

# The Woman Question in Brussels: Feminist Content Analysis and Governance in the EU

SPIRe Seminar Series – November 11<sup>th</sup> 2014  
Muireann O'Dwyer,  
PhD Candidate in European Governance and Law

## **Table of Contents**

### **1. Introduction**

### **2. Theoretical Framework**

*2.1 Feminist Research*

*2.2 Intersectionality*

*2.3 Gender and Power*

*2.4 Gender and Language*

### **3. Critical Framework Methodology**

*3.1 The Requirements and Challenges*

*3.2 Critical Framework Analysis of Gender Mainstreaming*

*3.3 Critical Framework Analysis of Economic Governance*

### **4. Conclusions and Potential Pitfalls**

*4.1 Relations to Other Work*

*4.2 Limitations of the Methodology*

*4.3 Conclusion*

### **5. Bibliography and Appendix**

*5.1 Bibliography*

*5.2 Appendix One – Critical Framework Analysis of Gender Mainstreaming summary sheet*

## **1. Introduction**

The EU is often viewed as being to forefront in gender equality, and was one of the innovators of gender mainstreaming. However, the implementation of gender mainstreaming has come in for criticism from feminist scholars (Shaw 2005 and Kantola 2010). Further, within the area of EU governance (Piattoni 2010, Jachtensfuchs 2010 and de Burca and Scott 2006) it is difficult to see the influence of gender mainstreaming at all (Kronsell 2005). This can be seen, for example, in two recent surveys of the literature where there is no mention of gender in either (Stephenson 2013 and Kohler Koch and Rittberger 2006) This is especially surprising given the stated aspirations of much of the new modes of governance to embrace participation of interest groups, and to be a less hierarchical form of decision making.

Drawing on the approaches and research of feminist scholars in other areas of the EU (Kantola 2010 and Shaw 2000), as well as the wider literature of feminist theory, this thesis sets out to examine whether or not the processes of Governance are themselves gendered. This is not a case of simply utilising gender as a variable, but instead recognises that gender can be embedded throughout social structures, and uses gender as a lens for analysing those structures (Kronsell 2005).

The focus of the thesis is on the practice of governance at the EU level. While this requires the leaving for future scholarship the important work of examining the process of implementation at member state level, it is crucial to first examine the policy making process through a gendered lens, before looking at how those policies translate into the contexts of the member states. By focusing on the practice of governance there will be engagement with the interdisciplinary literature on EU governance.

The overarching question that drives this research is: Is EU Governance gendered? Given the often celebrated gender awareness of the EU, it is striking that the White Paper on Governance does not mention gender even once. In

questions of participation and legitimacy within governance there is little regard given to gender. Are patterns of discrimination observable within the processes of Governance, and to what extent? Does Governance recreate and reinforce the gender bias that has been observed and critiqued in the traditional forms of decision making? This paper introduces the methodological approach to be taken in my thesis. The thesis will be using an adaption of a Critical Framework Analysis – a form of discourse analysis that is particularly attentive to the power of framing in the policy process.

## **2. Theoretical Framework**

The purpose of this section is to outline the theoretical underpinnings of the methodology. This is crucial for the development of the research design, as well as guiding the application of the methodology itself.

### *2.1 Feminist Research*

What makes research feminist? In particular, what makes a research method a feminist method? While research that focuses on gender equality, or on women, or on gender based discriminations is very often feminist, the subject of research is not definitive in determining whether research is feminist. Indeed, as feminist research has developed and matured across multiple disciplines it has branched out from early studies that focused on such questions of explicit gender inequality to bring feminist research and analysis to all facets of political and social life. Anne Phillips characterises the early feminist research in political science as concerned “Asking the woman question” (Phillips 1995) – where the first step of analysis was to ask how a policy affected women. This approach was as much a critique of the policy itself, and the policy process, as it was of mainstream research which did not ask the woman question. Mainstream research responded, to varying degrees, by introducing gender as a variable, and paying more attention to the ways in which the gendering of society can influence outcomes. The limitations of this “add women and stir” (Charlsworth and Chinkin 2000) approach soon become clear, and feminist research has developed into a body of literature that is concerned more with transforming mainstream research rather than simply amending it. It is this approach which

has led to feminist research moving beyond studies of obviously gender-related issues.

If the subject of research can not be used to categorise feminist research, then the concept of a feminist research ethic is a useful one for identifying feminist work. As Catherine MacKinnon has said, "Method concerns the way one thinks, not what one thinks about," (MacKinnon 2013:1019). The research methodology outlined in this paper is feminist because it is driven by a feminist research ethic, and is feminist-informed research. Feminist informed research begins with an appreciation of the diversity and complexity of the social world, and is based on the normative concerns raised by feminist theory (Ackerly and True 2010).

A feminist research ethic requires a commitment to reflexivity in research, and also comprises attentiveness to four key areas. (Ackerly and True 2010) Firstly, this ethic of research design requires paying attention to the power of knowledge, to the power that is contained with epistemological stances and the debates between them. Secondly, it stipulates an awareness of boundaries, marginalization, silences and intersections. This aspect does not simply require an awareness of the silence or marginalisation of women as a broad group, but to pay attention to silencing within feminist research, for example with regards to race, nationality etc. Thirdly, awareness the importance of relationships and their power differentials is a key component of the feminist research ethic. This applies to the research process itself, in terms of interactions with research participations, collaborators, and recipients. Finally, there is a need for personal reflection, and an upfront engagement with the researchers own socio-political location, or situatedness. This requires an awareness of the researcher's own set of privileges, for example their race, gender, professional standing and so on. <sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> This description of the feminist research ethic is taken from Ackerly and True, 2010. While the four components clearly comprise a research ethic committed to good research, they conceptualization of power within each requirement that draws on feminist theory that makes this an explicitly feminist criteria.

While the first three criteria should become clear throughout this paper, at this point it is appropriate to reflect on my own situatedness. As a white woman living in a developed and well off nation, I engage in this work from a particular status of privilege. In addition, my status as an academic gives me credibility, and also time and resources necessary to carry out this work. These aspects of my situation can limit my appreciation of other experiences, as well as creating subconscious biases. While such human bias can never be eradicated entirely, feminist research requires a constant awareness of their potential, and a reflexive consideration of their impacts.

## *2.2 Intersectionality*

Critics of earlier feminist work, as well as critics of gender mainstreaming in the EU, have pointed out that “women” and “men” are not homogenous categories, and have argued that other aspects of social relations and other dimensions of discrimination need to be included in feminist analysis. To avoid such inclusion leads to essentialism, which means that research and theory can only ever be applicable to limited number of women, of a certain race, class or sexuality (amongst other categories). Essentialism requires an assumption of universal traits and erases the subjectivity of experiences. Feminist theory cannot simply speak to the experiences of a select group of women, as these interactions create many different contexts and experience of oppression. Much early feminist work fell into this trap, of attempting to make universal claims about women and women’s experiences. This led to criticism, starting from Black feminists (Crenshaw 1991 and Collins 1999) in the United States and non-western feminists (Mohanty 1988 and Spivak 1999).

Crenshaw is often credited with coining the term intersectionality. In her seminal work, she highlighted the experience of black women as existing at the intersection of both race and gender, and showed how that experience was shaped by both identities in a way that went beyond simple combination - that is, the experience of a person at the intersection could not be explained derivatively from experiences of people in either category (Crenshaw 1991). It is clear that intersectionality is influenced by postmodern feminism - the attack on the idea of

a unified subject fed into the destabilisation of categories such as woman, lesbian or black (Benhabib 1995). This insight has profound implications for feminist activism and for research.

Intersectional feminism does not seek to order these dimensions of discrimination in any type of hierarchy, or simply to add class, sexuality or other analysis to feminist analysis. It requires a much more complete rethinking of feminist work. The fragmentation of the subject generated by an intersectional approach forces the researcher to focus on the structures of power, and of discrimination and oppression, in a much more comprehensive way (MacKinnon 2013). This can be done through a focus on the experiences of those who exist in various intersections, or on the margins between the standard categories (Collins 1999) or it can influence the way in which institutions, structures and processes are analysed.

Further, it should be clear that intersectionality is not a content specialisation - it is an epistemological approach to doing research that frames how questions are asked, how findings are interpreted and how claims are evaluated (Hancock 2007). Crucially, intersectionality calls into question the way things are, and is focused on how structures and distributions of power interact to form different sites of oppression. It is an investigation of how things are, rather than who people are (Cho, Crenshaw and McCall 2013).

### *2.3 Gender and Power*

Power is a central concern of feminist work. The overall PhD thesis is concerned with investigating the gendered power of EU governance, and as such the methodology is based on a particular conceptualisation of power. Firstly, it is appreciated that power – and the institutions of power such as states, governments, or supranational organisations – is dynamic and non-homogenous (Brown 1992). Even though we may speak of the state or the EU as a singular entity – as an “it” – we must remember that it is comprised of competing claims, contradictory and often mutually exclusive goals, and a variety of ideological regimes. An awareness of this complexity and dynamism avoids capturing

snapshots – analysis limited either by time or scope, which does not adequately represent the subject of analysis.

In exploring the gendered nature of state power in the United States, Brown focuses on four expressions of state power – the judicial or legislative power, the capitalist and economic power, the prerogative or legitimating power and the bureaucratic power. By separating out the expressions of power in this way the nuances, contradictions and complexities of power can be better captured. Her focus is on uncovering masculinist power – not necessarily the power of men at the expense of women, but an embedding of masculine norms, and the establishment of structures and policies that are based on these norms, which are presented as neutral (Brown 1992). It is this idea of masculinist power that is being investigated by this methodology. This is what is meant when posing the question, “is EU governance gendered?”

Fraser’s theory of social justice is based on what she refers to as the three Rs – Redistribution, Recognition and Representation<sup>2</sup> (Fraser 2006 and Fraser 2009). Redistribution refers to material fairness, to economic and resource distribution and equality. Recognition is the principle of respect for group and individual identity, and the protection against the violence of being misrecognised. Representation concerns the ability for people to participate in and influence the processes of decision making which impact upon their lives. All three are required for system to meet the standards of justice she outlines, and all three are interactive with one another. Within this project, the focus is on representation, though of course it can not ever be completely separated out.

Representation in this sense is not a simplified notion of democratic rights. It is concerned with how the decision making process creates boundaries between the public and private (or the political and the private). In particular, in relation to the increasing level of decision making that is happening at a trans-

---

<sup>2</sup> It is worth noting that Lynch 2009 has added a fourth R – relationship, which encompasses an understanding of justice in interpersonal relationships, drawing heavily on a feminist ethic of care.

national level, representation in these sense is concerned with the demarcation of constituencies, with the power dynamic that decides who has a legitimate claim to participation. The harm solved by representation is that of silencing. To follow Lukes' radical formulation of power, then, one of the levels of power of concern here is that in which an issue is unquestioned so that within the discourse of the actors involved, and even within their own minds, the issue is not even formulated as a political issue (Lukes 2005). It is this exercise of power – of boundary drawing and of silencing, that this methodology seeks to explore.

#### *2.4 Gender and Language*

A final key theoretical underpinning for this methodology concerns the interaction between gender and language. Gender is itself constructed through language (Butler 2011). The establishment and enforcement of gender categories, and the hierarchy between them is also clearly a discursive practice. Language forms part of the everyday expression of gender ideologies, whether through reinforcing a binary understanding of gender, or by denigrating concepts, actions and norms that are associated with the feminine (Lazar 2007) In order to appreciate this role of language, this methodology draws on two theoretical approaches – Feminist Critical Discourse Analysis and Gender Knowledge.

Building on feminist interpretations, criticism and appropriation of the works of Foucault, Bourdieu, Gramsci and others, the field of Feminist Critical Discourse Analysis is an interdisciplinary approach situated within the broader literature on critical discourse analysis. As such it is highly sensitive to the power dynamics of language and discourse. The purpose of feminist critical discourse analysis is to develop a “distinctly feminist politics of articulation” (Wetherell 1995: 141) which seeks to theorise, unpack and analyse the “particularly insidious and oppressive nature of gender as an omnirelevant category in most social practices” (Lazer 2007: 3). As a critical methodology, this approach recognises that discourse can be the site of resistance as well as oppression, and seeks to identify mechanisms of subversion and emancipation within the



discourses under examination. This fits with the particular feminist commitment to research as part of a political project of unmasking patriarchy (West 1988)

This approach is of particular relevance to investigations of gender discrimination that is less overt. This type of discrimination is the operation and expression of a subtle form of power that is “substantively discursive in nature. This form of power is embedded and dispersed throughout networks of relations, is self regulating, and produces subjects in both senses of the word” (Lazer 2007: 9). In particular, this approach can uncover patriarchal power that has come to be seen as natural – the type of power which is insidious precisely because it has become invisible. It is based on the internalization of gendered norms and gender ideology. Clearly this type of analysis is pertinent to examinations of the European Union, where overt discrimination is often tackled, and claims of gender neutrality abound (Kantola 2010).

“Gender knowledge is an analytical concept that can be used as a framework to identify explicit and implicit assumptions or conceptions concerning gender and gender relations, and the norms which support them” (Cavaghan 2010: 18). Coming out of sociological approaches, gender knowledge has been increasingly applied to questions of politics and law (Young 2010). It begins from the premise that all knowledge is based on a specific gender knowledge, produced, internalised and recreated discursively. It distinguishes between two levels of gender knowledge – collectively held, “objective” gender knowledge and “subjective” gender knowledge. It also captures the variety of gender knowledge – that is, the different gender ideologies at play. This is a key strength of the gender knowledge approach, as it allows for a nuanced exploration of gender power where there are multiple gender regimes in contest and discourse with one another, such as is the case within the EU (Walby 2004).

One of the key epistemic tools found within the theory of gender knowledge is that of boundary work. Boundary work concerns the description and focus on those key moments within a discourse where gender is perceived as relevant or not for the policy process- as such these moments define whether

or not gender will be included in the debate. A focus on these key moments allows for an appreciation of how disciplinary and institutional factors construct and therefore use gender knowledge. This leads to decisions about who may/should legitimately participate. As such it is a key moment in the exercise of power of silencing and boundary drawing (Çağlar 2010). In particular, Çağlar notes that the categorisation of an issue as either social or economic is heavily influenced, and heavily influences, whether gender is constructed as key aspect of the policy process.

### **3. Critical Framework Methodology**

This section will outline the methodology which is built upon the theoretical work laid out above. In order to present the methodology in a concrete way, an example from one of the thesis' case studies will be used. In the field of EU economic governance there have been several reforms in response to the economic and fiscal crises. Two of these reforms take the form of regulations which create requirements for supervision and oversight of member state economic and budgetary affairs. These regulations were adopted in 2011 as part of the "Six Pack" of reforms aimed at strengthening the now discredited Stability and Growth Pact. Analysis of these two regulations will be used here to illustrate how the methodology works in practice. However, it should be noted that the various contexts across the different case studies will lead to some differences in the application of the methodology. The logic, however, remains the same across all of the applications.

#### *3.1 The Requirements and Challenges*

The research question established at the outset of this paper, is EU governance gendered, sets many requirements for an answer. Firstly, there is the standard of intersectionality to be met. The conceptualisation of gender from an intersectional lens requires that care be taken at each step of the methodology to avoid essentialism and exclusion of identities within the broad category of gender. This is a challenge in the process of data collection – which documents are judged to be relevant, as well as in interpretation. In interpretation, both the bias of the researcher, and the bias of the documents themselves pose a risk to

the intersectional intentions. Care has to be taken to not re-produce hidden essentialism from the documents in the production of the coding schema.

The second key challenge is to be found in the nature of governance. The type of governance under study here has proven resistant to empirical investigation (Stephenson 2013, Kohler Koch and Rittberger 2006 and Piattoni 2010b). The informal aspects of governance, as well its nature as innovative or experimental make application of pre-existing coding frameworks difficult, if not impossible. These aspects also limit the amount of useful documentary evidence that is accessible. Further, in the empirical work that has been done, there has been a consistent gap between rhetoric and action identified. This clearly raises issues for analysis that is based on a study of discourse and not focused on measuring implementation, and so this inconsistency must be given consideration in any conclusions drawn. This rhetoric-outcome gap is similar to that found in gender policies of the EU (Abels and Mushaben 2012), and so this methodology can follow the approaches of discourse studies of gender mainstreaming and anti-discrimination policies in order to avoid pitfalls. Indeed, analysis of this kind can help to shed light on the cause of this gap, by identifying the underlying meanings in pronouncements and rhetoric.

A final challenge for the development of a suitable methodology for the research question results from the fact that the majority of feminist work on the EU has focused on gender policies in particular.<sup>3</sup> The methodological approach detailed below, the Critical Framework Analysis, for example is concerned with gender equality policies and gender mainstreaming in the EU. In order to adapt such an approach for the examination of new modes of governance, there needs to be particular attention paid to the process of data selection. Where gender equality policies are under study, the selection of documents is guided by the existing parameters of that policy. In contrast, in terms of new modes of governance, one of the steps of analysis is identifying the absence of gender in the policy process, and so the universe of available and relevant documentation

---

<sup>3</sup> Key exceptions to this include MacRae (2013), Beveridge and Velluti (2013) and Prugl (2011)

is much broader. It is important to avoid re-creating biased views about where gender is and is not relevant prior to the analysis, as to do so would prevent the emergence of more genuine and reflective framework.

### *3.2 Critical Framework Analysis of Gender Mainstreaming*

Gender mainstreaming – the principle that gender should be incorporated into every step of the policy process – was welcomed by feminist scholars upon its adoption by the EU (Lombardo and Meier 2006). However, it quickly became clear that gender mainstreaming would not live up to expectations. In order to investigate why, a critical framework analysis has been developed by several feminist scholars (for example, Woodward 2003, Rees 2005, Lombardo and Meier 2008 and Verloo 2005)<sup>4</sup>

Critical framework analysis of gender policies in the EU starts from an assumption of multiple interpretations of gender equality. It seeks to explore how those meanings are utilised in the process of gender mainstreaming, and uses that information to understand the failures of gender mainstreaming. The first key concept of this approach is the “policy frame”. A policy frame is “an interpretation scheme that structures the meaning of reality” (Verloo and Lombardo 2007: 32). These policy frames originate in discursive consciousness, as well as in practical consciousness. They shape and reflect the gender assumptions of the actors involved. Policy frames are organising principles that transform fragmentary information into a meaningful and structured problem, in which a solution is implicitly or explicitly included (Verloo 2005). This occurs in two dimensions – diagnosis and prognosis. In this sense it is not simply the policy as response that is at issue, but also the formation of the policy problem. The framing of a problem establishes the “problem holder” as well as delimiting the relevant actors for the policy process.

Further to the concept of policy frame, is the idea of “master frames”. These refer to overarching frameworks which shape the prognosis and

---

<sup>4</sup> Much of this work has been connected with the MAGEEQ project, the results of which are available here: <http://www.mageeq.net/>

diagnosis, and the discourse. Such frameworks are hegemonic ideologies – such as, for example, neo-liberalism, or gender equality. The role of these master frames is to further limit the discourse on particular issues. Critical framework analysis is able to uncover these master frames – which often gain significant power by virtue of their invisibility (Verloo and Lombardo 2007).

Asking “what’s the problem?” can reveal much about the policy frame. Identifying the context in which the problem is situated can set the terms for the solution – for example if gender inequality is framed as women lagging behind men, that will lead to a different set of policy solutions than if the problem is framed as men gaining unfair advantages over women. Further, the framing of the problem identifies the policy area in which the solution will be located – for example in anti-discrimination policy, labour issues, trade policy etc. (Bacchi 1999).

Critical Framework Analysis uses reflective framing. It does not begin with an established frame. This allows for the engagement with multiple and disputed meanings, and enables the capturing of that diversity. It also diminishes the risk of the researcher biasing the analysis by operating with a preset understanding of the problem. However, this does limit the generalizability of the analysis, and makes comparison more difficult. The Critical Framework approach is, therefore, ill equipped to make claims about how or why such frameworks have emerged or gained dominance. Instead, it offers an analysis of the frameworks, which is necessary before such causal process can be explored (Verloo and Lombardo 2007)

### *3.3 Critical Framework Analysis of Economic Governance*

The Critical Framework Analysis used to examine gender mainstreaming in the EU is adapted to examine new modes of governance in the EU. To outline the process of this methodology, this section will refer to the particular analysis of two key regulations in economic governance.

The method of data collection closely reflects that outlined by the MAGEEQ project – starting with the regulations themselves, incorporating the

discussion and public statement documents connected with their design and adoption, and the documentation related to their announcement. Further documentation, including follow up information, as well as the annual reviews submitted and published are also used. Documentation is added cumulatively until there is no additional substantial information being collected. Special attention was given to collecting a wide range of document types, in order to include legally binding documentation as well as discussion documentation.

The first step of analysis involves identifying the documents which explicitly or implicitly incorporate gender. This categorisation is a useful starting point to examine whether gender mainstreaming principles have been implemented in practice in this area. Following this surface analysis, the framework analysis is applied. The approach follows that of the MAGEEQ project, with detailed, and relatively open ended coding sheets being used.<sup>5</sup> This step relies on the theoretical understandings about language and gender, and seeks to examine both the prognosis and diagnosis processes of the regulations. It is in this step that both policy frames and master frames are to be uncovered and examined. Thirdly, the documents are subjected to a more traditional discourse analysis (Wodak and Meyer 2009) – questioning what is being portrayed as truth by the documentation, how “normality” is constructed, what the competing realities are within the discourse, and how actors are conceptualised. It is in this step that the question of boundary work is pertinent. If gender is not present, why? What conceptualisation of the policy led to the exclusion of gender? What gender regime underlies these assumptions (Walby 2004)? What is prioritised here? What is excluded? The penultimate step involves a return to the theoretical framework, to examine the findings in relation to the specific theories of gender and power, as well as against the stated aims of gender mainstreaming and gender equality of the EU. The final step involves reflection on the process, and adjustments to the coding sheets, the theoretical framework or the methodology if necessary. This reflexivity is a key part of the feminist research ethic in practice.

---

<sup>5</sup> For an example of such a coding sheet see the appendix.

#### **4. Conclusions and Potential Pitfalls**

This paper has outlined the theoretical framework and methodological approach to be taken in the three case studies of the thesis. There remain several key questions to be answered about this approach. A key aspect of this approach is its reflexivity, and it is envisioned that much will be learned as the methodology is applied across the case studies. This section outlines how this paper relates to the other case studies, and to other work. It also discusses some of the limits of the methodology, as well as its strengths.

##### *4.1 Relations to Other Work*

As has been mentioned, this methodology is to be applied across three case studies – economic governance, the services directive, and external governance. There are differing constraints within each of the cases, in particular in relation to the data available. In particular, within the case on external governance there is a heightened awareness of gender issues. This, along with a slightly longer time frame, means that the number of documents which are deemed relevant is much higher than for the other cases. This raises issues of practicality, as there simply is not enough time to go through these documents to the same extent as in the other case studies. Use of software has been explored to solve this problem, but it remains unclear whether or not a software programme can be used without hiding some of the crucial information that is found through in depth readings.

This methodology is accompanied by use of the doctrinal method. This is mainly used as a descriptive method, but it provides for a contextualisation of the regulations and policies under scrutiny, and serves to conceptualise them within the wider context of EU governance. This additional methodology does not serve a triangulation function, in particular as it may be drawing on the same biases of the researcher and the documents as the framework analysis method.

As was mentioned earlier, there remains a difficulty in developing an empirical evaluation of governance of the EU (in particular here, governance refers to the new governance methods under study in the thesis). As such, this

methodology could be instructive to those seeking to evaluate governance from other normative perspectives, for example in relation to the democratic deficit, or from an efficacy standpoint. It is hoped that this work will therefore be engaged with beyond the feminist literature.

#### *4.2 Limitations of the Methodology*

No methodology is perfect. There are two key potential problems with this methodology that are discussed here (there may indeed be more). Firstly, there is a question as to how well the subject of inquiry – governance – is operationalized. By focusing on content and discourse at the expense of implementation there is a potential to simply discover whether the documentation of governance is gendered. There are steps that can be taken to limit this danger somewhat, for example, by drawing upon the existing work on implementation at in the analysis of the findings. Another potential solution to this problem may be found in a closer engagement with the theories of feminist institutionalism that have emerged in the past decade. Developing a dialogue between framework and discourse analysis and those theories would be incredibly constructive. Clearly, more needs to be done to ensure that the methodology fully connects with the research question, and this will be an ongoing process.

The second main problem concerns the issue of comparison. The framework analysis is not particularly well suited to comparative study, at least not in the positivist sense (Lombardo and Meier 2008). However, even outside of that conception of comparison, there are questions over the usefulness of data generated by this methodology to the various audiences at which the thesis is aimed. The thesis aims to engage with political science and legal scholars focusing on governance, as well as with feminist researchers and feminist activists. If the findings are not adequately contextualised, or the methodology not extensively explained, that engagement will be limited. In seeking to address many audiences, the thesis (and the methodology) may end up over-simplifying some aspects, or over complicating others. Developing a distribution strategy that deals with these problems is intimately connected with the research design, as part of the feminist research ethic.



### *4.3 Conclusion*

Despite the risks outlined here, this is an incredibly useful methodology. It enables an analysis that brings to the fore power dynamics that exceed in their invisibility. It allows the researcher to engage with complex discourses, where there are often competing understandings and meanings. It also enables an analysis grounded in feminist theories of power. Given the interaction between language, gender and power, such a discursive approach is indeed appropriate. By adapting the critical framework approach to deal with policy areas that are not explicitly concerned with gender equality or gender mainstreaming, the methodology outlined in this paper allows for the development of feminist theorising of the EU, and also highlights the mechanism for feminist investigations of complex structures - something which remains both a challenge and priority.

## 5. Bibliography and Appendix

### 5.1 Bibliography

Abels, G., & Mushaben, J. M. (Eds.). (2012). *Gendering the European Union: New approaches to old democratic deficits*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Ackerly, B. A., & True, J. (2010). *Doing feminist research in political and social science*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Bacchi, C. (2005). Discourse, discourse everywhere: Subject “agency” in feminist discourse methodology. *Nordic journal of women's studies*, 13(03), 198-209.

Benhabib, S. (Ed.). (1995). *Feminist Contentions: A Philosophical Exchange*. Routledge.

Beveridge, F., & Velluti, S. (Eds.). (2013). *Gender and the open method of coordination: perspectives on law, governance and equality in the EU*. Ashgate Publishing, Ltd..

Brown, W. (1992). Finding the Man in the State. *Feminist Studies*, 7-34.

Butler, J. (2011). *Bodies that matter: On the discursive limits of sex*. Taylor & Francis.

Çağlar, G. (2010). Multiple meanings of gender budgeting: gender knowledge and economic knowledge in the World Bank and UNDP in In Young, B. (Ed.). *Gender knowledge and knowledge networks in international political economy*. Baden-Baden: Nomos.

Cavaghan, R. (2010). “Gender knowledge: A review of theory and practice.” In Young, B. (Ed.). *Gender knowledge and knowledge networks in international political economy*. Baden-Baden: Nomos.

Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford law review*, 1241-1299.

Cho, S., Crenshaw, K. W., & McCall, L. (2013). Toward a field of intersectionality studies: Theory, applications, and praxis. *Signs*, 38(4), 785-810.

Collins, P. H. (1999). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*. Routledge.

Charlesworth, H., & Chinkin, C. (2000). *The boundaries of international law: A feminist analysis*. Manchester University Press.

De Búrca, G., & Scott, J. (2006). *New governance, law and constitutionalism. Law and New Governance in the EU and US*.

Fraser, N. (2006). *Mapping the feminist imagination: From redistribution to recognition to representation* (pp. 37-51). VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

Fraser, N. (2009). *Scales of justice: Reimagining political space in a globalizing world*. Columbia University Press.

Hancock, A. M. (2007). When multiplication doesn't equal quick addition: Examining intersectionality as a research paradigm. *Perspectives on Politics*, 5(01), 63-79.

Jachtenfuchs, M. (2001), The Governance Approach to European Integration. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 39: 245–264.

Kantola, J. (2010). *Gender and the European Union*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kohler-Koch, B., & Rittberger, B. (2006). Review Article: The 'Governance Turn in EU Studies. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 44(s1), 27-49

Kronsell, A. (2005). Gender, power and European integration theory. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 12(6), 1022-1040.

Lazar, M. M. (2005). *Feminist critical discourse analysis: gender, power, and ideology in discourse*. . Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Lombardo, E., & Meier, P. (2006). Gender Mainstreaming in the EU Incorporating a Feminist Reading?. *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 13(2), 151-166.

Lombardo, E., & Meier, P. (2008). Framing gender equality in the European Union political discourse. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society*, 15(1), 101-129.

Lombardo, E., Meier, P., & Verloo, M. (Eds.). (2009). *The discursive politics of gender equality: stretching, bending and policy-making*. Routledge.

Steven, L. (2005). *Power: A radical view*. Hampshire and New York, Palgrave Macmillan.

Lynch, K. (2009). Affective Equality: Who cares&quest. *Development*, 52(3), 410-415.

MacKinnon, C. A. (2013). Intersectionality as method: A note. *Signs*, 38(4), 1019-1030.

MacRae, H. (2013, May). (Re-) Gendering integration: Unintentional and unanticipated gender outcomes of European Union policy. In *Women's Studies International Forum*. Pergamon.

- Mohanty, C. T. (1988). Under Western eyes: Feminist scholarship and colonial discourses. *Feminist review*, 61-88.
- Phillips, A. (1995). *The politics of presence*. Oxford University Press.
- Piattoni, S. (2010). *The theory of multi-level governance: conceptual, empirical, and normative challenges*. Oxford University Press.
- Prügl, E. (2011). *Transforming masculine rule: agriculture and rural development in the European Union*. University of Michigan Press.
- Rees, T. (2005). Reflections on the uneven development of gender mainstreaming in Europe. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 7(4), 555-574.
- Shaw, J.(2000) 'Importing gender: the challenge of feminism and the analysis of the EU legal order', *Journal of European Public Policy*, 7:3: 406-431.
- Shaw, J. (2005). Mainstreaming equality and diversity in European Union law and policy. *Current Legal Problems*, 58(1), 255-312.
- Spivak, G. C. (1999). *A critique of postcolonial reason: Toward a history of the vanishing present*. Harvard university press.
- Stephenson, P. (2013). Twenty years of multi-level governance: 'Where Does It Come From? What Is It? Where Is It Going?'. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 20(6)
- Verloo, M. (2005). Displacement and empowerment: Reflections on the concept and practice of the Council of Europe approach to gender mainstreaming and gender equality. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society*, 12(3), 344-365.
- Verloo, M., & Lombardo, E. (2007). "Contested gender equality and policy variety in Europe: Introducing a critical frame analysis approach." In Verloo ed. *Multiple meaning of gender equality: A critical frame analysis of gender policies in Europe*.
- Walby, S. (2004). The European Union and gender equality: Emergent varieties of gender regime. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society*, 11(1), 4-29.
- West, R. (1988). Jurisprudence and gender. *The University of Chicago Law Review*, 1-72.
- Wetherell, M. (1998). Positioning and interpretative repertoires: Conversation analysis and post-structuralism in dialogue. *Discourse & Society*, 9(3), 387-412.

Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (Eds.). (2009). *Methods for critical discourse analysis*. Sage.

Woodward, A. (2003). European gender mainstreaming: Promises and pitfalls of transformative Policy1. *Review of Policy Research*, 20(1), 65-88.

Young, B. (Ed.). (2010). *Gender knowledge and knowledge networks in international political economy*. Baden-Baden: Nomos.

5.2 Appendix One – Critical Framework Analysis of Gender Mainstreaming  
summary sheet

Taken from Verloo, M. (2007). Multiple meanings of gender equality. *A Critical Frame Analysis of Gender Policies in Europe*.

*MAGEEQ Methodology of Critical Frame Analysis*  
*SUPER-TEXT TEMPLATE*

**NUMBER/CODE/ TITLE (max 20 signs)**

- Full title
- (In English and in original language)
- Country/Place
- Issue
- Date
- Type/status of document
- Actor(s) and gender of actor(s) if applicable
- Audience
- Event/reason/occasion of appearance
- Parts of text eliminated

**Voice**

**SUMMARY**

- Voice(s) speaking
- Perspective
- References: words/concepts (and where they come from)
- References: actors
- References: documents

**Diagnosis**

**SUMMARY**

- What is represented as the problem?
- Why is it seen as a problem?
- Causality (what is seen as a cause of what?)
- Dimensions of gender (social categories/identity/behavior/norms & symbols/institutions)
- Intersectionality
- Mechanisms (resources/norms & interpretations/legitimization of violence)

- Form (argumentation/style/conviction techniques/dichotomies/metaphors/contrasts)
- Location (organization of labor/organization of intimacy/organization of citizenship)

#### **Attribution of roles in diagnosis**

##### **SUMMARY**

- Causality (who is seen to have made the problem?)
- Responsibility (who is seen as responsible for the problem?)
- Problem holders (whose problem is it seen to be?)
- Normativity (what is a norm group if there is a problem group?)
- Active/passive roles (perpetrators/victims, etc.)
- Legitimization of non-problem(s)

#### **Prognosis**

##### **SUMMARY**

- What to do?
- Hierarchy/priority in goals
- How to achieve goals (strategy/means/instruments)?
- Dimensions of gender (social categories/identity/behavior/norms & symbols/institutions)
- Intersectionality
- Mechanisms (resources/norms & interpretations/violence)
- Form (argumentation/style/conviction techniques/dichotomies/metaphors)
- Location (organization of labor/intimacy/citizenship)

#### **Attribution of roles in prognosis**

##### **SUMMARY**

- Call for action and non-action (who should [not] do what?)
- Who has voice in suggesting suitable course of action?
- Who is acted upon? (target groups)
- Boundaries set to action
- Legitimization of (non)action

## Normativity

### SUMMARY

- What is seen as good?
- What is seen as bad?
- Location of norms in the text (diagnosis/prognosis/elsewhere)

## Balance

### SUMMARY

- Emphasis on different dimensions/elements
- Frictions or contradictions within dimensions/elements

## Comments