement Actor, Name, Micro-frame: Issue Definition/ Policy Goals
C1A_2 – Women's Movement Actors Issue Definition Policy Goals That are Feminist
C1A_5 – Major Stipulations of Policy Outcome
C2A_1 – WMA Form, Location, and Activities During the Debate
C2A_2 – Information on Beginning of Policy Debate
C3A_1 – Issue frame at the beginning of the debate
C3A_2 – List of gendered ideas in the issue frame at the beginning of the debate
C3A_3 – Issue frame at the end of the debate.
C3A_4 – List of gendered ideas in the issue frame at the end of the debate
C4A_4 – Micro-frames of WPAs by acronym (include QUAWPAs)
C5A_3 – WPA Feminist micro-frames
C8A_1 – WPA Formal/Informal policy orientation and Policy Agenda
C10A_1 – Institutional setting of WPA
C12A_1 – WPA leader(s): name; years; women's movement activity
C13A_1 – Dates, evidence, citation for WMA stage
C16A_1 – List of policy agendas of WMAs for the period of the debate
C20A_1 – Countermovement actors; micro-frames
C23A_1 – List of policy actors in sub-system
C25A_2 – Parties if Single Governing Majority
C25A_3 – Parties if split governing majority: Executive
C25A_4 – Parties if split governing majority: Legislature
C26A_1 – List of Trans-national Advocacy Networks by name
C26A_3 – CEDAW provision on the policy issue under debate

2. For determining which women's movement actors to study, the project has referred to "WMA active or participating in the debate." By this we intend to include a range of activities related to the debate, from taking a position on the issue through active inclusion in the policy sub-system. In short, we are interested in WMAs and what they said and did during the debate.

3. In the coding process, we will check and approve all work on: C1A_1 WMA name, issue definition and policy goal; C2A_5—WMA micro-frames.

4. When coders list WPAs they write it out the first time and then use acronyms.

5. For listing women's policy agencies, when there are multiple agencies under the authority of a single agency, count that as one WPA. For example: Women's Rights Service in France in

APPENDIX 4

1993 was in charge of the Equal Employment Council. They acted as one agency. When there is a change in WPA due to government change, code both separately.

6. The appendices for all coding worksheets will be distributed with the data. We will not distribute the debate/specific or general women's movement worksheets except by special request.

7. On the last page of the coding worksheet, coders will indicate missing data for research assistant to complete.

8. Planned Parenthood as a WMA. We do not count PP organizations in any country or at the International level as a WMA, because the group is not overtly representing women's interests, i.e. not women speaking on the behalf of women, although it does take feminist positions.

9. Feminist Micro-frames. Support of women's right to choose implicitly challenges gender hierarchies, thus should be considered feminist. Explicit use of gender equality is feminist – implicitly challenge gender hierarchies.

10. For all entries with missing data, we coded -4; could not use .999 since it is used for Not Applicable.

11. Coding QUAWPAS in Political Parties. When the arena of the debate is the political party in PR debates and the WPA is a QUAWPA in the party, it is not necessary to gather national level information on the WPAs, unless they were involved with the debate.

12. Counting WPAs. Leave blank values for WPA slots when only there are fewer than 3 WPAs, rather than filling in Not Applicable.

13. Not Applicable. Not Applicable is used, when a secondary answer is dependent on yes in a previous question.

14. Council for Equality for all Finnish Debates. We use the term Council for Equality (CE) for this particular WPA for all of the debates on Finland. Its formal title is Council for Equality Between Women and Men – not clear if it kept this specific title throughout or not.

BY CONCEPT/ VARIABLE

1. C1A_1. In determining, WMA policy goals in micro-frame; in cases where information is not explicit on worksheets, coders extrapolate and summarize based on available information.

2. C1A_2. To construct list of policy goals and issue definitions of women's movement actors that are feminist, coder decides which of the two aspects of the frame match the operational definition of feminist discourses and lists theme in each appendix.

3. C 1_4/6. Non Decisions as Policy Outcomes. In cases of non decision, if the end of the debate rejects an active proposal to change the law, the policy outcome to be coded in C1-6 is the law that is still in force. If the end of the debate is a report with no active effort to change the law, then the policy outcome to be coded is the report.

APPENDIX 4

4. C1_8. When the policy outcome was a non decision, put Not Applicable for whether the policy action fit the feminist goals- and actually we should have Not Applicable on C1_6 as well.

5. C 1_8 Policy Response. WMA Feminist Micro-frame Fit with Policy Outcome in cases where the content of the policy outcome is compatible and threatening to the feminist micro-frames of WMAs, code as incompatible.

6. C2 Procedural Response. In cases where WMAs from outside of the sub-system participate in the established sub-system, if the sub-system is coded as being open to "occasional participants", then these WMA activities should be coded as being in the sub-system at the end of the debate (C2_3).

7. C2_2/C2_4. Proportion of WMA in sub-system. When several WMAs are in a consultative process—e.g., parliamentary testimony, commissions, etc. and there are a significant number of other actors, use 5% as the lowest and then estimate from 5% if there are a significant larger number of WMAs.

8. C2_1/ C2_3. Participation of WMAs in the debate. If only a single individual, as opposed to an organization WMA participated, it does not count.

9. C2_4. Estimating the proportion of women's movement actors who are in the policy sub-system at the end of the debate in terms of the total sub-system actors depends on information on the policy sub-system actors. Look at list of policy sub-system actors (C23A_1) and estimate the proportion of women's movement actors among those actors.

10. C2_5. Using Appendices entries C1A_1 and C1A _2 and the worksheet information on which women's movement actors were in the sub-system, examine the feminist issue definitions and policy goals of those women's movement actors in the sub-system, if there were any at all.

11. C2_5. When there were no WMAs in the sub-system, code Not Applicable for the answer on whether WMA in the sub-system had feminist micro-frames.

12. C3_4A. Gave Not Applicable when issue was not gendered at the beginning of the debate.

13. C4_1 Listing WPAs that have potential to get involved in the debate is determined by whether the issue being debated is in the "policy orientation". An exception is the EO in prostitutions debates in Sweden because it was in the first PT debate.

14. C4_2. What do we mean by women's policy agency "active" in the debate? We decided to include any agency as active which took a position on the specific policy question being debated or were inside the policy sub-system.

15. C4_4B. Gave Not Applicable when issue was not gendered at the end of the debate.

16. C4_4B. If the frame was split between pro and anti feminist positions, the frame at the end of the debate was still counted as being feminist.

APPENDIX 4

17. C4_5,6,7: We are not coding C4_5F which measures if QWAWPA1 advanced a gendered micro-frame during the debate. It is the only one of the WPA questions that has a separate entry just for QUAWPA.

18. C7. WPA Type of Appointment. When the head of an administrative WPA is appointed by a Minister or similar member of the party coalition in the government, it will be coded as a political appointment e.g. Women's Bureau in the Department of Labor.

19. C8. Cross-sectional WPA policy orientation is reserved for the systematic gender mainstreaming mission. Coders should be careful to check worksheets references to "cross-sectional" policy orientation to be sure they refer to this explicit definition.

20. C 10_4 WPA – Policymaking Capacity – Enforcement. Enforcement also includes implementation. If a WPA has no field offices, then no implementation capacity when not indicated in worksheets.

21. C 11_4AA. WPA – Administrative Resources – Separate Budget. For QUAWPAs that are in political parties, code no for separate budget. Minimum budget is .0001% of overall government budget.

22. C11_1BA. Staff positions of WPAs. For WPAs that combine women with family, or other portfolios, we put a proportion of the staff.

23. C12. When there are two WPA heads listed, code the head that is in charge of the day to day management of the WPA. When leadership is shared and either has feminist experience, then code as WMA experience.

24. C12_2A, 2B,... Using appendix C12A_1 and the worksheet entry on WPA leaders, in case where the WPA leader was in a WMA or was a WMA, determine whether the discourse was feminist.

25. C14-1A. When coding organizational closeness to the Left, very close requires both women's sections and women in leadership positions in either the parties or unions or both. This codes presence not degree of closeness within the party. Be careful to review the connections between the party/union sections and the WMAs in general.

26. C17-1. For determining WMA cohesion use C1A_1 to identify the WMA micro-frame that solicits the most agreement among the wm actors in the debate. Agreement here should be interpreted around the general lines of the frame and not specific items. More specifically, either that it was clear that the WMAs had a general consensus on the policy positions and/or issue definition or there was no clear disagreement, i.e., that one or more WMAs did not come out and say they were against the positions of the other WMAs.

27. C18. Women's Movement Actor Location. If the individual who is representing a WMA organization is the only person from that group involved with the debate, then this should be coded as a WMA individual rather than a WMA organization.

APPENDIX 4

28. C19_1. Individual actors do not articulate micro-frames—do not code/eliminate from coding worksheet.

29. C19_1 WMA Feminist Activism C19_1 should have the same answer as 4 or 5. Need to check this.

30. C19_2-9. Use Appendices C1A_1, C1A_2, and C2A_1 to determine whether micro-frames of WMAs in the debate in each location were feminist.

31. C19. WMA Feminist Activism. Answer no for actors that were not involved in the debate, rather than Not Applicable and for actors that did not advance a feminist frame.

32. C20. Countermovement. Taking authors judgment on the three tiered measure. Countermovements consist only of actors that actively mobilize against the entire issue frame, e.g., problem definition and policy goals of given issue. They do not include actors that take stand against different aspects of the issue frame. For example interest that represent employers that oppose equal employment policies for women are not counted as countermovements.

33. C24_1. For coding Issue Frame fit, if the issue frame is presented in terms of a two-sided conflict, women's movement micro-frame may be compatible with one side of the conflict and still coded as matching.

34. C25_5. Governing majority. When there is a change in the majority during the period of the debate, code the majority in power when final action was taken on the policy outcome.

35. C25_7. Party in Power. For country with significant bi-cameral legislatures, primarily the USA, when there are two different majority parties in each house, take the average of the two – centrist in the case of the USA.

36. C26_1. WMA participation in TAN. should be TANs on the issue.

37. C26_3. For coding whether CEDAW requirements coincided with the WM goals, Dorothy and Amy will assess using CEDAW provisions.

38. C26 7-13. Extra-National – National Compliance with EU Policy. National compliance on all different types of EU policy (e.g., directives, recommendations, soft law and out of compliance orders) is to be assessed on the policy outcome for that debate and not national policy in general.

39. C26 8-12. Compliance of National Policy with EU Policy. For all job training debates, Not Applicable, since EU policy directives and other recommendations did not specifically address training – OK for last batch, check previously coded observations on training.

40. C26-11. Extra-national linkages – National Policy Compliance With Soft Law. Soft law includes ECJ decisions.

APPENDIX 4

41. C26-13. Extra-national linkages – EU Out of Compliance Order. Not Applicable indicates that there was no out of compliance order issued against the country.

APPENDIX 5

APPENDIX 5
LIST OF RNGS PUBLICATIONS AND PAPERS

RNGS Project Books

Haussman, Melissa and Birgit Sauer Ed. 2007. *Gendering the State in the Age of Globalization. Women's Movements and State Feminism in Postindustrial Democracies*. Rowman and Littlefield.

Lovenduski, Joni, Ed. 2005. With contributions by Diane Sainsbury, Claudie Baudino, Marila Guadagnini and Petra Meier. *State Feminism and the Political Representation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mazur, Amy. Ed. 2001. *State Feminism, Women's Movements, and Job Training: Making Democracies Work in the Global Economy.* New York and London: Routledge.

McBride, Dorothy E. and Amy G. Mazur with contributions by Joni Lovenduski, Joyce Outshoorn, Birgit Sauer, and Marila Guadagnini. 2010. *The Politics of State Feminism: Innovation in Comparative Research.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

McBride Stetson, Dorothy. Ed. 2001 *Abortion Politics, Women's Movements and the Democratic State: A Comparative Study of State Feminism* .Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Outshoorn, Joyce, Ed. 2004. *The Politics of Prostitution: Women's Movements, Democratic States, and the Globalization of Sex Commerce*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Other Books and Journal Articles Associated with the RNGS Project

Kantola, Johanna and Judith Squires. 2004. "Discourses Surrounding Prostitution Policies in the UK". *European Journal of Women's Studies* 11 (1) pp77-101.

Mazur, Amy G. and Dorothy E. McBride. 2006. "The RNGS Dataset: Women's Policy Agencies, Women's Movements and Policy Debates in Western Postindustrial Democracies" *French Politics*.4 (2).

Mazur, Amy G. and Janine Parry. 1998. "Choosing not to Choose in Comparative Policy Research Design: The Case of the Research Network on Gender, Politics and the State." *Journal of Policy Studies*. 26, 3: 384-395.

McBride, *Dorothy* E. and Amy Mazur. "Women's Movements, Feminism and Feminist Movements. In Goertz and Mazur, eds. *Politics, Gender and Concepts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Forthcoming.

McBride, Dorothy E. and Amy G. Mazur. 2006. "Measuring Feminist Mobilization: Cross-National Convergence and Transnational Networks in Western Europe.". In *Global*

APPENDIX 5

Feminism: Transnational Women's Activism, Organizing, and Human Rights. M.M. Ferree and A.Tripp, eds. 219-246. New York: New York University Press.

McBride Stetson, Dorothy and Amy G. Mazur. 2000. "Women's Movements and the State: Job Training Policy in France and the US." *Political Research Quarterly*. 53 (3). 597-623.

McBride Stetson, Dorothy and Amy G. Mazur "Operationalizing and Measuring Women's Movements in Comparative Research". *APSA-CP. The Newsletter of the Organized Section of Comparative Politics*. Vol. 14 (1) Winter. 2003 (11-14).

Outshoorn, Joyce and Johanna Kantola. Eds. 2007. *Changing State Feminism: Women's Policy Agencies Confront Shifting Institutional Terrain.* London: Palgrave/MacMillan.

Parry, Janine A., 2000. "Putting Feminism to a Vote: The Washington State Women's Council (1963-1978)," *Pacific Northwest Quarterly* 91:171-182.

Parry, Janine A.. 2000. "What Women Wanted: The Arkansas Governors' Commissions on the Status of Women and the ERA," *Arkansas Historical Quarterly* 59:265-298.

Stetson, Dorothy McBride and Amy Mazur, Ed. 1995. *Comparative State Feminism*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Chapters in Mazur, Amy. Ed. 2001. *State Feminism, Women's Movements, and Job Training: Making Democracies Work in the Global Economy.* New York and London: Routledge:

Buchinger, Birgit and Sieglinde Katharina Rosenberger. "A Women- Friendly Employment Administration Pursues Symbolic Policies in Austria., 65-78.

Good, Anne. "Femocrats Work with Feminists and the EU against Gender Bias in Ireland.", 213-234.

Guadagnini, Marlia. "Limited Women's Policy Agency Influence Produces Limited Results in Italy." 131-154.

Holli, Ann Maria. "A Shifting Policy Environment Divides the Impact of State Feminism in Finland." 183-212.

Hoskyns, Catherine. 2001. "Gender Politics in the European Union: The Context for Job Training." 31- 48.

Laatikainen, Katie Verlin. "Caught between Access and Activism in the Multilevel European Union Labyrinth." 79-110.

Mazur, Amy G. "Republican Universalism Resists State Feminist Approaches to Gendered Equality In France." 155-182.

APPENDIX 5

Stetson, Dorothy McBride. “Federal and State Women’s Policy Agencies Help to Represent Women in the United States.” 271-292.

Teghtsoonian, Kathy and Joan Grace. “Something More is Necessary: The Mixed Achievements of Women’s Policy in Canada.” 235-270.

Tobio, Constanza. 2001. “Women’s Strategies and the Family- Employment Relationships in Spain.” 49-64.

Valiente, Celia. “A Closed Sub-system and Distant Feminist Demands Block Women- Friendly Outcomes in Spain.” 111-154.

Chapters in McBride Stetson , Dorothy. Ed. *Abortion Politics, Women's Movements, and the Democratic State*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Calloni, Marina. "Debates and Controversies on Abortion in Italy." 181-204.

Celis, Karen. "The Abortion Debates in Belgium 1974-2000." 39-62.

Haussman, Melissa. "Of Rights and Power: Canada's Federal Abortion Policy 1969-1991." 63-86.

Kamenitsa, Lynn. "Abortion Debates in Germany." 111-134.

Kopl, Regina. "State Feminism and Policy Debates on Abortion in Austria." 17-38.

Mahon, Evelyn. "Abortion Debates in Ireland: An Ongoing Issue." 157-180.

Outshoorn, Joyce. "Policy-Making on Abortion: Arenas, Actors, and Arguments in the Netherlands." 205-228.

Robinson, Jean C. "Gendering the Abortion Debate: The French Case." 87-110.

Stetson, Dorothy McBride. "US Abortion Debates 1959-1998: The Women's Movement Holds On." 247-268.

Stetson, Dorothy McBride. "Women's Movements' Defense of Legal Abortion in Great Britain." 135-156.

Valiente, Celia. "Gendering Abortion Debates: State Feminism in Spain." 229-248.

Chapters in Outshoorn, Joyce, ed. 2004. *The Politics of Prostitution: Women's Movements, Democratic States and the Globalisation of Sex Commerce*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Amir, Delila and Menachem Amir. “The Politics of Prostitution and Trafficking in Women in Israel.” 144-64.

APPENDIX 5

Danna, Daniela. "Italy: the never ending debate." 165-84.

Holli, Anne Maria. "Towards a New Prohibitionism? State Feminism, Women's Movements and Prostitution Policies in Finland." 103-22.

Jeffery, Leslie Ann. Prostitution as Public Nuisance: Prostitution Policy in Canada." 83-102.

Kantola, Johanna and Judith Squires. "Prostitution policies in Britain 1979-1982." 62-82.

Mazur, Amy G. "Prostitute Movements face Elite Apathy and Gender Biased Universalism in France." 123-44.

Outshoorn, Joyce. "Voluntary and Forced Prostitution: The Realistic Approach of the Netherlands." 185-204.

Sauer, Birgit. "Taxes Rights and Representation: Discourses on Prostitution in Austria." 41-61.

Sullivan, Barbara. "The Women's Movement and Prostitution Politics in Australia." 21-40.

Stetson, Dorothy McBride. "The Invisible Issue: Prostitution and the Trafficking of Women and Girls in the United States." 245-64.

Valiente, Celia. "State Feminism and the Central- State Debates on Prostitution in Post-Authoritarian Spain." 205-24.

Chapters in Lovenduski, Joni, Ed. 2005 (with contributions by Diane Sainsbury, Marila Guadagnini, Petra Meier and Claudie Baudino) *State Feminism and Political Representation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Köpl, Regina. "Gendering Political Representation: Debates and Controversies in Austria." 20-40.

Meier, Petra. "The Belgian Paradox: Inclusion and Exclusion of Gender Issues in Politics." 41-61.

Holli, Anne Maria and Johanna Kantola. "A Politics for Presence. State Feminism, Women's Movements and Political Representation in Finland." 62-84.

Baudino, Claudie. "Gendering the Republican System: Debates on Women's Political Representation in France" 85-105.

Kamenitsa, Lynn and Brigitte Geissel. "WPAs and Political Representation in Germany." 106-129.

Guadagnini, Marila. "Gendering the Debate on Political Representation in Italy: a Difficult Challenge." 130-152.

APPENDIX 5

Oldersma, Jantine. “High Tides in a Low Country: Gendering Political Representation in the Netherlands.” 153-173.

Valiente, Celia. “The Women’s Movement, Gender Equality Agencies, and Central-State Debates on Political Representation in Spain (1983-2003).” 174-194.

Sainsbury, Diane. “Party Feminism, State Feminism and Women’s Representation in Sweden.” 195-215.

Lovenduski, Joni..” Party Government and Women’s Representation Debates: the UK.” 216-238.

Parry, Janine A. “Women’s Policy Agencies, the Women’s Movement, and Representation in the U.S.” 239-259

Chapters in Haussman, Melissa and Birgit Sauer Ed. 2007. *Gendering the State in the Age of Globalization. Women's Movements and State Feminism in Postindustrial Democracies*. Rowman and Littlefield.

Aalto, Terhi and Anne Marie Holli. “Debating Day Care in Finland in the Midst of an Economic Recession and Welfare State Downsizing.” 101-120.

Bergvist, Christina. “The Debate about Care Allowance in Lifht of Welfare Stae Reconfiguration.” (Sweden) 245-62

Braun, Katrin. “Women, Embryos, and the Goiod Society: Gendering the Bioethics Debate in Germany.” 147-168

Guadagnini, Marila. “The Reform of the State in Italy.” 169-188

Haussman, Melissa. “New Federalism and Cracked Pillars: the Canadian Health Insurance System under the 2000 Romanow Commission and Beyond.” 79-100

Iwamoto, Misako. “Electoral Reform in the Mid-1990s Japan.” 189-208

Lovenduski, Joni. “The UK: Reforming the House of Lords.” 263-280

Mazur, Amy. “Thirty-five-Hour Hour Work-Week Reforms in France, 1997-2000: Strong Feminist Demands, Elite Apathy, and Disappointing Outcomes”. 121-146

McBride, Dorothy E. “Welfare Reform: America’s Hot Issue”. 281-300

Oldersma, Jantine and Joyce Outshoorn. “The ‘Home Care Gap’: Neoliberalism, Feminism and the State in the Netherlands.” 209-226

Sauer, Birgit. “Reevaluating the ‘Heart of Society’: Family Policy in Austria.” 19-38

APPENDIX 5

Sullivan, Barbara. "Feminism and Indigenous Rights in Australia in the 1990s." 39-58

Valiente, Celia. "The Women's Movement, State Feminism and Unemployment Reform in Spain, 2002-2003." 227-244

Woodward, Alison. "Speedy Belgians: the New Nationality Law of 2000 and the Impact of the Women's Movement." 59-78

Papers

Government Allies for Gender Equality: A Transatlantic Dialog. 2005. RNGS Mini-Conference at the Institute of Women's Policy Research's 8th Annual International Policy and Research Conference, June 2005. Conference packet available at http://libarts.wsu.edu/polisci/rngs.

Mazur, Amy. 2005. **"**The Impact of Women's Participation and Leadership on Policy Outcomes: A Focus on Women's Policy Machineries". Presented at the Expert Group Meeting on Equal Participation of Women and Men in Decision-making Processes, with Particular Emphasis on Political Participation and Leadership. United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (DESA), Division for the Advancement of Women (DAW), Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, October 24-27.

McBride, Dorothy and Amy Mazur. 2005. "Comparative Study of Women's Movements: Conceptual Puzzles and RNGS Solutions". American Political Science Association Meeting, Washington D.C., September.

McBride, Dorothy and Amy Mazur. 2006. "Women's Movements, Women's Policy Agencies and Democratization " Council for European Studies Meeting, Chicago, March.

McBride, Dorothy and Amy Mazur. 2006. "Building a (data) Bank While Crossing the Bridge: RNGS Strategies to Integrate Qualitative and Quantitative Methods". British Journal of Political Science Anniversary Conference, London. June.

APPENDIX 6
PROJECT DESCRIPTION FOR QUALITATIVE PHASE OF RNGS STUDY

Abridged RNGS Project Description[1]

Research Problem

The goal of this project is to conduct a cross-national study of the role of women's policy agencies in the democratization of postindustrial democracies. It builds on the findings of the comparative state feminism project as reported in *Comparative State Feminism* (Stetson & Mazur 1995). This project explores the patterns of interaction between women's movements and the state by examining consequences of agency activities for substantive and descriptive representation of women in the policy making process. The goal is to develop empirically verified theoretical propositions cross-nationally applicable to postindustrial democracies.

Women's policy agencies are those state institutions charged formally with furthering women's status and sex-based equality. Democratic governments have established these agencies in response to women's movement demands. What we call women's policy agencies the United Nations calls machineries for the advancement of women (Rai 2003). Many terms have been used to label these state apparati, including equality offices (Scandinavia and Italy), equal opportunities units (the EU and the UK), emancipation departments (the Netherlands), women's bureaus and commissions (the USA and Canada), women's rights or women's affairs ministries (France and Germany), and more generally state feminist offices (Stetson & Mazur 1995). *Postindustrial democracies* are the 23 or so countries which have relatively similar levels of high national wealth, similarly large service, or "post-fordist" economies, a stable nation-state, and a well-established tradition of representative democratic institutions, and/or the emergence of stable democratic institutions since World War II.[2]

Theoretical Foundations

This study is based on a synthesis of several strands of theory – democratic representation, institutionalism, and social movement – with an analysis of gender and feminist politics. The research findings will stimulate a new area of comparative inquiry on postindustrial democracies. Specifically, it provides an opportunity to examine the intersection between social movements, bureaucratic agencies, and the expansion of democratic decision making processes.

Democratic representation

Democracies are assessed in terms of the extent to which they achieve inclusion of societal interests, in other words their representativeness (Pitkin 1967; Phillips 1991, 1995; Parenti 1974; Inglehart 1990; Mény 1992; Elshtain 1983). Feminist critiques of democracy in postindustrial societies (Pateman 1988; Phillips 1991; Hernes 1987) and non-feminist critiques (Parenti 1974; Inglehart 1990; Mény 1992; Schattschneider 1960; Bachrach and Baratz 1970; Edelman 1985)

---

1 The Project Description functions as a guide to the project and remains a working document. For the complete and most recent version see the RNGS website: http://libarts.wsu.edu/polisci/rngs

2 The concept postindustrial democracy is used instead of advanced industrialized democracy to avoid normative implications of comparing the "first world" to the "third world". For more on postindustrial democracies see Esping-Andersen 1993, 1999, Wiarda 2000 and Wilensky 2002.

APPENDIX 6

have put into question the extent to which contemporary free-market democracies with their highly developed welfare states are actually democratic. Critics of contemporary postindustrial democracies argue that in reaching high levels of economic wealth these systems have excluded major sectors of society from economic resources and political rights.

Pitkin suggests four types of representation: *authorized*, where a representative is legally empowered to act for another; *descriptive* representation, where the representative stands for a group by virtue of sharing similar characteristics such as race, gender or ethnicity, or residence; *symbolic* representation where a leader stands for national ideas; and *substantive* representation where the representative seeks to advance a group's policy preferences and interests. Both descriptive and substantive representation are useful for comparing the extent to which policy processes in democratic regimes include existing societal interests and demands.

New institutionalism

While it is conventional to think about descriptive and substantive representation in democracies in terms of either electoral or interest group politics, public administration scholars identified with the public bureaucracy movement in the United States (e.g. Wilson 1989, Derthick 1990) assert that focusing on bureaucratic agencies sheds "light on democracy's critical processes" (Kettl 1993, 421). Likewise, students of comparative public administration argue for an organizational focus in understanding "the course and meanings of public policy in contemporary democracy" (Peters 1992, 283). Gray (1988) and Peters (1992) both point out that there is a "dearth of systematic analysis on the role of bureaucracies in making policy" (Peters 1992, 285). The new institutionalism also directs attention to the role of state institutions in advancing or limiting representation. As March and Olsen assert: "The bureaucratic agency, the legislative committee, and the appellate court are arenas for contending social forces, but they are also collections of standard operating procedures and structures that define and defend interests. They are political actors in their own right." (1984, 738). This institutional approach is new because it challenges the view, popular among political theorists since the 1950s, that state institutions are neutral, at the mercy of exogenous social influences, or merely the aggregate expression of rational individual actors. By positing that state institutions other than legislatures may be causal factors in policy and politics, the institutional approach also shifts attention to the links among structures within the state and between state structures and societal groups. In terms of democratic theory, the question from an institutionalist perspective becomes: How do state institutions affect democratic politics?

Social movement theory

The institutional approach also challenges the assumption that policy outputs, e.g., statutes, budgets, and programs, are the most important concern of social movements. Rather, it brings into the analysis the process of institutional change itself as an equally important focus. In this, it is compatible with developments in social movement theory. For the most part, scholars have tended to conceptualize social movement success as either an immediate policy response or the ability of a movement to sustain itself over time. The most common focus is on the movement itself and its ability to influence policy and public opinion (Staggenborg 1991). Less attention has been paid to bureaucratic institutions created in response to movement demands. Indeed, participation of movement activists in state institutions has frequently been interpreted as co-optation (Piven & Cloward 1979). A different perspective is offered by Rochon and Mazmanian who point out that *process change* involving the government's recognition of protest groups and

APPENDIX 6

the development of "mechanisms for dialogue and collaboration between government and political organizations" places social movements in a position to reach policy change (1993, 77).

In the literature on social movements in postindustrial democracies, few studies have tackled the question of social movement impact on the state; even fewer studies have been longitudinal, comparative or both (McAdam, McCarthy &, Zald, 1988; 1996; Rochon, 1990; Rochon and Mazmanian, 1993; Quadagno, 1992; Giugni, 1995; Giugni, McAdam & Tilly, 1999). Most rare in this literature are studies of links between movement activists and agencies inside the state. Gamson's study (1975) continues to provide the basis for most movement impact studies. His typology is based on two variables: (a) substantive responses – whether or not the state changes the content of policy to answer movement demands and (b) procedural acceptance – whether or not the state accepts social movement organizations as legitimate representatives for movement interests in the policy making process.

Work on women's movements mirrors the broader social movement literature (Beckwith 2000). Some have used social movement theory to analyze a single movement (Ferree & Hess 1994; Whittier 1995; Ryan 1992; Buechler 1986; Lovenduski & Randall 1993; Costain 1992; Staggenborg 1991). Some literature focuses on movements in more than one country. These studies are usually historical and descriptive (Kaplan 1992) or compiled in edited volumes which have common themes without a common theoretical framework (e.g., Katzenstein and Mueller, 1987; Dahlerup, 1986b; Ferree and Yancey, 1995; Bystydzienski 1992; Threlfall 1996; Bull, Diamond, and Marsh 2000). A few studies have generated comparative propositions about the interaction between the movement and government but these focus primarily on the content of policy rather than changes in institutions and process (Bashevkin 1994, 1996; Gelb 1987, 1989; Banaszak, 1996; Beckwith, 1985, 1987; Lycklama, Vargas & Wieringa 1998). Another more recent study examines how changes in democratic states affect movement strategies (Banaszak et al. 2003). With very little specific exploration of how women's movements interact with government and, in turn, how the state responds structurally, work on women's policy has tended to criticize state policies and to generate prescriptions about how to make more "women-friendly" policy (e.g., Boneparth and Stoper 1988; Bussemaker and Voet 1998; Conway et. al., 1987; Dolors and Monk 1996; Drew et al. 1998; Hantrais 2000; Kaplan 1992; Lewis 1997; Lovenduski 1986; Meehan and Sevenhuisjen 1991; Singh 1998; Walby 1997).

A growing body of work shows that governments in all postindustrial democracies responded to second-wave movement demands by creating women's policy offices that, at least on paper, have had some feminist-oriented focus (see, for example, Siim, 1991; Sawer, 1990, 1993; Eisenstein, 1990 and 1996; Outshoorn, 1994; Pringle and Watson, 1992; Franzway et al, 1989; Stetson and Mazur, 1995, 2000; Borchorst, 1986; Ferree, 1991-92; Dahlerup, 1993; Kamenitsa, 1997; Valiente 1995; Lycklama, Vargas & Wieringa 1998). Women's policy agencies offer the potential for the state to ally with women's movement activists to produce state responses that advance the movement's goals. As yet, studies of social movements in general, or women's movements in particular, do not provide a framework for integrating research on the women's movement with the growing body of scholarship on women's policy agencies.

RNGS Model of Women's Policy Agency Activism/Movement Impact

APPENDIX 6

To study the impact of women's movements, frameworks must direct research attention in a way that will produce a comprehensive picture of the subject. For one thing, models must allow for study of impact over time. Activities of the women's movements, waxing and waning, may range over many decades. In addition, any approach to the comparative study of women's movement impact must take into account the great diversity of ideas, organizations and activities that have constituted women's movements in democratic states since the 1970s. And, since governments have established women's policy machinery in response to these movements, the models guiding research must take this type of state response into account. As they stand, the conventional models based on resource mobilization, political opportunity structure, culture theory, and new social movements, individually and in combination, are of limited use. The RNGS model builds on past research and offers a new approach.

RNGS MODEL
Unit of Analysis: Policy Debate

INDEPENDENT VARIABLES
Women's Movement Actor Characteristics: Stage; Closeness to Left; Issue priority; Cohesion; Location; Feminist Activism
Policy Environment:
Policy Sub-system: Structure; Issue Frame Fit:
Party/coalition in power; Countermovement

INTERVENING VARIABLES
Women's Policy Agency Characteristics: Scope; Type; Proximity; Administrative Capacity; Leadership; Policy Mandate
Women's Policy Agency Activities: (Insider, Marginal, Non-feminist, Symbolic)

DEPENDENT VARIABLE
Women's Movement Impact/State Response: (Dual Response, Co-optation, Pre-emption; No Response)

The RNGS model adapts and augments the conventional models to overcome their weaknesses for the comparative study of the impact of women's movements. In the first place, rather than using the nation-state at the unit of analysis, as the conventional model does, the unit of analysis in this study is a policy debate that leads to some type of state action. The focus is the effect of movement-related activities on problem definition, policy content, and the policy making processes. Using the policy debate as the unit of analysis permits longitudinal study of the women's movement and state interactions as well as analysis across issues and policy arenas within the state. Thus, whether or not there are national differences in movement impact becomes a matter for empirical study rather than an assumption of the model.

The researchers involved in the RNGS project have developed this model as a guide to data collection and analysis in this cross-national comparative study. Categories from democratic representation and social movement impact theories are synthesized into typologies to measure the intervening and dependent variables: women's policy agency activities and women's movement impact. At the same time, these typologies analytically separate the variations in agency activities from the state's policy and procedural responses to permit examination of the

APPENDIX 6

effects of one on the other. They also separate substantive representation from descriptive representation.

Women's Movements and Feminist Movements: Nominal Definitions

Note: At the beginning of data collection on the qualitative phase of the project, RNGS did not offer an operational definition of women's movements or of feminism, since the researchers were working in such varied contexts, but rather asked researchers to classify those ideas and activists who self identify with women's and feminist movements in each political system. The expectation was that the research findings would reveal the extent to which there is a set of feminist beliefs common to across the majority of the cases. However, due to lack of common guidelines, this approach proved ineffective. Thus, the researchers agreed to a working definition of feminism for the purpose of further study in the project, including the quantitative phase. This discussion is in Appendix 4 of the Codebook.

Framing and Gendering Policy Debates: Definition and Measurement.

Framing

This study conceptualizes the policy making process in democratic systems as a conflict of ideas, focusing on issues and the modes of defining problems. Attention is directed to the argument among policy actors over what problems deserve attention and what should be done about them. This study assumes that the struggle over the definition of public policy is at the center of the political forces in democracies. Society based groups and state actors line-up around the definition of policy issues in a certain light that often reflects their own positions and aims. Although there are different terms for the competition over political meaning in the policy arena – universe of political discourse, *référentiel*, framing, issue definition – analysts agree on the connection between problem definition and political participation and, eventually, policy outcomes (Schattschneider 1960; Kingdon 1995; Cobb & Elder 1983; Schneider & Ingram 1993; Muller 1990). In this study, we use the term framing to capture the way in which actors define policy issues in terms of problems and policy goals.

The way policies are framed favors some interests over others (Przeworski 1991; Schattschneider 1960; Cobb & Elder 1983; Schneider & Ingram 1993). A change in framing constitutes one form of process change because it brings interests of new groups into the policy discourse and changes substantive representation. Framing issues to recognize new groups' interests also gives those groups a basis for participation in policy processes which would increase their descriptive representation. With respect to women's representation, changes in the framing of debates to recognize gender roles brings interests of women into the policy making arena. At the same time it gives groups of women justification for participation. Policy debates that ignore gender roles deny women both substantive representation and the basis for increased descriptive representation. Thus, gendering policy debates is one form of process change, and it provides the basis for a second form of process change: increased participation by groups of women in the policy making process.

Gender is a concept that has acquired several different meanings (Harding 1986). As originally adapted for social science, it provided a way to distinguish between biological sexual differences and the cultural and social meanings attached to those differences (Nelson 1989). For this study, we propose a definition that arises from the assumption that gender refers to meaning or ideas

APPENDIX 6

people attach to biological and demographic differences between men and women. Gender representations are found by studying the ideas people express about men and women in asymmetrical (uneven) relation to each other. In this research therefore, gender has empirical referents (i.e. expressions of ideas, meaning) that are different from referents for the concepts sex (biological characteristics) and women (demographic characteristics). Gendering refers to the process whereby phenomena, such as identities, observations, entities, and processes acquire symbols based on gender (ideas about men and women). Gendered debates, therefore, are those policy debates explicitly framed in terms of ideas about how the problem and proposed solutions will affect women in comparison with men.

Determining whether a debate is framed in terms of gender adds these questions to the policy debate schema:

a. What are the ways the policy problem is defined by actors? To what extent is the wrong, injustice, threat or situation that needs corrective action described as a harm to women in their gender roles? Are women or groups of women identified as interested parties with stakes in the possible policy outcomes?
b. Who is to blame for the problem, in the view of the participants to the debate? Are gender-identified groups or entities considered to be responsible for the wrongs, injustices or threat?
c. What should be done? What corrective action should be taken? How do proposals for corrective action take gender questions into account? Are there expressions of concern about the effect on women in relation with men?

With respect to the women's movement and the WPA, the model brings the notion of *gendering* of policy debates to the fore, questioning whether or not the women's policy agency influences the terms of the debate to insert ideas of gender into the definition of policy problems. Following Schattschneider and others (Przeworski 1991; Schneider & Ingram 1993; Cobb & Elder 1983; Jenson 1988), the model sets forth the proposition that WPAs may facilitate the goals of the women's movement within the state, not only by advocating its agenda, but by changing the terms of debate to recognize gender roles and bring interests of groups of women into the policy making arena. In other words, the WPA may attempt to reframe the debate to follow the demands of women's movement actors.

To describe and compare agencies' activities we propose a typology of women's policy agency activity based on two variables: whether or not the agency is an advocate for women's movement goals in the policy making process on the issue and whether or not the agency is effective in changing the frame of the debate to these terms.

Dependent Variable: Movement Impact/State Response

To measure the impact of the women's movement representatives on the state we start with Gamson's typology (1975) and apply it to the unit of analysis, the policy debate leading to state action. The typology is based on two variables: (a) substantive responses – whether or not the state changes the content of policy to answer movement demands and (b) procedural acceptance – whether or not the state accepts social movement organizations as legitimate representatives for movement interests in the policy making process. We retain the substantive indicator and expand the procedural variable to include descriptive representation; thus we look for the presence of individual women who may forward women's issues in the policy debate along with

APPENDIX 6

organized groups and assess whether they represent the women's movement and if so, which part. Both the individuals and the formal and informal organizations are women's movement actors.

There are four categories in the new typology measuring impact: Dual response is where the state both accepts individual women, groups, and/or constituencies representing gender interests into the process and changes policy to coincide with feminist goals; Cooptation is when the state accepts the individual women, groups, and/or constituencies into the process but does not give policy satisfaction; Preemption is when the state gives policy satisfaction, but does not allow women, as individuals, groups or constituencies into the process; No response is the vacant cell where the state has no procedural or substantive response to movement demands.

Policy Response, Procedural Response and Process Change: Definition and Measurement
Measurement of policy response in the model involves comparing the provisions of government action with the goals of the women's movement activists as they are elaborated in the micro-frames of the WMAs through assessing to what degree the policy outcomes of debates fit or match WMA goals. Policy content fit, is based on the concept of "goodness of fit" developed by Risse, Cowles and Caporaso (2001) in their study of Europeanization of national policy. Here, the extent to which the content of the policy outcome "fits" the policy goals in the micro-frame of WMAs during the debate indicates whether the WM as a whole has a positive impact on state policy responses, in other words whether the state has responded through policy outcomes to the women's movement. To measure the procedural response, the model includes all actors presenting women's movement discourse in the search for procedural change. This could include individuals inside and outside the state, but excludes officials of women's policy agencies.

Participation includes formal participation at governmental sites, such as being appointed to a decision-making or recommending body or being present at those times when issues are debated and resolved to form policy, and less formal types of participation such as claims making, that is, the articulation of needs and demands. Participation by women's movement actors in policy processes includes individual women, formal and informal organizations, and women's constituencies. It is important to note that, in order to be counted on this dimension, individual women, women's constituencies and women's groups must be actively advancing some aspects of women's interests in the policy debate under study in line with women's movement discourse defined in this study. Also, to determine whether there were or were not women's movement actors accepted into the process there must be evidence of a critical mass of actors participating.

Intervening Variable Construct
To study the influence and effects of women's policy agencies on the success or failure of women's movement activists, the researchers have developed a typology of activities and examine ways in which the agencies activities vary according to their different characteristics. Therefore this construct is composed of three variables: two compose the typology and the third describes the agencies' characteristics.

Women's Policy Agency Activities Typology

APPENDIX 6

The activities of the Women's Policy Agencies are observed in the complex process of how debates unfold and become sites around which various state and society interests mobilize to eventually change or defend the general terms of the issue frames. The Women's Policy Agency Activities (WPAA) typology addresses the role and effect of women's policy agencies as potential allies of the women's movement within the state in each policy debate. Are these agencies representatives of women's movements inside the state? Or are these agencies examples of the state's efforts to control or 'deal with' the movement without changing process or policy? Do agencies affect changes in state operations and policies to integrate women's movement activists and goals?

The WPAA typology looks not only at the goals advocated by agency staff in a particular policy debate, but also at the agency's effectiveness in changing problem definition, that is, the "mobilization of bias" (Schattschneider 1960) likely to determine what is done and who gets access in each policy debate. This produces four categories for measuring the role of the women's policy agency (WPA) in representing feminist claims: Insider. – WPA incorporates women's movement goals into its own positions on the policy issue and is successful in gendering, that is, inserting these gendered policy definitions into the dominant frame of the public debate on the issue; Marginal – WPA asserts movement goals, but is not successful in gendering the policy debate; Non-feminist – WPA is not an advocate for movement goals but genders or degenders policy debates in some other ways; and Symbolic – WPA is neither an advocate for movement goals in the policy process nor does it gender policy definitions on the issue.

Women's Policy Agency Characteristics

Data on the characteristics of the women's policy agencies themselves will be collected to see if certain characteristics are associated with role of these agencies as insiders, marginal, non-feminist or symbolic. We identify six different dimensions to this variable: scope, type, proximity, administrative capacity, leadership, and policy mandate. As institutions, these vary according to time and place. Scope may be single issue or cross-section or other. Types of agencies include those that are based on political appointments or established through bureaucratic channels or lay panels. The proximity of WPAs to major power centers in their institutional settings may be near or distant. In terms of administrative capacity, some have extensive staff, separate administrative divisions, field offices, subsidies earmarked for women's groups, and budgets; others may be part-time committees or individuals. The degree of capacity should be based on comparison to other WPAs within each country. Agency heads – leadership – may be feminist at some times or reluctant to recognize feminist connections at others. Beyond the mandate of a given policy office, an agency's leadership often selects a particular issue of focus that dictates the major policy orientations of the WPA. Researchers may find other characteristics of women's policy agencies to be important in addition to this list. Researchers should provide evidence for how they arrived at their assessments. For determining administrative capacity researchers may want to use the WPA with highest level of administrative capacity as a benchmark for determining the capacity of other offices. The existence of separate administrative divisions, field offices and subsidies for women's groups are particularly interesting indicators for administrative capacity.

Independent Variables

APPENDIX 6

Conventional approaches for comparing effects of social movements typically focus on two sets of independent variables: 1) characteristics of the social movements in resource mobilization theory and culture theory; and 2) characteristics of the environment through theories about political opportunity structure (POS) and new social movements (Giugni 1995). Similarly, many comparative studies of women's movement politics are guided by these approaches (e.g., Haussman, 1992; Banaszak, 1996; Gelb, 1987, 1989). The RNGS model keeps the characteristics of social movement variables and adapts the POS to a more useful concept for this study – policy environment. The list of indicators for these two clusters of variables to be used in the empirical cases is located at the end of the project description.

Women's Movement Actor Characteristics

With respect to characteristics of the women's movement that may affect state responses, RNGS is interested in stage, closeness to the Left, priority of issues, cohesion, strength of countermovements, the location of movement actors, and whether they are feminist; all characteristics that are likely to vary over time. Some of these tap factors included in the resource mobilization and POS models, for example, movement organization and allies and support groups.

Values for this variable are developed on worksheet III by first mapping out women's movement actors. Using a combined measure of size, opinion support and mobilization, a study of the USA movement (Rosenfeld and Ward 1996) found three stages: abeyance/emergence, growth, and consolidation/decline. Here these are modified to account for distinctions between abeyance emergence and consolidation and decline: Stages are: emerging/reemerging; growth, consolidation, decline/abeyance. Closeness to the Left refers to both ideology and organizational closeness to political parties and trade unions associated with the left and may be very close, close or not close. Priority of issue to the movement agenda indicates the attention devoted to each policy debate by movement activists and may be high, moderate, low or not on the agenda. Cohesion of the movement around the issue refers to the unity of movement organizations during the policy process. The location of movement actors is determined by identifying where the women's movement actors are working from: autonomous groups, within political parties or trade unions, or individual actors, such as experts or parliamentarians.

Policy Environment

The Policy Environment (PE) substitutes for the more general, and oft-criticized (e.g., Gamson and Meyer 1996) system-wide concept of Political Opportunity Structure of the conventional model. PE focuses attention on the possibilities for social movement influence in a particular policy area in a particular period of time. There are two aspects of the Policy Environment which may affect the state's response to the women's movement: policy sub-system and party in power. The **policy sub-system** houses the decision-making activities in a particular policy area during a particular policy cycle. First identified by Ernest F. Griffith in 1939, policy sub-systems exist around functional areas of policy and consist of "whirlpools of special social interests and problems (cited in Anderson 1994, 74). There are two significant aspects of the policy sub-system that can account for variations in movement success and WPA effectiveness: (1) Structure of the sub-system and (2) fit of the dominant conceptual framework used by sub-system actors with women's movement and/or WPA goals. Whereas the structure of a given policy sub-system addresses the institutional rules of the game, assessing the fit of the frame at

APPENDIX 6

the policy sub-system level, amongst one or several different policy communities, provides a way of assessing the influence of the dominant norms and attitudes of a given policy sub-system, that is, the culture of the various policy actors that mobilize around a given issue, on women's movement impact and WPA activities. .

Structure

Building from the concept of iron triangles and taking Heclo's (1978) notion of issues networks into account, Anderson (1994, 75) suggests that different types of policy sub-systems can be arranged along a continuum based on levels of organization and openness. At one end of the continuum are found more closed and structured policy sub-systems like iron triangles,"…with their limited participation, resistance to external influences and preoccupation with material interest." (Ibid.). Here there is usually a single community of policy actors. At the opposite end of the spectrum policy sub-systems would take on the shape of an issue network "with its amorphousness, wide and changing participation, issue experts, unclearness about who is in control." (Ibid). In this looser scenario, it is possible to several different policy communities coming together. Based on its organization, participation and power balance, therefore, a sub-system may be open (a network), moderately closed (a community), and closed (an institution). To illustrate, where as job training issues in the RNGS project tend to generate a single set of actors that mobilize around the issue in state and society based on employment power relations, including labor and management, prostitution issues tend to be defined by several different policy communities, health, criminal justice, foreign affairs, women's rights, etc..

Issue Frame Fit

Actors mobilize around specific definitions, what is called here the issue frame, of a given policy issue over time at the sub-system level. Such frames can be welcoming to the women's movement activists or hostile. In this study, it is important to determine to what degree the dominant issue frame forwarded in each debate actually fits the goals of the women's movements actors presented in the debate on that particular issue and, where relevant, the WPAs. Research shows that the support of non feminist decision makers, sometimes "male allies" (Eisenstein 1996), for women's movement demands is an important factor in policy success (e.g. Mazur 2002). At the same time, movement activists will find it extremely difficult to influence debate frames when the dominant frame is opposed to the movement's views. Occasionally, especially when a new policy problem emerges, the actors will not agree on a common set of norms and perspectives. In those cases, the policy debate itself may be not only about a policy proposal but over the proper frame in which to deal with it. Whatever frame is found on a given debate, researchers should compare it to the women's movement's frame (micro-frame) on the policy to determine the issue frame fit: matching; compatible, or incompatible.

Party in power

Along with the policy sub-system, the party in power when the policy debate is under consideration provides a more or less sympathetic policy environment. In democracies where parties can be placed on a continuum ranging from Left to right, and where Left signifies parties that are more likely to promote agendas that emphasize greater political, social and economic equality than parties of the right, Left parties are considered to be more receptive to social movements. Many scholars hypothesize that women's movements are more effective when

APPENDIX 6

parties of the Left are in power (e.g., Bashevkin 1998; Beckwith 1985). Whether or not this is supported by the data will be a result of the RNGS project. This factor directs researchers to note the party/parties who set policy direction for the Government during the period of each policy debate.

Countermovement

The strength of any countermovement women's movement actors face is likely to affect both their strategies and their effectiveness. In earlier versions of the project model and in the published issue books, RNGS included countermovement as a women's movement characteristic. No matter how important opposition may be in affecting movement actions, by definition, it is not a feature of the movement. At the same time, it is not, technically, a part of the policy environment, that is it does not necessarily have the political characteristics similar to party in power, structure and issue frame fit. Thus while listed under policy environment here, in the cross issue and longitudinal analysis of the policy debates the countermovement may be considered separately.

Hypotheses

The RNGS model enables researchers to posit a set of hypotheses for empirical analysis. To summarize, the model names state responses to movement activists' demands in policy debates as the dependent variable, using a modified version of Gamson's typology to measure the variations. Characteristics of women's movement actors and the policy environments are the independent variables. The intervening variables are the degree of effectiveness of women's policy offices on specific policy debates in relation to their institutional capacities. The research question is: To what extent and under what circumstances do different kinds of women's policy offices provide necessary and effective linkages for women's movements in achieving substantive and procedural responses from the state? The hypotheses will be examined in the following order

> H1. Women's movement activists in democratic states have tended to be successful in increasing both substantive representation as demonstrated by policy content and procedural/descriptive representation as demonstrated by women's participation.
>
> H2. Women's movement activists in democratic states have tended to be more successful where women's policy agencies have acted as insiders in the policy-making process, that is, have gendered policy debates in ways that coincide with women's movement goals.
>
> H3. Women's policy agencies with institutional capacity as defined by type, proximity, administrative capacity and mandate have been more effective than agencies with fewer resources and less capacity in providing linkages between women's movements and policy makers.
>
> H4. Variations in women's movement representatives' characteristics and/or policy environments explain variations in both women's policy agency effectiveness and movement activists' success in increasing women's representation.

APPENDIX 6

H5. Women's policy offices have tended to provide necessary and effective linkages between women's movement activism and substantive and procedural responses by democratic states.

H6A. If women's policy offices are necessary and effective linkages between movement activism and state substantive and procedural responses, then variations in movement resources and policy environments will have no independent relation to state responses.

H6B. If women's policy offices are not necessary and effective linkages between movement activism and state substantive and procedural responses, then variations in women's movement resources and policy environments will be directly related to variations in state responses, regardless of women's policy office activities.

Policy Issues: Criteria and Selection

The parent study of RNGS, *Comparative State Feminism* (Stetson & Mazur 1995), sought to compare effects of women's policy agencies by examining the same policy area in every country case study (equal employment policy). There were many problems with this approach, so the RNGS group decided that the next stage of the project should examine several policy issues across time and cross-nationally to gain a more comprehensive picture of agency activities. They agreed to study the following issues about which states make policy: job training, abortion, prostitution, political representation, and a hot issue – a topic high on the public agenda in the 1990s but which can vary cross nationally. The RNGS researchers in Leiden (1995) selected all but the hot issue from categories of policy problems that have a gendered dimension, in that they organize the relation of women and men to each other. Issues were drawn from these gendered dimensions: (1) the division of labor in the home and work place; (2) human reproduction; (3) sexuality; and (4) citizenship rights. Public problems that affect people according to the gendered division of labor in the home and at work include labor issues and family laws. Public questions raised by family planning, abortion and contraceptive practices, and new reproductive technologies pertain to gender differences in reproduction. Political regulation of sexuality is expressed in laws about prostitution, pornography, and rape. Constitutional provisions regulating opportunities to attain citizenship, vote and to gain both substantive and descriptive representation in decision making arenas are all issues of citizenship rights.

The following criteria were used to select issues from these four categories. 1. Cross national comparability. Policy making on the subject must have occurred in the political arenas of each country since the establishment of the women's policy machinery. At the same time, the issues need not have the same salience in each system. 2. Capability of being both gendered and non-gendered. Issues must not be inherently gendered in the sense that it is impossible to discuss them without explicit reference to gendered characteristics of people. Using these criteria, the RNGS directors selected four issues from which a representative sample of policy debates will be drawn for all 15 systems; each issue is primarily associated with one of the gendered dimensions: job training representing division of labor; abortion representing reproduction; political representation representing citizenship rights and prostitution representing sexuality. All meet the criterion of cross-national comparability. In addition, policy debates about each may be explicitly framed in non-gendered terms. For example, abortion problems may focus on the

APPENDIX 6

rights of the fetus against medical practice. Prostitution may be viewed as a health problem or a matter of public decency. Job training debates may involve problems of budgetary expenses.

RNGS has opted to study a fifth issue to assess the overall importance of gender to political debates of prominent national significance in the democracies under study, not necessarily explicitly based on gendered dimensions. The hot issue is to be selected from the most controversial domestic issues in each country during the period from 1990 to the present in terms of attention paid to them, degree of conflict generated, and potential numbers of affected people. To provide a basis for comparison, the policy debates to be studied must represent a significant change in the configuration of state/society relations.

Research Plan/Methods

Approach to the Research Problem: The Comparative Method

The comparative method employs in-depth analysis of a small number of cases to investigate research questions about phenomena of interest, to search for diverse patterns of explanation, and to determine whether there are general patterns of variation and explanation cross-nationally. The case-oriented comparative method has been classified as one of the qualitative methods in contrast to quantitative comparative approaches which use large numbers of cases to test general hypotheses. Our group selected the comparative method because the questions of interest are best understood through "close analysis of relatively few observations." (Collier 1991, 7). At the same time, careful attention to design allows such qualitative research to make important contributions to scientific inquiry and theory building (King, Keohane, and Verba 1994).

Essays elaborating the comparative method reveal its strengths and weaknesses (Chilcote 1994; Collier 1991; Collier and Mahon 1993; Lijphart 1971, 1975; Mayer 1989; Ragin 1987; King, Keohane, & Verba 1994). The strength of the method is that it permits the study of complex phenomena over time while grounding observations in diverse cultural contexts of the country case studies. According to Collier (1991), however, the usefulness of any method is its "capability to sort out rival explanations." King, Keohane and Verba (1994) assess qualitative research plans according to the project's ability to make valid scientific inferences. In meeting these criteria, scholars using the comparative method face a dilemma. To increase explanatory power, researchers should try to increase the number of cases or units to be studied. The comparative method, with its requirements of detailed investigation into each case, presents a daunting challenge to individual scholars. For example, it is rare that an individual has both the necessary expertise in language and culture and the time to collect information on a research question in more than one or two cases. In addition, increasing the number of cases requires increased resources. "Conceptual stretching," that is, the over-extension of concepts to many cultural contexts, threatens to undermine the explanatory benefits (Sartori 1970; Collier & Mahon 1993). The comparative method has also been selected to make it possible to turn the qualitative data into quantitative measures, suitable for statistical analysis of the study's hypotheses.

To explore a small number of cases while at the same time enhancing the potential for contributing to general knowledge, the international network of researchers works from this common research design. Thus, the number of cases for analysis can be increased without

APPENDIX 6

placing undue language, resource, or time demands on any one of the participating investigators. Each investigator's separate study is a valuable contribution in its own right, but the intensive coordination process makes the whole more valuable than the sum of its parts, especially for systematic comparative analysis.

To minimize the problem of conceptual stretching, researchers collaborate at all stages: the development of research questions, the elaboration and operationalization of key concepts, the analysis of policy debates for each issue area; and the final comparative analysis. Every stage of the cross-national study of women's policy offices and democratization requires the combined work of the project directors in this proposed study and researchers in the larger RNGS project.

Research tasks

Investigators trace the role of the women's policy machinery in gendering debates on five policy issues: political representation, job training, abortion, prostitution and the hot issue. In each country the research tasks are: (1) to construct an inventory of women's policy agencies; (2) to select a representative list of policy debates on each issue; (3) to analyze debates in order to determine the extent to which they are gendered and describe the role of the women's policy agency in the debate; (4) to study women's movement actors' participation in the policy debates and the content of decision/action that ended the debate; (5) Map the position and activities of women's movement activists and organizations with respect to each policy debate; (6) Gather data pertinent to women' movement representatives' characteristics, policy environments, and women's policy agency characteristics (See worksheets at the end of Project Description).

1. *Inventory of Women's Policy Agencies*

The first task in each country is to construct an inventory of the women's policy agencies. This could be completed by the team for all to use or by each researcher for those policy debates she has selected. This study considers women's policy agencies to be any structure that meets both of the following criteria: (1) any agency/governmental body formally established by government statute or decree; and (2) any agency/governmental body formally charged with furthering women's status and rights or promoting sex-based equality. WPAs that are not formally established but still are important state actors seeking to further women's status and rights in policy process are called Quasi WPAs or QUAWPAs. They are usually attached to government institutions or political parties and function in the policy process like WPAs. To "function in the policy process like WPAs" means that the QUAWPA is explicitly charged with furthering women's status and rights or promoting sex-based equality by or through an institution that is part of the state or by a political party that dominates the policy sub-system making authoritative policy on an issue. Examples of QUAWPAs include women's commissions in political parties in parliamentary systems where they serve as policymaking bodies in the party and eventually in the government when the party enters the governing majority. With this definition, researchers look for activities of machinery at all levels of government: national, regional, state, departmental, and municipal, and if appropriate, extra-national. It includes a variety of forms of organization, such as, bureaus, commissions, committees, councils, and ministries.

2A. *Selection of Debates* (Abortion; Political representation; Job Training; Prostitution)

The second research task is to select a representative list of debates on each policy issue. The following procedures are to be followed for selecting debates for analysis for the first four issue

APPENDIX 6

areas. Hot issue debate selection criteria are outlined in the next section. Issues of political representation, abortion, job training, and prostitution are not likely to be on the public agenda continuously during the period under study or of equal significance to femocrats in all countries. A variety of patterns is possible. Some issues may have come up only once or twice for intense discussion resulting in policy reform and then receded. Others may appear and reappear sporadically. Both women's movement organizations and women's policy agencies may decline to participate in a debate.

Selecting the representative list of debates is a three-step process. Researchers should record findings for each step in this process on Worksheet 1 which is in the appendix of the project description. STEP 1 is to locate the policy sub-system. To do this, the researcher must determine which institutions in the political system make the most important decisions about this issue. For example, in approaching the issue of prostitution or job training, researchers would look across the political system to see where the major, defining decisions that regulate prostitution or provision of job training programs are made. It could be national or regional level, parliament or the cabinet, one ministry or several, state agencies or parties or social partners, or a combination. In coming to a decision about this question, researchers should cite evidence to support the conclusion, probably a scholarly source. The most important decisions can take place at a variety of different government levels and in a variety of different organizations, state and non-state. For instance, in some countries, major policy decisions are made in the political parties and trade unions.

STEP 2 is to construct the universe of policy debates that have that have come up in this policy sub-system (or sub-systems) since 1970, according to the criteria for selecting debates: (1) debates take place in public arenas such as the legislature, courts, news media, political party conferences or electoral campaigns; (2) debates occur in periods when a women's policy agency was in existence; (3) debates represent the range of discussions on the issue in the country in the period under study (see below); (4) debates end with an official state decision, including for instance, legislation, an executive order, a court ruling or a government policy proposal. The time frame for each debate on an issue may vary from country to country depending on when the debates appeared on the public agenda.

[Note: if there is a conflict between criteria 2 and 3, that is, the researcher finds that to represent the range of discussions on the issue, it is necessary to include a debate that occurs prior to the establishment of a women's policy agency, or the women's agency has ceased to exist during the time of the debate, it is possible to include such debates if the researcher is convinced it is necessary to give an adequate overview of the issue in the country as long as most of the debates studied fit all four criteria. This latter requirement is important for the comparative analysis.]

STEP 3 is to select debates to study from the list generated in Step 2. No matter what, the researcher needs to justify the selection here in a formal manner. The Paris group developed the following criteria to be used by all researchers to determine representativeness:

> a. Decisional System Importance - If an issue is considered in more than one institutional arena/policy sub-system, select at least 1 debate from each – e.g., one from the federal level and one from the local level, political party, ministerial office, parliamentary groups, etc.

APPENDIX 6

b) Life Cycle – the policy debates selected should represent the general time frame/life cycle of universe of major debates in the area.
c) Issue Area Salience – the debate is relatively important to the substance of the debates in the universe of major debates.

[Note: these are meant to be a common basis for justification of debate selection to ensure comparability; researchers may use additional criteria to justify representativeness that may develop from issue networks or with relation to smaller comparative studies]

2B. *Selecting the debate (Hot Issue)*
Since, by definition, the hot issue network is studying a single issue of national priority since 1990, the selection process varies from that of the other issue networks. To provide a basis of comparability, the debate selected will be on a policy issue about important reconfiguration of the state (Banaszak, Beckwith and Rucht 2003), that is, policies that seek to change in some systemic way the structure of the state and/or the way the state interrelates with society taking place in the 1990s.

For the hot issue, the following are the steps each researcher will follow to select representative debates.

STEP 1 is to construct the universe of top priority policy issues, where policy issues are defined as areas of public policy on the public agenda in a political system. The universe should include at least four policy issues on the public agenda from 1989 to 2002 that meet all the following criteria: **Major Scope**: A large portion of society could be affected by the policy and any proposed policy change; **High degree of conflict**: The policy issue engages the major socio-political actors: political elites, political parties, social partners, interest groups, and social movements; **Wide range of public attention**: The policy issue generates interest of the public as demonstrated through public opinion polls, demonstrations, strikes, public conferences, media coverage and the like; **Top priority of major policy actors:** Changes in the policy issue are high on the agendas of the political executive and political party leaders.

In STEP 2, the researchers selects one issue from the top priority universe that involves major changes state society relations, such as: Selective down sizing government; devolution of policy to regional/local governments; devolution of social responsibilities from state to civil society, marketization of state policies, shifting of policy making to new networks, or expansion of state activities in response to technological change.

In STEP 3, for the issue selected, the researcher lists four completed policy debates in the period from 1989-2002. Select one debate for study in your chapter. Criteria for selecting the debates are: (1) salience in issue area, that is, this debate represents the most important debate in the issue; and (2) the debate is a top priority debate in the issue area according to Scope, Degree of Conflict, Public Attention and Policy Actor Priority.
(If there is only one complete debate in the time period, Debate selection is complete with Step 2)

3. *Gathering data and analyzing gendering of policy debates*
Once the debates are selected, researchers will identify the speakers, that is, those who participate in the debate in a public arena, and consult texts that present their points of view.

APPENDIX 6

These materials would include reports in the print and electronic media, reports of government committees or commissions, testimony at hearings and other publications such as newsletters. Investigators will also identify individual policy actors for interviews.

Next comes the analysis of debates to determine the extent to which they are gendered and the contribution of the women's policy agency to that gendering. Researchers should complete Worksheet 2, found in the Appendix to the project description, recording information on the frame, trajectory, gendering and participation. Researchers will study the framing of public problems during the life-cycle of each policy debate from the time it appears on the public agenda until it recedes. Special attention will be paid to the inter-relations between extra-national, national, and sub-national arenas of debate. The target for study will be when and if the debate is framed in gendered terms, what these gendered terms are like, how they change, and the role of women's policy agencies and other advocates for women in this pattern.

After the debate "sites" have been located and materials that set out the debate itself have been gathered, each investigator will seek to discover to what extent problems are constructed in gendered terms by looking at the language used to define policy problems and propose policy solutions. According to M.F. Katzenstein (1995), gendered references could pertain to the following: images of women and what they are like; how women are different from men; and how women are different from each other. More generally gendering would also include those statements that refer to women in relation to men. After locating gendered references, if they exist, the researchers will characterize their centrality to the basic frame of the debate at the beginning of the debate, the presence of gendered references in the micro-frames and issue frames of the participants in the debate, and the presence of gender references at the end of the debate.

4. *Analyzing women's participation*

The fourth research task is to study participation of women's movement actors in the policy process as it relates to the framing of the debates. Researchers will locate when, where and how these actors participated in the debate. Such participation could be by individuals, groups and organizations, networks and women's publics. In exploring the pattern of debates, researchers will be looking for evidence of articulation of needs, problem solving, and formal representation of different aspects of women's interests that coincide with the core ideas of women's movement discourse. Researchers will pay close attention to any evidence that women's policy agencies assisted participation by women in various forms.

Having traced the role of women's policy offices in policy debates, researchers will have evidence to answer the following research questions.

A. To what extent is the policy debate defined in gendered terms when it is under consideration in the public arena?

B. Did the women's policy agency adopt a strategy to change the frame by inserting references to gender? Did any other participant adopt a strategy to insert gendered concepts?

C. Did the terms of debate change to reflect the strategy?

D. Did the gender terms increase the significance of groups of women and those who speak for them in the policy arena?

APPENDIX 6

E. To what extent did the women's policy agency's activities in the policy debates facilitate participation by women's movement actors, individuals, women's organizations and constituencies?

5. *Mapping women's movement actors*
The RNGS model assesses the activities of the women's policy agencies and the impact of the movement on the state by comparing agency activities and policy content with goals and demands of the women's movement on the policy issue under debate. Therefore researchers will be careful to explore and record terms of the debate on the issue within the organizations and outlets of the various parts of the women's movement. RNGS recognizes that there is likely to be a great range of information with respect to any aspects of women's movements at different times and in different locations.

6. *Data for intervening and independent variables*
For each policy debate, researchers will seek to fill in information on the characteristics of women's movement actors, the policy environment, and women's policy agency characteristics, according to the indicators listed in the RNGS model. Where possible, researchers are expected to consult secondary sources to complete this research task.

7. *Complete Worksheet 3*
Record information for indicators of all model variables on Worksheet 3, found in the Appendix: women's movement impact; women's policy agency activities and characteristics; policy environment and women's movement characteristics.

The comparative table found in the Appendix to the project description should be used to record the summary values on the dependent, intervening and independent variables. This will facilitate the cross-debate analysis within each country, our final cross-national analysis in each issue area and the final overall comparative analysis of all of our debate findings – over 100 debates.

References. See Appendix 6 at the end of the codebook.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION APPENDIX 1
INDICATORS FOR CLASSIFYING INDEPENDENT VARIABLE IN QUALITATIVE STUDY

Cluster One: Characteristics of Women's Movement Actors

Stage:

1. *Emerging/Re-emerging*. Formation of new organizations; re habilitation of older organizations toward new goals.
2. *Growth*. Expansion in numbers of organizations, activities.
3. *Consolidation*. Organizations have structure, endurance and regular support; institutionalized in community and government arenas.
4. *Decline/Abeyance*. Decrease in organizations members and activities over the period. Latent organizational activity primarily by individuals.

APPENDIX 6

Closeness to Left:

1. *Very Close*. Groups formally ally with or work with political parties and/or trade unions of the Left. Ideas from the movement are taken up by Left-wing parties in party platforms. Activists have internal power positions in the Left-wing parties.
2. *Close*. Groups formally ally with or work with political parties and/or trade unions of the Left. They do not have internal power positions in the parties or unions and if the Left takes up the ideas of movements they do so without stating so and bring these ideas to fit the party line.
3. *Not Close*. Movement and the Left are remote or hostile to each other.

Priority of Issue:

1. *High*. Issue is one of the top priorities of the women's movement activists and serves to forge alliances among the various wings and tendencies.
2. *Moderate*. Not a uniting issue, but is a priority for some activists and organizations.
3. *Low*. Not a priority for any organization, but mentioned by some. Not on the agenda. Not present at all on agendas of individuals and organizations in the movement.

Cohesion:

1. *Cohesive*. Movement organizations active on the issue agree on the frame and/or policy proposals.
2. *Divided*. Movement organizations active on the issue disagree on the frame and/or policy proposals.

Location:

Yes or no for each dimension

1. Autonomous
2. Political Party
3. Trade Union
4. Established Interest Organizations
5. Legislature or Government

Feminist Activism:

Yes or No

Cluster Two: Policy Environment

Policy Sub-system Structure:

1. *Open*. Organization is amorphous, no common rules or conventions; participation is wide and changing with a variety of interest group representatives and free agents. Power balance shows no clear chain of command.
2. *Moderately Closed*. Organization is more clearly defined but changing over time. Participation shows some regular actors but some free agents around. Power balance shows several actors trying to dominate the group but no single line of command.
3. *Closed*. Codification of system through regular meetings and rules. Participation is limited with few free agents. Power balance shows one major actor controls policy space and parameters of the arena. A single policy community mobilizes around the issue.

APPENDIX 6

Issue Frame Fit:

1. *Matching*: Issue frame that initially shapes the debate is expressed in terms that are similar to movement goals as expressed by activists
2. *Compatible*: Issue frame that initially shapes the debate is not expressed in terms that are similar to movement goals as expressed by activists
3. *Incompatible*: Issue frame that initially shapes the debate is expressed in terms that are in conflict with (oppose) movement goals the debate as expressed by activists.

Party or Coalition in Power:

1. *Strong Left-wing control*: Left-wing parties may have majority in popularly elected legislative chambers and the Presidency/executive
2. *Moderate Left-wing control*: Left-wing parties may have the popularly elected chambers only and not the president. In the U.S. the Left may have majority in only one elected chamber of the legislature.

Countemovement:

1. *Strong*. Prevalent and proactive movement aimed at issue or issues taken-up by different parts of the women's movement.
2. *Moderate*. Countermovement less active against women's movement issues.
3. *Weak*. Nearly moribund or non existent.

APPENDIX 6

PROJECT DESCRIPTION APPENDIX 2
WOMEN'S POLICY AGENCY CHARACTERISTICS FOR QUALITATIVE STUDY

Scope
- Single Issue
- Cross-Section
- Other

Type
- Political appointments
- Bureaucratic
- Lay Panels

Proximity to Power Centers
- Near
- Distant

Administrative Capacity
- High – Extensive staffs, separate division, field offices, subsidies, significant budget.
- Medium – Some staff, separate divisions, or fields offices, moderate budget.
- Low – Minimal staff, no separate divisions, no field offices, minuscule budget.

Leadership
- Feminist
- Not Feminist

Policy Mandate
- Cover Debate Issue
- Does not Cover Debate Issue

APPENDIX 6

PROJECT DESCRIPTION APPENDIX 3
WORKSHEETS FOR QUALITATIVE STUDY

WORKSHEET I Selection of Policy Debates for Study
(One for each issue area: abortion, prostitution, job training, political representation.)
Issue Area _____

STEP 1: Issue Area Universe of Major Policy Debates
A. Who and/or which institutions/policy sub-systems make the most important decision about this issue?

STEP 2: Universe of debates
List of debates that come-up before these institutions/actors/sub-systems?

BASE CRITERIA: (1) debates take place in public arenas such as the legislature, courts, news media, policy party conferences or electoral campaigns; (2) debates occur when a women's policy agency is in existence; 3) debates end with an official state decision, including for instance, legislation, an executive order, a court ruling or a government policy proposal.

STEP 3: Selection of Representative Debates

CRITERIA FOR REPRESENTATIVENESS: 1) Decisional System Importance;2) Life Cycle;3) Issue Area Salience

CRITERIA USED:

LIST OF DEBATES (at least three if possible; determined by resources of group):

APPENDIX 6

WORKSHEET 1. Hot issue – Selection of Policy Debates for Study

STEP 1: Universe of Top Priority Policy Issues

Policy issues are defined as areas of public policy on the public agenda in a political system.

List universe of at least four policy issues on the public agenda from 1989 to 2002 that meet all the following criteria:

Major Scope: A large portion of society could be affected by the policy and any proposed policy change

High degree of conflict: The policy issue engages the major socio-political actors: political elites, political parties, social partners, interest groups, and social movements.

Wide range of public attention: The policy issue generates interest of the public as demonstrated through public opinion polls, demonstrations, strikes, public conferences, media coverage and the like.

Top priority of major policy actors: Changes in the policy issue are high on the agendas of the political executive and political party leaders.

Universe of Top Priority Issues Listed here:

1.
2.
3.
4.

For each issue, give evidence of the following
SCOPE
CONFLICT
PUBLIC ATTENTION
PRIORITY

STEP 2: Selection of issue:

Select one issue from the top priority universe that involves major changes state society relations, such as:

Selective down sizing government?
Devolution of policy to regional/local governments?
Devolution of social responsibilities from state to civil society?
Marketization of state policies?
Shifting of policymaking to new networks?
Expansion of state activities in response to technological change?

Issue selected _____

STEP 3: Selection of Debate

APPENDIX 6

For issue selected, list universe of completed policy debates in the period from 1989-2002:
(If there is only one complete debate in the time period, Debate selection is complete with Step 2)
BASE CRITERIA: (1) debates take place in public arenas such as the legislature, courts, news media, policy party conferences or electoral campaigns; (2) debates occur when a women's policy agency is in existence; (3) debates end with an official state decision, including for instance, legislation, an executive order, a court ruling or a government policy proposal.

List universe of debates here:
1.
2.
3.
4.

STEP 4

Select one debate for study in your chapter. Criteria for selecting the debates are: (1) salience in issue area, that is, this debate represents the most important debate in the issue; and (2) the debate is a top priority debate in the issue area according to Scope, Degree of Conflict, Public Attention and Policy Actor Priority.

Debate selected_____

Give evidence of salience and priority of debate:

APPENDIX 6

WORK SHEET 2. Policy Debate Information

(complete one for each debate)

1. Policy Debate

2. Appeared on Public Agenda

3. Endpoint Government Decision

4. WPA (s) in existence over time period

5. Debate sites: organizations/level of government

6. Documents and other sources used

7. Describe Policy Debate in Three Stages

* Dominant Frame at the Beginning of Debate;
* How Frame Changes;
* Frame at the End of Debate.

Describing the frame:

A. What is problem, what is it that needs fixing? Wrong; injustice; threat; situation that needs corrective action?

B. Who is to blame for the problem?

C. What should be done? Corrective Action D. Content of Gendered Debate:

1. Images of Women and what they are like:
2. How men and women are different from each other:
   How men and women are NOT different
3. The ways gender systems shape situations/identities:
4. How to correct? Challenges to male domination? Challenges to traditional gender roles?

E. Is gendered debate feminist?

8. Gendering and Policy Debate

A. Who presented gendered issues? (Groups, individuals, networks, publics, WPAs, women's movement, trade unions etc.)

B. Were these actors/gendered positions feminist?

C. Centrality of gendering to the debate?

D. Effect on law and legislation?

E. What was the position of the women's movement on this policy debate?

9. Women's Participation (How did women participate in this policy debate, not necessarily feminist women and did they advocate some aspect of women's interests in the debate?)

Individuals

Groups

Networks, Publics

APPENDIX 6

WORKSHEET 3. VALUES FOR MODEL VARIABLES FOR QUALITATIVE STUDY
Policy Debate Name and Dates:
Endpoint Government Decision:

1. IVI-WM Women's Movement Actors Characteristics

Mapping the WM: What are the major organizations, movements, individuals of the women's/ feminist movement and what are the major ideas espoused by this constellation of actors. The values on the indicators for the variable:
1. Stage (emerging, re-emerging, growth, consolidation, decline/abeyance:
2. Closeness to the Left and/or political parties/groups that espouse social equality:
3. Strength of countermovement:
4. Priority of issue to movement agenda:
5. Cohesion of movement:
6. Location:
7. Feminist Activism:

2. IVII-PE Policy Environment

1. Policy sub-system structure: Who are the major actors, dominant structures and patterns of interaction (open. moderately closed, closed):
2. Issue Frame Fit: What is the frame used by the policy actors that mobilize around this particular issue? To what degree does it fit with the goals of the women's movement actors on this issue (Matching, compatible and incompatible)
3. Party in Power/Coalition. What is the party or coalition of parties in power, in executive and legislature, at the time of the debate?

3. Intervening Variable
Women's Policy Agency Characteristics

If more than one WPA, information should be gathered on each.
1. Scope (single issue, cross-sectional, other?):
2. Type (political, administrative, other?):
3. Proximity (position in government hierarchy)
4. Administrative Capacity: (Budget, staff, administrative divisions, field offices, women's groups subsidies, etc.):
5. Individual Leadership (feminist, political, bureaucratic, etc.)
6. Policy Mandate (major policy orientations):
Women's Policy Agency Activities (Insider, Marginal, Non-Feminist, Symbolic)
WPA Gendered Policy Debate?
WPA Promoted Women's Movement Goals?

4. Dependent Variable

Women's Movement Impact (Dual Response, Co-optation, Preemption, No Response)
Were women (individuals, group networks, constituencies) advanced some aspect of women's interests accepted in policy making process?
Policy action achieved women's movement goals or not?

APPENDIX 6

PROJECT DESCRIPTION APPENDIX IV

TEMPLATE FOR SUMMARY TABLE FOR QUALITATIVE STUDY

DEBATE	**Women's Movement Characteristics**	**Policy Environment**	**Women's Policy Agency Characteristics**	*Variables for Typologies*	Variables for Typologies
1. Name of Debate, Date of Appearance on Agenda and Date of Decision	Stage: Left: Priority: Counter: Cohesion: Location: Feminist Activism:	**Sub-system:** Structure: Issue Frame Fit: **Party/Coalition in Power:** Executive: Legislature:	Scope: Type: Proximity: Administrative Capacity: Leadership: Policy Mandate:	**WPA Activities:** WPA advocates WM: goals in debate: (*Yes or NO)* WPA Genders Debate: (*Yes or No)* **Movement Impact/SR:** Policy Content coincides with WM: *(Yes or NO)* Were Women accepted as participants in the policy process: (*Yes or No)*	**WPA Activities: (***SELECT ONE)* INSIDER MARGINAL NON FEMINIST SYMBOLIC **Movement Impact/SR: (***SELECT ONE)* DUAL RESPONSE COOPTATION PREEMPTION NO RESPONSE

APPENDIX 7

APPENDIX 7
WORKS CITED

This appendix includes all of the works cited in this codebook, including for the qualitative project description in Appendix 6. RNGS publications are cited separately in Appendix 5.

Anderson, James E. 1994. *Public Policymaking: An Introduction*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Ashford, Douglas E. ed. 1992. *History and Context in Comparative Public Policy*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Bachrach, Peter, and Morton S. Baratz. 1970. *Power and Poverty. Theory and Practice*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Banaszak, Lee Ann, Karen Beckwith and Dieter Rucht Ed.2003. W*omen's Movements Facing the Reconfigured State*. Cambridge University Press.

Banaszak, Lee Ann. 1996. *Why Movements Succeed or Fail: Opportunity, Culture, and the Struggle for Woman Suffrage*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Banerjee M, Capozzoli L, McSweeney L, Sinha D. 1999. "Beyond kappa: a review of interrater agreement measures." Canadian Journal of Statistics. Vol. 27, no. 1, March. 3–23.

Bashevkin, Sylvia. 1994. "Confronting Neo Conservatism: Anglo-American Women's Movements Under Thatcher, Reagan and Mulroney." *International Political Science Review*. Vol. 15, no. 3. 275-296.

Bashevkin, Sylvia. 1996. "Tough Times In Review: The British Women's Movement During the Thatcher Years." *Comparative Political Studies*. Vol. 28, no. 4, January. 525-552.

Bashevkin, Sylvia. 1998. *Women on the Defensive: Living through Conservative Times*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Basu, Amrita. Ed. 1995. *The Challenge of Local Feminisms: Women's Movements in Global Perspective*. Boulder: Westview Press.

Beasley, Chris. 1999. *What is Feminism? An Introduction to Feminist Theory*. London: Sage.

Beckwith, Karen. 2004. "Mapping Strategic Engagements of Women's Movements." Annual Meeting of International Studies Association, March 17-30, Montreal.

Beckwith, Karen. 1985. "Feminism and Leftist Politics in Italy: the Case of UDI-PCI Relations." *West European Politics*. 8 (4) pp. 19-37.

Beckwith, Karen. 1987. "Response to Feminism in the Italian Parliament: Divorce, Abortion, and Sexual Violence Legislation." *The Women's Movements of the United States and Western Europe*. In M.F. Katzenstein and C.M. Mueller. Ed. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, pp. 153-171.

Beckwith, Karen. 2000. "Beyond Compare? Women's Movements in Comparative Perspective." *European Journal of Political Research*. 37: 431-468.

Benford, Robert D. and David A. Snow. 2000. "Framing Processes and Social Movements: An Overview and Assessment." *Annual Review of Sociology.* 26: 611-630.

Bergqvist, Christina et al. (Eds). 1999. *Equal Democracies*. Oslo: Scandinavia University Press.

Black, Naomi. 1989. *Social Feminism*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Boneparth, Ellen and Emily Stoper. 1988. "Introduction: A Framework for Policy Analysis." In *Women, Power, and Policy: Toward the Year 2000*. E. Boneparth and E. Stoper, eds. New York: Persimmon Press. 1-22.

APPENDIX 7

Borchorst, Anette. 1986. "Statsfeminism eller afledningsmanøvre. Om dansk ligestillingsppolitik gennem 20 är" [State feminism or diversionary maneuvers: On 20 years of Danish policies of equal opportunities]. In *Ärbog for dvindestudier AUC 1986* (pp. 59-94). Aalborg: Universitetsforlag.

Buechler, Steven M. 1986. *The Transformation of the Woman Suffrage Movement: The Case of Illinois, 1850-1920.* New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Buechler, Steven M. 1993. "Beyond Resource Mobilization? Emerging Trends in Social Movement Theory." *The Sociological Quarterly*. 34 (2), pp. 217-235.

Bull, Anna, Hanna Diamond & Rosalind Marsh.Ed. 2000. *Feminisms and Women's Movements in Contemporary Europe*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Bussemaker, J. and Voet, R., eds., 1998. *Gender, Participation and Citizenship in the Netherlands*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Bystydzienski, Jill M. Ed. 1992. *Women Transforming Politics: Worldwide Strategies for Empowerment*. Blooming: Indiana University Press.

Chappell, Louise A. 2002. *Gendering Government: Feminist Engagement with the State in Australia and Canada*. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Chilcote, Ronald H. 1994. *Theories of Comparative Politics: The Search for A Paradigm Reconsidered*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Cobb, Roger and Charles D. Elder. 1983. *Participation in American Politics: The Dynamics of Agenda-Setting*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Cockburn, Cynthia. 1991. *In the Way of Women: Men's Resistance to Sex Equality in Organizations*. New York: ILR Press.

Cohen, Jean. 1985. "Strategy or Identity: New Theoretical Paradigms and Contemporary Social Movements" *Social Research*. 52 (2), pp. 663-716.

Collier, David. 1991. "New Perspectives on the Comparative Method." In *Comparative Political Dynamics: Global Research Perspectives*, Dankwart A. Rustow and Kenneth Paul Erickson, Ed. New York: Harper Collins.

Collier, David. 1995."Translating Quantitative Methods for Qualitative Researchers: The Case of Selection Bias." *American Political Science Review* 89: 461-466.

Collier, David, and Steven Livitsky. 1996. "Democracy 'With Adjectives': Conceptual Innovation in Comparative Research." Working Paper, the Kellogg Institute, University of Notre Dame.

Collier, David, and James E. Mahon. 1993. "Conceptual 'Stretching' Revisited: Adapting Categories in Comparative Analysis." *American Political Science Review* 87 (December): 845-55.

Conway, Jill, Susan c. Bourque, and Joan W. Scott. 1987. "The Concept of Gender." *Daedalus* 116 (4) pp. xx-xxix.

Costain, Ann. 1992. *Inviting Women's Rebellion: A Political Process Interpretation of the Women's Movement*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Cress, Daniel M. and David Snow. 1996. "Mobilization at the Margins: resources, benefactors, and the viability of homeless social movement organizations." *American Sociological Review*. 61 (December) 1089-109.

Dahlerup, Drude. 1986a. "Introduction." In *The New Women's Movement*. Ed. D. Dahlerup. Bristol: Sage, pp. 1-26.

Dahlerup, Drude. Ed. 1986b. *The New Women's Movement.* Bristol: Sage.

APPENDIX 7

Dahlerup, Drude. 1993. "From Movement Protest to State Feminism: The Women's Movement and Unemployment Policy in Denmark." *NORA. Nordic Journal of Women's Studies*. 1: 4-21.

Derthick, Martha.1990.*Agency Under Stress: The Social Security Administration in American Government*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution

Diani, Mario and Ron Eyerman. Ed. 1992. *Studying Collective Action*. London: Sage Publications.

Dolors, Maria, García-Ramon and Janice Monk, eds. 1996. *Women of the European Union: The Politics of Work and Daily Life*.London: Routledge.

Drew, E.,Emerek, R. and Mahon, E., ed.1998. *Women, Work, and the Family in Europe*. London: Routledge.

Edelman, Marc. 2001. "Social Movements: changing Paradigms and Forms of Politics." *Annual Review of Anthropology*. 30: 285-317.

Edelman. Murray. 1985. *The Symbolic Uses of Politics*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Eisenstein, Hester. 1990. "Femocrats, Official Feminism and the Uses of Power." In *Playing the State: Australian Feminist Inverventions,* S. Watson, Ed. pp. 87-103. London: Verso.

Eisenstein, Hester. 1996. *Inside Agitators: Australian Femocrats and the State*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Elshtain, J. B. 1983. "Antigone's Daughters: Reflections on Female Identity and the State." In *Families, Politics and Public Policy: A Feminist Dialogue on Women and the State*, ed. Irene Diamond. New York: Longman.

Esping-Andersen, Gøsta, ed., 1993. *Changing Classes: Stratification in Postindustrial Societies*. London:Sage Publications

Esping-Andersen, Gøsta. 1999. *Social Foundations of Postindustrial Economies*.London: Oxford Press.

Feick, J. 1992. "Comparing Comparative Policy studies – A Path Toward Integration?" *Journal of Public Policy*,12 (3) 257-285.

Ferree, Myra Marx. 1991-92. "Institutionalizing Gender Equality: Feminist Politics and Equality Offices." *German Politics & Society*. 24 & 25 (Winter), 53-66.

Ferree, Myra Marx. 2006. "Globalization and Feminism: Opportunities and Obstacles for Activism in the Global Arena." In *Global Feminism: Transnational Women's Activism, Organizing, and Human Rights*. M.M. Ferree and A.M Tripp. Eds. pp. 3-23. New York: New York University Press.

Ferree, Myra Marx. 2000. *Controversy and Coalition: The New Feminist Movement*. 3rd Ed. New York: Routledge.

Ferree, Myra Marx and Patricia Yancey Martin. Eds.1995. *Feminist Organizations*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Ferree, Myra Marx and Carol Mueller. 2004 "Feminism and the Women's Movement: A Global Perspective." In *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*. David A. Snow, Sarah A. Soule, and Hanspeter Kriesi. Ed. pp. 567-602. Malden: MA: Blackwell Publishing

Franzway, S., Court, D., & Connell, R. W. (1989). *Staking a Claim: Feminism, Bureaucracy and the State*. Sydney, Australia: Allen & Unwin.

Freeman, Jo. 1987. "Whom You Know Versus Whom You Represent." In *The Women's Movements of the United States and Western Europe*. M.F. Katzenstein and C.M. Mueller. Ed., pp. 214-244. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Fulenwider, Claire K. 1980. *Feminism in American Politics*. New York: Praeger.

APPENDIX 7

Funk, Nanette and Magda Mueller. Ed. 1993. *Gender Politics and Post-Communism: Reflections from Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union*. New York: Routledge.

Gamson, William A. 1975. *The Strategy of Social Protest*. Homewood, Il: The Dorsey Press.

Gamson, William A. 1988. "Political Discourse and Collective Action." In *International Social Movement Research* Vol 1. ed. Bert Klandermans, Hanspeter Kriesi, and Sidney Tarrow. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Gamson, William and David Meyer. 1996. "Framing Political Opportunity." In *Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures and Framing: Comparative Application of Contemporary Movement Theory*. D McAdam, J. McCarthy, and M. Zald. Eds., pp. 275-290. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Gelb, Joyce. 1987. "Social Movement 'Success': A Comparative Analysis of Feminism in the United States and the United Kingdom." In *The Women's Movements of the United States and Western Europe*. Mary Katzenstein and Carol Mueller, Ed.,267-289. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Gelb, Joyce. 1989. *Feminism and Politics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Gelb, Joyce. 2003. *Gender Policies in Japan and the United States: Comparing Women's Movements, Rights and Politics*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Giugni, Marco. 1995. "Outcomes of New Social Movements." In *New Social Movements in Western Europe: A Comparative Analysis*, Hanspieter Kriesi, et.al, Ed. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Giugni, Marco, Doug McAdam and Charles Tilly. Ed. 1999. *How Social Movements Matter*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Gornick, J., M. K. Meyers, and K.E. Ross. 1997. "Supporting the Employment of Mothers: Policy Variation Across Fourteen Welfare States." *Journal of European Social Policy*. 7(1): 45-70.

Gray, A. 1988. "Bureaucracy and Political Power." *Political Studies* 36: 131-34.

Guadagini, Marila. 1995. "The Latecomers: Italy's Equal Status and Equal Opportunities Agencies." In Dorothy McBride Stetson and Amy G. Mazur eds., *Comparative State Feminism*., 150-167. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Haavio-Mannila, E., D. Dahlerup, M. Eduards, E. Gudmundsdóttir, B. Halsaa, H.M. Hernes, E. Hänninene-Salmelin, B. Sigmundsdóttir, S. Sinkkonene, and T. Skard. 1985. *Unfinished Democracy-Women in Nordic Politics*. New York: Pergamon.

Hantrais, Linda. Ed. 2000. *Gendered Policies in Europe*. London: MacMillan.

Harding, Sandra. 1986. *The Science Question in Feminism*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Harrop, Martin. Ed. 1992. *Power and Policy in Liberal Democracies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Haussman, Melissa. 1992. "The Personal is Constitutional: Feminist Struggles for Equality Rights in the United States and Canada." In *Women Transforming Politics: Worldwide Strategies for Empowerment*. J.M. Bystydzienski. Ed., pp. 108-123. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Hawkesworth, Mary. 1994. "Policy Studies within a Feminist Frame." *Policy Sciences*. 27: 97-118.

Hayward, Jack. 1992."The Policy Community Approach to Industrial Policy" In *Comparative Political Dynamics: Global Research Perspectives*. D. Rustow and Erickson, Ed., pp. 381-407. New York: Harper Collins.

APPENDIX 7

Heclo, Hugh. 1978. "Issue Networks and the Executive Establishment," In *The New American Political System,* Anthony King, Ed., pp. 87-124. Washington: American Enterprise Institute.

Heidenheimer, Arnold J., Hugh Heclo and Carolyn Teich Adams. 1990. *Comparative Public Policy: The Politics of Social Choice in European and America*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Hellman, Judith Adler. 1987. *Journeys Among Women: Feminism in Five Italian Cities.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Hernes, Helga. 1987. *Welfare State and Woman Power*. Oslo: Norwegian University Press.

Inglehart, Ronald. 1990. *Culture Shift in Advanced Industrial Society*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Jamison, Andress, Ron Eyerman, Jacqueline Cramer and Jeppe Læssøe. 1990. *The Making of Environmental Consciousness: A Comparative Study of Environmental Movements in Sweden, Denmark and the Netherlands.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Jenson, Jane. 1985. "Struggling for Identity: the Women's Movement and the State in Western Europe." *West European Politics*. 8(4), pp. 5-18.

Jenson, Jane. 1988. "Changing Discourse, Changing Agendas: Political Rights and Reproductive Policies in France." In *The Women's Movements of the United States and Europe: Consciousness, Political Opportunity and Public Policy*. M.F. Katzenstein and C. M.Mueller. Ed., pp. 64-88. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Jenson, Jane. 1989. "Ce n'est pas un hazard: The Varieties of French Feminism." In *Contemporary France, vol. 3, A Review of Interdisciplinary Studies*. Jolyon Howorth and George Ross. Ed. London: Frances Pinter.

Jenson, Jane and Mariette Sineau.1995. *Mitterrand et les Françaises: Un rendez-vous manqué.* Paris: Press de la Fondation Nationale des Sciences Politiques.

Johnston, Hank and Bert Klandermans. Ed. 1995. *Social Movements and Culture*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Joppke, Christian. 1993. *Mobilizing Against Nuclear Energy: A Comparison of Germany and the United States.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Kamenitsa, Lynn. 1997. "Equality Offices in Eastern Germany: Does Institutionalization Help Marginalized Groups?" *German Politics & Society* 15, 3: 24-43.

Kaplan, Gisela.1992. *Contemporary Western Feminism*. London: UCL Press and Allen & Unwin.

Katzenstein, Mary Fainsod. 1995. "Discursive Politics and Feminist Activism in the Catholic Church." In *Feminist Organizations.* Myra Marx Ferree and Patricia Yancey Martin, Ed. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Katzenstein, Mary Fainsod. 1998. *Faithful and Fearless: Moving Feminist Protest Inside the Church and Military.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Katzenstein, Mary and Carol Mueller. Ed.1987. *The Women's Movements of the United States and Western Europe*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Kettl, Donald F. 1993. "Public Administration: The State of the Field." In *Political Science: the State of the Discipline*, Ada Finifter, Ed. Washington,D.C.: American Political Science Association.

King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba. 1994. *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Kingdon, John. 1995. *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies*. New York: Harper Collins.

APPENDIX 7

Kitschelt, Herbert P. 1986. "Political Opportunity Structures and Political Protest: Anti-Nuclear Movements in Four Democracies." *British Journal of Political Science*. 16, pp. 57-85.

Klandermans, Bert. 1993. "A Theoretical Framework for Comparisons of Social Movement Participation." *Sociological forum*. 8 (September) 383-402.

Kriesi, Hanspeter, Ruud Koopmans, Jan Willem Duyvendak, Marco Giugni. 1995. *New Social Movements in Western Europe: A Comparative Analysis*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Kuumba, M. Bahati. 2001. *Gender and Social Movements*. Walnut Creek, CA : AltaMira Press.

Lewis, Jane. Ed.1997. *Lone Mothers in European Welfare regimes: Shifting Policy Logics.* London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Lewis, Jane. Ed. 1993. *Women and Social Policies in Europe*. Aldershot, England: Edward Elgar.

Lewis, Jane and Ilona Ostner. 1994. *Gender and the Evolution of European Social Policies.* ZE-S, Arbeitspapier nr. 4/94, Universität Bremen.

Liebert, Ulrike, ed. 2002. *Europeanisation and Gender Equality. Reframing Public Policy in EU Member States*. Bruxelles: Peter Lang. 2002.

Lijphart, Arend. 1971. "Comparative Politics and Comparative Method." *American Political Science Review* 65: 682-93.

Lijphart, Arend. 1975. "The Comparable Cases Strategy in Comparative Research." *Comparative Political Studies* 8: 481-96.

Lijphart, Arend. 1984. *Democracies: Patterns of Majoritarian and Consensus Government in Twenty-one Countries.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Locke, Richard and Kathleen Thelen. 1995. "Apples and Oranges Revisited: Contextualized Comparison and the Study of Comparative Labor Politics." *Politics & Society* 23:3 (September), 337-367.

Lovenduski, Joni. 1986. *Women and European Politics: Contemporary Feminism and Public Policy*. London: Wheatsheaf.

Lovenduski, Joni, and Pippa Norris. Ed. 1993. *Gender and Party Politics*. London: Sage.

Lovenduski, Joni and Vicky Randall. 1993. *Contemporary Feminist Politics: Women and Power in Britain*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lycklama à Nijeholt, G., Vargas V., & Wieringa, S. Ed.1998. *Women's Movements and Public Policy in Europe, Latin America, and the Caribbean.* New York: Garland.

Mansbridge, Jane. 1996. "What is the Feminist Movement? In *Feminist Organizations: Harvest of the New Women's Movement.* Myra Marx Ferree & Beth B. Hess. Ed., 27-33. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

March, James G., and Johan P. Olsen. 1984. "The New Institutionalism: Organizational Factors in Political Life." *American Political Science Review* 78: 734-749.

Mayer, Lawrence. 1989. *Redefining Comparative Politics: Promise Versus Performance.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Mazmanian, David A. and Paul A. Sabatier. 1983. *Implementation and Public Policy*. Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman.

Mazur, Amy G. 1995. *Gender Bias and the State: Symbolic Reform at Work in Fifth Republic France*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Mazur, Amy G. 2002. *Theorizing Feminist Policy*. London: Oxford University Press.

APPENDIX 7

Mazur, Amy G. and Janine Parry. 1998. "Choosing Not to Choose in Comparative Policy Research Design: the Case of the Research Network on Gender, Politics and the State." *Journal of Policy Studies*. 26 (3) 284-95.

McAdam, Doug, John D. McCarthy, & Mayer N. Zald. 1996. *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Cultural Framings.*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McAdam, Doug, John D. McCarthy, Mayer N. Zald. 1988. "Social Movements." In *Handbook of Sociology*, Neil J. Smelser, Ed., pp. 695-737. Newbury Park: Sage.

McBride Stetson, Dorothy. 1995. "Gender Conflict and Policy Making: A Research Strategy for the Comparative Analysis of State Feminism." Mimeo

McBride, Dorothy E. and Amy Mazur. "Women's Movements, Feminism and Feminist Movements. In Goertz and Mazur, eds. *Politics, Gender and Concepts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Forthcoming.

McBride Stetson, Dorothy and Amy G. Mazur. 2000. "Toward a Comparative Theory of Social Movements and the State: State Feminism and Job Training Policy debates in France and the United States." *Political Research Quarterly*. September. 597-624.

McBride Stetson, Dorothy and Amy G. Mazur. 2002. "Defining Women's Movements Cross-Nationally and Over Time: Lessons from the Project of the Research Network on Gender, Politics and the State." Canadian Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Toronto, May 29-31.

McBride Stetson, Dorothy and Amy G. Mazur 2003a. "Reconceptualizing the Women's Movement in Comparative Perspective: Discourse, Actors and the State" International Studies Association Annual Conference Portland, OR. February .

McBride Stetson, Dorothy and Amy G. Mazur 2003b. "The Women's Movement Paper: The Sequel" Prepared for RNGS Conference, Leiden, the Netherlands 12-15 June.

McCarthy, John and Mayer Zald. Ed.1973. *The Trend of Social Movements in America: Professionalization and Resource Mobilization*. Morristown: General Learning Press.

McCarthy, John and Mayer Zald. Ed. 1979. *The Dynamics of Social Movements: Resource Mobilization*. Cambridge, MA: Winthrop.

McCarthy, John and Mayer Zald.1977. "Resource Mobilization and Social Movements: A Partial Theory." *American Journal of Sociology*. 82 (6): 1212-1241.

McCarthy, John D. and Mark Wolfson. 1994. "Resources Mobilizition by local Socal Movement Organizations: Agency, Strategy, and Organization in the Movement Against Drinking and Driving." *American Sociological Review*. 61 (December): 1070-88.

Meehan, Elizabeth & Selma Sevenhuijsen. Ed. 1991. *Equality Politics and Gender.* London: Sage Publications.

Mény, Yves. 1992. *La Corruption de la République*. Paris: Editions Fayard.

Meyer, Mary K. and Prügl, Elisabeth. Ed. 1999. *Gender Politics in Global Governance*. Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Molyneux, Maxine. 1998. "Analyzing Women's Movements." In *Feminist Visions of Development: Gender, Analysis and Policy,* Cecile Jackson & Ruth Pearson, Ed., pp. 65-88. London: Routledge.

Morris, Aldon D. and Carol McClug Mueller. Ed. 1992. *Frontiers of Social Movement Theory*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Muller, Pierre. 1990. *Les Politiques Publiques*. Paris: PUF.

APPENDIX 7

Nelson, Barbara J. 1989. "Women and Knowledge in Political Science: Texts, Histories and Epistemologies." *Women & Politics*. 9: 1-25.

Norris, Pippa. 1987. *Politics and Sexual Equality: The Comparative Position of Women in Western Democracies*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Reiner.

O'Connor, Julia S., Ann Shola Orloff, and Sheila Shaver. 1999. *States, Markets, Families: Gender Liberalism and Social Policy in Australia, Canada, Great Britain and the United States.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

O'Connor, Julia S. 1993. "Gender Class and Citizenship in the Comparative Analysis of Welfare State: Theoretical and Methodological Issues." *The British Journal of Sociology* 44: 501-18.

Orloff, Ann Shola. 1993. "Gender and the Social Rights of Citizenship: The Comparative Analysis of Gender Relations and Welfare States." *American Sociological Review* 58: 303-328.

Parenti, Michael. 1974. *Democracy for the Few*. New York: St. Martin's.

Pateman, C. 1988. *The Sexual Contract*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Peters, B. Guy. 1992. "Public Policy and Public Bureaucracy." In *History and Context in Comparative Public Policy,* Douglas Ashford, Ed. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Phillips, Anne. 1991. *Engendering Democracy*. University Park, PA: The University of Pennsylvania Press.

Phillips, Anne. 1995. *The Politics of Presence*. Cambridge: Oxford University Press.

Picq, Françoise. 1987. "Le mouvement de libération des femmes et ces effets." Recherches Féministes et Recherches sur les femmes, No. 1.

Pitkin, Hanna Fenichel. 1967. *The Concept of Representation*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Piven, Frances Fox, and Richard A. Cloward. 1979. *Poor People's Movements: Why They Succeed, How They Fail*. New York: Vintage Books.

Pressman, J. L. and A.B. Wildavsky. 1973. *Implementation: How Great Expectations in Washington Are Dashed in Oakland or, Why It's Amazing that Federal Programs Work at All.* Berkeley CA: University of California Press.

Pringle, Rosemary and S. Watson, 1992. "Women's Interests and the Post Structuralist State." *Destabilizing Theory: Contemporary Feminist Debates*. M. Barrett and A. Phillips. Ed., pp. 53-73. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Przeworski, Adam. 1991. *Democracy and the Market: Political and Economic Reforms in Eastern Europe and Latin America*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Quadagno, Jull. 1992. "Social Movements and State Transformation: Labor Unions and Racial Conflict in the War on Poverty." *American Sociological Review*. 57 (October) 616-634.

Rabinow, Paul and William M. Sullivan. Ed. 1979. *Interpretive Social Science: A Reader*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Ragin, Charles. 1987. *The Comparative Method: Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Rai, Shirin M. Ed. 2003. *Mainstreaming Gender, Democratizing the State? Institutional Mechanisms for the Advancement of Women*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Risse, Thomas and Kathryn Sikkuk. 1999. "The Socialization of international human rights norms into domestic practices: Introduction". In *The Power of Human Rights:*

APPENDIX 7

International Norms and Domestic Change. Thomas Risse, Stephen C. Ropp and Kathryn Sikkuk. Ed. pp. 1-38. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Risse, Thomas, Maria Green Cowles, and James Caporaso. 2001. "Europeanization and Domestic Change: Introduction." In *Europeanization and Domestic Change: Transforming Europe*, Cowles, Caporaso and Risse, Ed., pp. 1-20. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.

Rochon, Thomas. 1988. *Mobilizing for Peace: The Anti-Nuclear Movements in Western Europe*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Rochon, Thomas R. 1990."Political Movements and State Authority in Liberal Democracies." *World Politics* 42 (January) 299-313.

Rochon, Thomas R. 1998. *Culture Moves: Ideas, Activism, and Changing Values*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Rochon, Thomas R. and Daniel A. Mazmanian. 1993. "Social Movements and the Policy Process." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. 528: 75-87.

Rosenfeld, Rachel A. and Kathryn B. Ward. 1996. "Evolution of the Contemporary U.S. Women's Movement." *Research in Social Movements, Conflict and Change*, Volume 19, pp. 51-73. Greenwich CT: JAI Press.

Rucht, Dieter. Ed. 1991. *Research on Social Movements: The State of the Art in Western Europe and the USA.* Boulder: Westview.

Ryan, Barbara. 1992. *Feminism and the Women's Movement: Dynamics of Change in Social Movement Ideology and Activism*. New York: Routledge.

Sainsbury, Diane. Ed. 1994. *Gendering Welfare States*. London: Sage.

Santoro, Wayne A. and Gail M. McGuire. 1997. "Social Movement Insiders: The Impact of Institutional Activists on Affirmative Action and Comparable Worth Politics." *Social Problems*. 44 (4) 503-19.

Sartori, Giovanni. 1970. "Concept Misformation in Comparative Politics." *American Political Science Review* 74: 1033-1053.

Sawer, Marian. 1990. *Sisters in Suits, Women and Public Policy in Australia*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.

Sawer, Marian. 1993. Reclaiming Social Liberalism: The Women's Movement and the State. *Journal of Australian Studies*, (June) pp. 1-21.

Schattschneider, E.E. 1960. *The Semisovereign People: A Realist's View of Democracy in America*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Schneider, Anne and Helen Ingram. 1993. "Social Construction of Target Populations: Implications for Politics and Policy." *American Political Science Review* 87: 334-347.

Siim, B. (1991). Welfare state, Gender Politics and Equality Policies: Women's Citizenship in the Scandinavian Welfare States. In *Equality Politics and Gender*¸ E. Meehan & S. Sevenhuijsen, Ed., pp. 175-92. London: Sage Publications.

Singh, Rina. 1998. *Gender Autonomy in Western Europe: An Imprecise Revolution*. London: MacMillan.

Snow, David A. and Robert D. Benford. 1992. "Master Frames and Cycles of Protest." In *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory*, Aldon D. Morris and Carol McClurg Mueller, Ed. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Staggenborg, Suzanne. 1991. *The Pro-Choice Movement: Organization and Activism in the Abortion Conflict*. New York: Oxford University Press.

APPENDIX 7

Stetson, Dorothy McBride and Amy Mazur. Ed. 1995. *Comparative State Feminism*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Tarrow, Sidney. 1983. *Struggling to Reform: Social Movements and Policy Change During Cycles of Protest*. Western Societies Program, Occasional paper No. 15. Ithaca: Cornell University.

Tarrow, Sidney. 1989. *Struggle, Politics, and Reform: Collective Action, Social Movements, and Cycles of Protest.* Western Societies Program. Occasional Paper No. 21. Ithaca: Cornell University.

Tarrow, Sidney. 1994. *Power in Movement*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tarrow, Sidney. 1998. *Power in Movement: Social Movements and Contentious Politics.* 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tarrow, Sidney. 2002. "The New Transnational Contention: Organization, Coalitions, Mechanisms." Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Meetings, Boston. August 31-September 1.

Taylor, Verta. 2000. "Mobilizing for Change in a Social Movement Society." *Contemporary Sociology*. 29 (January) 219-30.

Taylor, Verta. 1989. "Social Movement Continuity: The Women's Movement in Abeyance." *American Sociological Review*. 54 (October) 761-775.

Threlfall, Monica. Ed. 1996. *Mapping the Women's Movement*. London: Verso.

Tobias, Sheila. 1997. *Faces of Feminism: An Activist's Reflections on the Women's Movement*. Boulder: Westview Press.

Tolleson Rinehart, Sue. 1992. *Gender Consciousness in Politics*. New York: Routledge.

True, J. and Mintrom, M. (2001). "Transnational Networks and Policy Diffusion: The Case of Gender Mainstreaming". *International Studies Quarterly*, 45: 27-57.

Valiente, Celia. 1995. "The Power of Persuasion: The Instituto de la Mujer in Spain." In Dorothy McBride Stetson and Amy G. Mazur eds., *Comparative State Feminism*., Thousand Oaks, 221-236. CA: Sage.

Vargas, V. and Wieringa, S. (1998). "The Triangles of Empowerment: Processes and Actors in the Making of Public Policy." In *Women's Movements and Public Policy in Europe, Latin America, and the Caribbean*, G. Lycklama à Nijeholt *et al*. Ed.. New York: Garland.

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

Watson, Sophie, ed. 1990. *Playing the State: Australian Feminist Interventions*: London: Verso.

Weldon, S. Laurel. 2002. *Protest, Policy and the Problem of Violence Against Women: a Cross National Comparison*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Whittier, Nancy. 1995. *Feminist Generations: The Persistence of the Radical Women's Movement*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Wiarda, Howard J. 1991. "Toward the Future: Old and New Directions in Comparative Politics." In *New Directions in Comparative Politics*, Howard Wiarda, Ed. Boulder: Westview.

Wiarda, Howard J. 2000. *Introduction to Comparative Politics: Concepts and Processes.* Belmont, CA; Wadsworth Publishing Co. 2nd Edition.

Wilensky, Harold. 2002. *Rich Democracies: Political Economy, Public Policy, and Performance.* Berkeley CA: University of California Press.

Wilson, E. 1977. *Women & the Welfare State*. London: Tavistock Publications.

Wilson, James Q. 1989. *Bureaucracy*. New York: Basic Books.

APPENDIX 7

Wolfsfeld, Gadi, Karl-Dieter Opp, and Henry A. Dietz. 1994. "Dimensions of Political Section: A Cross-Cultural Analysis." *Social Science Quarterly*. 75 (March), 98-114.