

Detailed Table of Contents

Acknowledgements | 9

1. Gender Bias in Policy Making | 11

- 1.1 Research Motivation, Questions and Structure | 11
 - 1.1.1 Motivation | 12
 - 1.1.2 Questions | 14
 - 1.1.3 Structure | 16
- 1.2 Choice of Language | 17
- 1.3 Good Governance and Better Regulation | 18
- 1.4 Impact Assessment and Public Policies | 21
 - 1.4.1 Policy Analysis and Impact Assessment | 21
 - 1.4.1.1 Genealogy | 23
 - 1.4.1.2 Scope | 25
 - 1.4.1.3 Evidence | 28
 - 1.4.2 Evaluations | 30
 - 1.4.2.1 Genealogy | 30
 - 1.4.2.2 Scope | 31
 - 1.4.3 Policy Cycle | 32
- 1.5 Controlling for Gender Mainstreaming—Through Tools? | 33
 - 1.5.1 Gender Mainstreaming as a Genealogy | 34
 - 1.5.2 Gender Mainstreaming as a Technology | 37
 - 1.5.3 The Technology of Gender Analysis | 45
 - 1.5.3.1 In/visibility of Gender Analysis? | 47
 - 1.5.3.2 Implementation of Gender Analysis | 49
 - 1.5.4 Gender Analysis Between Accountability and Controlling | 54
 - 1.5.4.1 Accountability | 55
 - 1.5.4.2 Controlling | 58
 - 1.5.5 Implications for Research | 62
- 1.6 Tool Typologies and Quality Criteria | 63
 - 1.6.1 Typologies of Gender Analysis in the Context of Impact Assessment Tools | 64
 - 1.6.1.1 Typology of Impact Assessment Tools | 64
 - 1.6.1.2 Typology of Gender Analysis Instruments | 68
 - 1.6.1.3 Typology of Gender in Integrated Impact Assessments | 73

1.6.2 Quality Criteria for Gender Mainstreaming Tools | 75

1.6.3 Implications for Research | 80

2. Methodology | 83

2.1 Reflexive Standpoint Approach | 83

2.1.1 Relevant Concepts of Feminist Standpoint Theory | 84

2.1.2 Standpoint Theory between Feminist and Critical Empiricism | 87

2.1.3 Implications for Research | 91

2.2 Governance | 95

2.2.1 From Government to Governance | 96

2.2.2 Multilevel Governance and Comparability | 97

2.2.2.1 Multilevel Governance | 98

2.2.2.2 Travelling Instruments of Equality Governance | 100

2.2.2.3 Comparison | 101

2.2.3 Epistemic Governance and Gender | 103

2.2.3.1 Insider/Outsider Actors and Third Way Governance Through Impact Assessment | 103

2.2.3.2 Feminist Critical Governance and State Feminism | 108

2.2.3.3 The Equality Governance of and by Impact Assessment | 112

2.2.4 Implications for Research | 115

2.3 Gender | 118

2.3.1 Sex, Gender and Intersectionality—Beyond the Binary? | 118

2.3.2 Gender and the Othering of Knowledge | 126

2.3.3 Implications for Research | 128

2.4 Methods and Research Design | 129

2.4.1 Positioning and Transdisciplinarity | 129

2.4.2 Mixed-method Research | 131

2.4.3 Expert Interviews | 132

2.4.3.1 Definitions of Experts | 132

2.4.3.2 Sampling Strategies and Saturation | 134

2.4.3.3 Interview Participation | 135

2.4.3.4 Limitations of Field Access | 139

2.4.3.5 Interview Questionnaire and Interrogation | 141

2.4.3.6 Interview Evaluation | 143

2.4.4 Triangulation | 144

2.5 The Analytic Framework | 146

2.5.1 Institutional Mechanisms for Gender Mainstreaming | 147

2.5.2 Gender Mainstreaming in Organisations: The Moser and Moser Framework | 148

2.5.3 Institutionalisation of Gender Analysis: The Analytic Framework | 151

2.5.4 Summary | 157

- 3. Gender in Federal Canadian Policy Analysis | 159**
- 3.1 Gender-based Analysis in Canadian Federal Administration | 159
 - 3.1.1 Canadian Political System and Policy Analysis | 159
 - 3.1.2 Legal Basis for and Advancement of Gender-based Analysis | 162
 - 3.2 Gender-based Analysis: “Mother of All Manuals” | 169
 - 3.2.1 Status of Women Canada and Gender-based Analysis | 170
 - 3.2.2 Gender-based Analysis in Canadian Federal Government | 183
 - 3.2.2.1 Gender-Based Analysis—the Tool | 183
 - 3.2.2.2 Gender-based Analysis and the Quality Criteria for Gender Mainstreaming Tools | 185
 - 3.2.3 Tool Re-launch: GBA+ | 185
 - 3.2.3.1 A Plus in Intersectionality, Reflexivity—and Application? | 186
 - 3.2.3.2 Application Step by Step | 187
 - 3.2.3.3 Critical Engagement | 190
 - 3.3 Departmental Implementation of Gender-Based Analysis: Case Studies | 190
 - 3.3.1 Canadian International Development Agency | 191
 - 3.3.1.1 Tools, Implementation, Governance and Accountability | 192
 - 3.3.1.2 Departmental Equality Machinery and Gender Training | 199
 - 3.3.2 Department of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada | 201
 - 3.3.2.1 Equality Architecture and Departmental Governance | 202
 - 3.3.2.2 Tools and Implementation Strategy | 204
 - 3.3.2.3 Evaluation, Accountability and Monitoring | 207
 - 3.3.3 Health Canada | 210
 - 3.3.3.1 Equality Architecture and Departmental Tool Governance | 211
 - 3.3.3.2 The Process of Tool Implementation | 212
 - 3.3.3.3 Accountability | 218
 - 3.4 The State-of-the-Art of Gender-based Analysis: Empirical Findings | 220
 - 3.4.1 Tools: “We Gently Knock On Their Door” | 220
 - 3.4.1.1 Status-quo: “A Way of Thinking”—“a Recipe”—“an Art”? | 221
 - 3.4.1.2 Intersectionality: “People Often Assume It’s Only Women and Men” | 225
 - 3.4.1.3 Challenges: “It’s the Assumption That We Already Do It” | 227
 - 3.4.1.4 Facilitation: “You Have to Keep Knitting” | 236
 - 3.4.1.5 Organisational Capacity: No “Rigid Application” | 239
 - 3.4.2 Responsibilities: “Here Is Our Policy, Have Fun” | 244
 - 3.4.3 Training: “We Are Going to Decrease Your Comfort Level” | 246
 - 3.4.4 Resources: “We Don’t Have a Budget” | 251
 - 3.4.5 Knowledge: “Putting a Face on That Population Base” | 254
 - 3.4.6 Accountability: The “Ultimate Utopia of Mainstreaming”? | 259

- 3.4.6.1 Gender-based Analysis: It Is “the Accountability Mechanism We Want to Get Our Dirty Little Fingers Into” | 263
- 3.4.6.2 Controlling for Gender-based Analysis: “It’s Going to Be Easy for Government” | 269
- 3.4.6.3 Canada and the New Zealand Accountability Experience—Excursus | 273
- 3.5 Summary: “I Can See a Difference Already” | 275

4. Gender in the Impact Assessment of the European Commission | 279

- 4.1 Political System, Policy Making and Impact Assessment | 279
 - 4.1.1 Policy Making Process and the European Commission | 280
 - 4.1.2 Legal Mandate for Gender Mainstreaming | 286
 - 4.1.3 Impact Assessment between Economy, Sustainability and Gender | 287
 - 4.1.3.1 Dual Origin of the Impact Assessment System | 290
 - 4.1.3.2 Inter-Institutional Common Approach to Impact Assessment | 294
 - 4.1.3.3 Integrated Impact Assessment Guidelines and System | 295
 - 4.1.3.4 Impact Assessment Board and Quality Management | 297
- 4.2 Gender in Impact Assessment: Experiment in Subordination | 300
 - 4.2.1 Gender Impact Assessment | 300
 - 4.2.1.1 Gender Impact Assessment: The Relevance Check | 303
 - 4.2.1.2 Gender Impact Assessment: Full-fledged | 304
 - 4.2.1.3 Gender Impact Assessment and the Quality Criteria for Gender Mainstreaming Tools | 305
 - 4.2.2 Other Gender Mainstreaming Impact Assessment Tools | 305
 - 4.2.2.1 The Manual on Gender Mainstreaming in Employment and Social Cohesion Policies | 306
 - 4.2.2.2 Gender Impact Assessment in Evaluating Socio Economic Development | 308
 - 4.2.3 Gender in the Integrated Impact Assessment Guidelines | 309
 - 4.2.3.1 The Integrated Impact Assessment Guidelines | 310
 - 4.2.3.2 The Supporting Social Impact Assessment Guidelines | 315
 - 4.2.3.3 Subordination in the Integrated Impact Assessment of the Commission | 317
 - 4.2.3.4 The Integrated Impact Assessment and the Quality Criteria for Gender Mainstreaming Tools | 319
 - 4.2.3.5 Fundamental Rights Impact Assessment | 321
- 4.3 Gender Impact Assessment and the Gender Equality Architecture | 321
 - 4.3.1 Gender Impact Assessment in the Gender Equality Strategy | 322
 - 4.3.2 Gender Equality Architecture and Equality Governance Through Impact Assessment | 324

- 4.4 Gender in the Impact Assessment of the European Commission: Empirical Findings | 332
 - 4.4.1 Tools: “Demonstrate That [...] We’re Doing What We Preach” | 333
 - 4.4.1.1 Status-quo: “It’s Not an Institutional Success” | 333
 - 4.4.1.2 Intersectionality: “It’s Not Something That We Do Systematically, but It Happens Of Course” | 335
 - 4.4.1.3 Challenges: “We Are Not Meant to Look Out for Gender, Gender Is With DG Justice” | 339
 - 4.4.1.4 Facilitation: “That We Assume That All Policies are Gender Neutral Unless Someone Points out That They Are Not” | 340
 - 4.4.1.5 Organisational Capacity: “You Are Asking Something Which Is Not Really in Place” | 344
 - 4.4.2 Responsibilities: “You Need a Strong Institutionalised Framework” | 351
 - 4.4.3 Training: “I Still Have Plenty of Things to Learn” | 355
 - 4.4.4 Resources: “That’s [...] a Very Theoretic Question” | 360
 - 4.4.5 Knowledge: “An Indicator As Such Doesn’t Say Much” | 365
 - 4.4.6 Accountability: “Monitoring Is the Only Way to Check It” | 370
 - 4.4.6.1 Accountability Through Consultations: “Sometimes I’m Looking at Who Has Answers, But [...] Nobody Asked Me That” | 374
 - 4.4.6.2 Controlling for Gender Impact Assessment: “We Did Work Informally, You Know Networking” | 378
 - 4.4.6.3 The Role of the Impact Assessment Board: “I Have Never Seen That the IAB Requests Something on Gender Equality” | 381
 - 4.4.6.4 The Role of the European Institute for Gender Equality: “I Know Their Work, But It’s Almost by Accident” | 384
 - 4.4.6.5 Summary | 385
- 4.5 Summary: “It Doesn’t Make a Critical Mass for Us to [...] Answer On This” | 385

5. Present and Future of Gender in Impact Assessment: a Standpoint— a Paradigm Shift? | 389

- 5.1 Gender Equality Governance through Impact Assessment: Comparative Conclusions | 389
 - 5.1.1 Tools: Fit for Use? | 390
 - 5.1.2 Responsibilities: Linking Gender Equality and Impact Assessment Governance | 397
 - 5.1.3 Training: Building Sustainable Gender Competency for Impact Assessment | 398
 - 5.1.4 Resources: Doing Gender Is Taking Time | 402
 - 5.1.5 Knowledge: Bridging the Science-Gender Gap | 404
 - 5.1.6 Accountability: Conflict For and Over Oversight | 408
 - 5.1.7 Summary: Hidden Leadership Disowned | 414
- 5.2 Equality Governance Through Impact Assessment | 421

- 5.2.1 Feminist Standpoints in Impact Assessment | 422
 - 5.2.1.1 Epistemic Advantage—Embodied, Embedded, Entrenched | 422
 - 5.2.1.2 Strong Objectivity and Expertocracy | 431
- 5.2.2 Feminist Empiricism in Impact Assessment | 434
- 5.2.3 Reflexivity in Impact Assessment | 438
- 5.3 Conclusion | 443

Annexes | 449

Annex I: Interview Sample | 449

Canada | 449

European Union | 454

Annex II: Invitation Letters | 457

Invitation Letter—English | 457

Invitation Letter—French | 458

Annex III: Form of Consent | 459

Annex IV: Interview Questionnaire | 460

Annex V: Analysis of Commission Impact Assessments 2011 | 463

Annex VI: Canadian Gender-based Analysis Tools | 464

Annex VII: Coding Tree | 466

List of Tables | 471

List of Abbreviations | 473

Bibliography | 477

Detailed Table of Contents | 563