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The Europeanization of Gender Equality Policies: A Discursive-Sociological Approach

Maxime Forest and Emanuela Lombardo*

Introduction

Europeanization and gender are two fields of study within political science that have often moved on parallel tracks and have only occasionally met. Yet they have much to offer each other, and if they joined forces they could help improve the understanding of the complex processes of policy change in Europe. This chapter aims to bring the two research agendas closer by discussing Europeanization theories from the perspective of scholars working on gender and other inequalities.

Europeanization is a widely discussed concept. Over the past ten years, it has generated plenty of definitions and operationalization attempts, whether as a new theory, a ‘catch-all’ concept, or a principle for organizing existing theories of European integration and (often divergent) empirical findings. Despite numerous clarification attempts, applications that draw on a narrow definition of the role of the European Union (EU) in promoting domestic policy change still coexist with broader applications that cover a wide variety of political, social, and cognitive phenomena (Baisnée and Pasquier, 2007; Graziano and Vink, 2008). Despite the concept’s lack of clarity and its broad scope, Europeanization studies have definitively contributed to changing the lenses through which European integration is analysed. The strengthening of the EU’s legal order, as well as its successive and increasingly conditional enlargements, have shaped the scholarly interest in Europe’s ‘domestic impact’. This interest has developed mainly from a top-down point of view, focussing on processes of internalization and norm adaptation, often with a specific premise: convergence is the rule, while increased variety/divergence is the exception.
The conceptualization of Europeanization as a convergence with the EU norm has nonetheless increasingly been both theoretically and empirically questioned (Featherstone and Radaelli, 2003; Caporaso, 2008), as it became clear that Europeanization, rather than being a proxy for convergence, was often a synonym for political contention, competing discursive patterns, and an institutional ‘misfit’. Another consequence of the increased diversity of the EU after the Eastern enlargement is that analyses of the EU member states’ (MS) relations have blossomed, providing more sophisticated and realistic frameworks for understanding the interactions between the EU and its member states. Far from constituting a united field with a shared research agenda or methodology, these analyses can nevertheless be characterized by a more comprehensive approach that takes into account institutional, discursive, and interactional factors, thus placing most of these studies at the intersection between different types of new institutionalism (Radaelli, 2000; 2004; Woll and Jacquot, 2010; Schmidt, 2010).

Gender equality policy is a field that is interesting particularly for exploring the institutional, discursive, and interactional dimensions of Europeanization processes, and it can also help challenge the idea of Europeanization as a convergence with the EU norm. The comparative literature on state feminism and feminist institutionalism has extensively studied the role of gender equality institutions, alongside the women’s movement, in gendering policy outcomes (Krook and Mackay, 2011; Outshoorn and Kantola, 2007; Stetson and Mazur, 1995). Gender scholarship has also explored how the meaning of gender equality is discursively constructed and contested in policy debates (Bacchi, 1999; Ferree et al., 2002; Kantola, 2006; Verloo, 2007; Lombardo, Meier and Verloo, 2009). Moreover, gender literature has highlighted the key role of actors – be they femocrats, feminist movements, advocacy coalitions, or ‘velvet triangles’ of gender policymakers, activists, and academics – in the making of policies (Van der Vleuten, 2007; Woodward, 2003, p. 76; Liebert, 2003; Keck and Sikkink, 1998). Finally, European gender research has revealed that comparisons across member states show diverse policy outcomes rather than uniform ones (Van der Wal and Verloo, 2009; Lauwers, 2009; Verloo, 2007; Liebert, 2003). This implies that convergence with the European gender norms tends to be taken to the empirical test.

By drawing on sociological and discursive approaches to Europeanization, this volume expects to contribute to the gender and Europeanization literature using the comparative analyses of gender and other equality policies in the enlarged EU that were conducted in the QUING (Quality in Gender+ Equality Policies) research project (see...
Chapters 3, 6, 8, and 9) and in scholarly works by experts in gender and Europeanization policies (see Chapters 2, 4, 5, and 7). Such a contribution is important not only to take into account the aforementioned institutional, discursive, and interactional variables, but also for the following reasons.

Firstly, although there are studies tackling the impact of the EU on the making of gender and other equality policies (see for instance Roth, 2008; Clavero and Galligan, 2009), works on gendering Europeanization that also engage in a theoretical discussion with the literature on Europeanization are rare, with the exception of Liebert (2003) and Kantola (2010). Secondly, since gender equality, as a field of EU intervention, has been developed through both ‘hard’ and ‘soft’ policy instruments (with a special emphasis on the latter, thanks to the diffusion of mainstreaming and the Open Method of Coordination; see Chapter 2 and Beveridge and Velluti, 2008), it provides an excellent starting point for exploring the cognitive dimension of Europe’s domestic impact due to the emphasis that these soft instruments place on norm diffusion and social learning. Thirdly, gendered approaches engaged with the increased diversity of the EU after the Eastern enlargement in terms of institutional, social, and political contexts (Krizsan, 2009; Clavero and Galligan, 2009) thus breaking with the methodological exceptionalism of accession studies (Dakowska and Neumayer, 2008). The emphasis in this book on a discursive and sociological approach to Europeanization was suggested by the demands of working with a contested concept such as gender equality, the meaning of which – according to gendered scholarship – continuously changes, thanks to the political and discursive action of a multiplicity of actors from institutions and civil society.

The analysis of discursive and institutional factors that characterizes our research agenda, combined with our focus on gender and other equality policies, could contribute to further development of the sociological and discursive turn in Europeanization literature. By privileging a focus on diversity, this contribution specifically aims to challenge the most static and narrowly defined approaches in European studies. For instance, the strong conditionality of the Eastern enlargement has generated rather normative and almost exclusively top-down perspectives. These, however, fail to account for the EU’s differential impact and the increased variety of gender policy regimes, intuitively maintaining the division of Europe into different ‘worlds of compliance’ (Falkner and Treib, 2008). With its special emphasis on the level of policy practices and discourses, this volume presents a much more fragmented and variegated political and institutional landscape in which the often-differentiated policy responses to the EU’s pressure to adapt can better be explained.
This chapter reviews the literature on Europeanization and the ‘gendering of Europe’, and it defines a joint research agenda. The first section contrasts an approach to Europeanization dominantly framed in terms of adaptation and compliance with the emergence of more pluralistic approaches that give increased relevance to the role of policy actors and discourses. It thus advocates an encounter between the gender and the Europeanization literatures, and outlines the research agenda of this book. The second section discusses the features of our discursive-sociological analysis of equality policy change in Europe. The chapter concludes by challenging Europeanization approaches that unilaterally focus on the analysis of compliance mechanisms, and argues in favour of a more pluralistic and inclusive framework for the study of Europeanization processes in the area(s) of gender and other inequalities.

Gendering Europeanization: theoretical debates

Broadening the scope: from ‘compliance-convergence’ to ‘discursive institutionalism’

A review of the relevant literature is important in developing an understanding of Europeanization processes that can account for their institutional, sociological, as well as discursive aspects. To make sense of the multiple perspectives in Europeanization literature, we will discuss first the limitations of a set of approaches dominated by a focus on ‘compliance-convergence’ with binding EU norms, then the emergence of more ‘pluralistic’ and comprehensive approaches that do include social learning, the diffusion of policy paradigms, and the Europeanization of collective action.

‘Compliance-oriented’ versus ‘pluralistic’ approaches

Until the mid-1990s, most of the literature on European integration had focussed on the making of a European polity that was the outcome of the ‘uploading’ of policy competency and the interest intermediation from the state to the supranational level. Therefore, whether this literature took a neo-functionalist, liberal intergovernmentalist, or multilevel approach, it usually adopted a ‘bottom-up’ perspective (Börzel and Risse, 2003, p. 55). The concept of Europeanization, however, was developed from a different standpoint, dealing with the European integration process’ direct or indirect implications for national political systems (Andersen and Eliassen, 1993; Mény, Muller, and Quermonne, 1996; Closa, 2001). Although much needed in order to fully grasp the ‘domestic impact of Europe’, studies adopting this top-down perspective frequently
assume a relatively narrow focus: the adaptive response of national systems to EU input. This is particularly the case in studies on the impact of European integration in those countries exposed to the unprecedented conditionality of the EU’s Eastern enlargement (Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier, 2005; Falkner and Treib, 2008; Sedelmeier, 2006).

The domestic impact of Europe is therefore often analysed as an independent (and external) variable that helps explain policy change, and a number of works on the issue have thus limited their focus to compliance with EU law, institutional policy transfers, and norm adaptation. Although they come from a variety of theoretical and methodological backgrounds, all these approaches share the assumption that policy change results from a ‘downloading’ process from the supranational to the national level (Andersen and Eliassen, 1993; Closa, 2001). Although it is acknowledged that this process might be precarious due to strong institutional misfits, the dependent variable remains the national systems’ degree of convergence with the EU model.

At the same time an increasing number of scholars exploring the complex interactions between the EU and the member states have conceptualized Europeanization in terms different from those of convergence. Studies of specific policy areas have acknowledged the difficulties in making an overall assessment of Europeanization, noting that domestic actors and institutions do not fit EU incentives smoothly and that the degree of convergence with EU norms in the same policy sector varies across member states (Lehmkuhl, 2000; Grossmann, 2006). These empirically driven conclusions have led to theoretical suggestions inspired by new institutionalism. Tanja Börzel and Thomas Risse (2003), for instance, proposed that the degree of domestic policy change might be proportional to the degree of misfit between both levels of governance. As part of this ‘goodness of fit’ approach, they described both political conflicts around norm adaptation, and processes of redistribution of resources among domestic actors due to the emergence of new opportunity structures.

The four new institutionalisms
Still far from drawing on a common research agenda, these approaches are nonetheless defined by the emphasis (alternatively or jointly) put on institutional paths, actors’ dynamics – including rational choice but also the sociological dimension of social learning and policy contestation – or discursive patterns. The first two in particular, institutional paths and actors’ dynamics, are usually examined from the perspectives of the historical and sociological new institutionalisms referred to by Hall and Taylor (1996).
Historical institutionalism studies the institutionalization paths of a public intervention area – such as equality policies – in a concrete domestic context, as well as the influence those paths are likely to have on the impact of the EU. Institutional legacies, ‘policy style’, and the general institutional framing of a policy issue are thus central to analyses from this perspective (see Cowles, Caporaso and Risse, 2001). In Europeanization literature, rational choice institutionalism focusses on the intentional usages of Europe in domestic politics (Jacquot and Woll, 2008; Woll and Jacquot, 2010), whereas sociological institutionalism suggests focussing on administrative, social, and political agents concerned primarily with policy change. Mainstreaming sociology in EU studies (Saurugger and Mérand, 2010) is not only relevant in analysing the emergence of Europeanized elites both at the EU level and in the member states, but also in studying the role of veto players (Tsebelis, 2000; Radaelli, 2000) and the incorporation of the EU dimension into domestic politics (Neumayer, 2006). As stressed by Sedelmeier, sociological institutionalism ‘is especially well suited to analyse processes of socialization and persuasion as a mechanism of EU domestic impact, phenomena which are disregarded by rationalist approaches’ (2006, p. 13).

The increasing role of soft instruments in EU governance (Beveridge and Velluti, 2008), which facilitate norm diffusion through social learning (Jacoby, 2004) and help shape the framing of policy issues in the member states, has also paved the way for a fourth institutionalism that gives preference to discursive patterns, cognitive processes, and ideational change. Cognitive, interpretive, and discursive policy analysis is now a consolidated research field that includes different theoretical and methodological premises. This variety shows in the scholarly references to comparable but not similar concepts such as policy paradigms (Hall, 1993), référentiels (Muller, 2005), or policy frames (Verloo, 2007). As part of a constructionist approach to political reality, ‘discursive institutionalism’ is particularly crucial in understanding how EU norms are internalized and which endogenous reasons (processes of social learning and framing, competing usages of the EU) shape domestic policy change (Schmidt, 2010, p. 21). Therefore, along with a sociological approach, discursive institutionalism seems the most appropriate for shedding light on the internalization of the ‘external’ variable by a number of actors, even through soft instruments or in the presence of a moderate pressure for adaptation. As we will argue, this methodological combination is of special relevance to studying the making of gender equality policies in the EU (see section ‘Bringing gender into Europeanization studies and vice versa’).
A pluralistic approach to the study of Europeanization

Far from being mutually exclusive, these four neo-institutionalism approaches can draw upon Radaelli’s extensive definition, which describes Europeanization as consisting of:

processes of a) construction, b) diffusion and c) institutionalisation of formal and informal rules, procedures, policy paradigms, styles, ‘ways of doing things’ and shared beliefs and norms which are first defined and consolidated in the EU policy process and then incorporated in the logic of domestic (national and subnational) discourse, political structures and public policies. (2004, p. 3)

As stressed by Baisnée and Pasquier (2007), it is maybe not so much this widely used definition that makes Radaelli’s clarification so valuable, but rather its ability to distinguish Europeanization from other phenomena such as convergence and integration, thus leaving space for analysing political conflict and the way it affects policy discourse. Moreover, Schmidt and Radaelli stress the need for what they call a ‘pluralistic approach’ to the study of policy change in Europe, arguing that ‘only by considering possible factors from a variety of methodological perspectives can one get a more complete explanation of policy change’ (2004, p. 184).

Such a pluralistic approach is still much needed, especially to challenge studies that, like Falkner and Treib’s (2008), adopt a relatively narrow and normative focus, establishing rankings of pioneers and laggards which fall into different ‘worlds of compliance’ that eventually match commonsensical and stereotypical national features. This particular study is especially challenging from the point of view of this volume: firstly because of the ‘politics of ranking’ it endorses (see Verloo and Van der Vleuten, 2009); secondly as it includes the field of gender equality policies in the labour realm; and thirdly because studies of the Europeanization of gender equality policies in post-accession countries, such as those of Krizsan (2009) and Clavero and Galligan (2009), have provided a more refined picture of the enforcement of EU norms in both Central and Eastern European Countries (CEECs), which Falkner and Treib placed in the same ‘world of dead letters’ (see Chapter 3).

A pluralistic approach to the study of Europeanization thus appears more in line with the kind of gendered analyses of soft and hard measures that also employ constructionist methodologies, and could instigate a fruitful exchange between the two disciplines (see section ‘Bringing gender into Europeanization studies and vice versa’). Additionally, the
extensive literature on Europeanization, which we have merely sketched here, points out challenges and theoretical insights that may deepen the understanding of policy change in the field of gender equality. At the same time, addressing the domestic impact of the EU through gender lenses helps clarify which processes will be addressed by an inclusive definition of Europeanization, especially regarding its discursive dimension. Consequently, we argue in favour of bringing both research agendas closer together.

**Bringing gender into Europeanization studies and vice versa**

*Changing the lens on the gendering of Europe*

Most studies dedicated to EU gender policies have concentrated on the EU policymaking level rather than on the EU–MS interactions. Scholars have mainly analysed the content and strategies of EU gender equality policies (Hoskyns, 1996; Verloo, 2005a; Van der Vleuten, 2007; Beveridge and Velluti, 2008; Kantola, 2010), sometimes as part of broader analyses of the EU social policy (Shaw, 2000a, 2000b; Hantrais, 1995). To a lesser extent, the transfer of the advocacy of women’s interests to the EU level has been researched through the lens of social movements literature (Banaszak, 2003), as a part of collective interests intermediation (Helferrich and Kolb, 2001; Rolandsen-Agustín, 2008), and as a process of professionalization (Cavaillé, 2006). EU gender equality policy has also been at the core of a number of works on European integration (Hoskyns, 1996; Shaw, 2000; Van der Vleuten, 2007; Mazey, 1995; 2000; Pollack and Hafner-Burton, 2000). Meanwhile, only a few studies have discussed the implementation of EU gender equality policies at the national level (among them Hoskyns, 1988; Ostner and Lewis, 1995; Beveridge, Nott and Stephen, 2000; Lombardo, 2003; 2004) from perspectives that placed greater emphasis on domestic factors than on Europeanization processes. Until the early 2000s, the Europeanization of gender equality had therefore mainly been addressed by privileging the sole level of EU institutions and the EU policy arena.

While gender studies on the domestic impact of Europe have not abounded so far, there are a few studies that have approached Europeanization as something to be explained through an in-depth analysis of institutions, discourses, and actors in the field of gender equality and anti-discrimination. Caporaso and Jupille (2001) explored the comparative impact of EU legislation on the making of equality policies in France and the UK from a top-down and historical-institutionalist perspective, emphasizing domestic institutional heritages and the way they shape the paths for internalizing the EU legal order. Geddes
and Guiraudon (2004) have adopted a similar perspective on the impact of EU anti-discrimination policy in France and the UK.

Liebert (2003), also drawing on historical institutionalism, attempted a first comparative mapping of the patterns of Europeanization in the field of gender equality policies in six member states. The authors in Liebert’s volume identified three mechanisms driving the Europeanization of gender equality policies: *institutional* (EU legislation, policy, and legal sentences); *cognitive* (frames that mobilize public opinion and help to reframe public policy issues); and *interaction* mechanisms (related to developing political representation and building transnational advocacy networks). Assessing the respective importance of these mechanisms according to national contexts, Liebert’s findings show diverging patterns in the Europeanization of gender equality policies. These are aggregated into different ‘ideal typical’ constellations of causes of Europeanization: ‘Stubbornness’ (refusal of EU norms or ideas); ‘Compliance’ (transposition); ‘Domestication’ (making EU frameworks fit domestic needs); ‘Transformation’ (reshaping of dominant frames in the interaction with EU incentives); and ‘Innovation’ (national development of EU norms beyond their original scope) (Liebert, 2003, pp. 302–3). While paths of institutionalization and domestic gender regimes are among the main variables, Liebert’s collection simultaneously emphasizes the role of ‘mediating factors’, such as women’s organizations, which Caporaso and Jupille (2001) had left unexplored.

Liebert’s work thus broadened the study of Europeanization to include the analysis of institutions, frames, and interactions, which had never before been jointly explored from a gendered perspective. Moreover, by not fixing one particular ideal type of Europeanization to one specific country, it avoids a normative and static assessment of performance in compliance of EU norms that – as Verloo and Van der Vleuten (2009) have argued – does not necessarily derive from actual quality performance but rather from the relative power position of a state.

**Towards a sociological approach? Soft and actor-oriented analyses**

While analyses of Europe’s domestic impact in this field remain scarce and are only occasionally drawn upon recent developments in the Europeanization literature, a number of recent studies have focussed on the making of EU gender equality policies through its soft instruments: gender mainstreaming, benchmarking, and the Open Method of Coordination (OMC) (see Chapter 2 for a definition). Soft measures, while extensively used in EU gender equality policies, are often criticized for not producing results in terms of implementation and enforcement,
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or of legally binding measures (Van der Vleuten, 2007; Hoskyns, 1996). Yet studies have also shown that soft instruments such as the European Employment Strategy (EES) and the OMC have enabled positive changes in gender policies where ‘hard’ law did not succeed (Zartaloudis, 2008; Guiraudon, 2008). Beveridge and Velluti’s (2008) gender analysis of OMC makes clear that the Europeanization of gender equality policy does not exclusively consist of the implementation of the *acquis* but that it also involves processes of norm diffusion and social learning that make soft policies a complementary ally of ‘hard measures’.

Contributions that adopt a constructionist perspective (for instance Bruno, Jacquot, and Mandin, 2006; Jacquot, 2006) also show that soft measures can be powerful instruments to spread particular EU norms and discourses, but they also warn that these measures are subject to being filled with a variety of meanings, especially in the case of gender mainstreaming, which was ‘subverted’ by the priority agenda of the EES, making it ‘less Europeanized as an instrument for reducing gender inequalities than as a means for promoting the development of the labour force and its flexibility’ (Bruno, Jacquot, and Mandin, 2006, pp. 519, 531). Analysing soft policy instruments in the field of gender equality thus often makes it necessary to pay attention to the different kinds of actors’ roles in this interpretive process, especially when, as in the case of the OMC, such instruments aim at fostering the participation of a broader range of actors in the policymaking process (Serrano, 2008).

It remains true, though, that the still incipient interest for the actors in the Europeanization of gender equality has mainly developed in relation to the making of new Europeanized elites at the EU level, such as those of female members of the European Parliament (Freedman, 2002; Beuvallet and Michon, 2008), lobbyists (Cavaillé, 2006), or EU femocrats (Jacquot, 2006). Additionally, taking into account the unprecedented extent and conditionality of the Eastern enlargement, a few recent studies addressed the opportunities that the EU accession offered for women’s organizations in the CEEC (Einhorn, 2006; Regulska and Grabowska, 2008) from an actor-centred perspective, occasionally referring to the cognitive dimension of the diffusion of soft policy instruments in their analyses of Europeanized women’s organizations and gender rights advocates (see Forest, 2006). Although these studies on the role of soft measures and the different levels of actors have so far remained quite marginal within the field of gender policy analysis, they might nonetheless contribute to the mutual exchange between gendered analyses and sociological approaches to Europeanization that we further develop below.
Research agenda and outline

This overview of Europeanization and gender studies reveals that the research agendas on the domestic impact of Europe and the making of equality policies could learn from each other. Europeanization literature has offered gender studies a variety of analytical tools to better understand the multi-level dimensions of policymaking processes that create opportunities and constraints for gender and other equality issues and actors. Further incorporation of Europeanization literature into gender analyses could benefit the latter, just as the incorporation of gender approaches would contribute to Europeanization studies.

One contribution of gendered approaches to pluralist Europeanization studies is the increasing body of literature on discursive politics that is developing within gender studies (Bacchi, 1999; 2009; Ferree et al., 2002; Kantola, 2006; Verloo, 2007; Lombardo, Meier, and Verloo, 2009). This discursive focus makes it clear that Europe ‘hits home’ (Börzel and Risse, 2000, p. 1) beyond legislation and institutional politics and affects domestic policy practices through paradigms, beliefs, and ‘ways of doing things’ (see section ‘A discursive approach to the Europeanization of gender and other equality policies’).

Another contribution is that due to the requirements of the equality policy area we are studying, our research design cannot be only top-down, but it necessarily also has to work bottom-up (see Radaelli and Schmidt, 2004), because domestic political dynamics – often related to the relations between institutions and civil society that are crucial to the making of equality policies – are key in understanding policy change and the role of the EU (Van der Vleuten, 2007). Moreover, gender equality policies are not only exposed to the influence of the EU but also to international actors such as the United Nations (UN), as well as transnational advocacy coalitions on particular policy issues (Keck and Sikkink, 1998). Thus, any Europeanization analysis must also take into account other external factors, and differentiate the role of EU and non-EU actors.

Focussing on institutional, discursive, and interactional aspects, our research agenda engages with a number of questions that current Europeanization studies have about gender equality policies and gender studies about Europeanization. At a general level, that means exploring the conditions under which Europeanization affects domestic policy patterns on gender and other equalities. The first set of questions tackled in this volume concerns the framing of certain issues, as well as the existing political contention and EU usages by institutional and civil society actors. In particular, what is the meaning of EU pressure? How contested is it at the domestic level? Could any shifts in policy framing
be attributed to the EU? To what extent are EU policy issues strategically framed to resonate within national hegemonic discourses? How do policy actors use the EU discourse? And of the various institutional and civil society actors – which contests the EU frame and which uses it?

Gender policies have been extensively developed through soft measures. Our second group of questions therefore concerns those issues of gender and other inequalities for which the EU has been promoting soft policy mechanisms, such as domestic violence, and/or those which it has not legislated on directly, such as same-sex partnership rights, but which have been indirectly tackled by the EU anti-discrimination policy: in what ways does the EU offer a window of opportunity for putting these issues (tackled either directly through soft policies or indirectly through anti-discrimination law) on domestic political agendas? What is the impact of soft Europeanization? What are the pros and cons of soft policy mechanisms for Europeanizing gender and other equality policies? What are the results of Europeanization when an EU issue is or is not embedded in the national political system? And what are the dynamics between the internal and external drives to Europeanization?

Finally, gender analyses can offer methodological and theoretical tools for studying Europeanization. The third set of questions thus engages more directly with theoretical and methodological approaches to Europeanization: what are the pros and cons of adopting a socio-logical and discursive approach to study the Europeanization of gender and other equality policies? To what extent is the making of country clusters useful for the comparative study of Europeanization processes, particularly when we look at gender and other equality policies?

Each of the contributions to this volume will tackle several of these questions, depending on the selected policy issue and the particular theoretical or methodological emphasis they have adopted. As these chapters examine gender and other equality policies, they will consider the multi-level dimensions of the politics of Europeanization, either in the sense of the different policy areas or the different levels of governance impacted by the EU. Exploring the role of soft measures (Beveridge’s Chapter 2), the issues of reconciliation of work and family life (Jacquot, Ledoux and Palier, and Donà Chapters 4 and 5), gender-based violence (Krizsan and Popa’s Chapter 3), the politics of intimate relations and partnership rights (Kuhar and Buzogány’s Chapters 7 and 8), and the institutionalization of equality and anti-discrimination policies (Lombardo and Bustelo and Buzogány’s Chapters 6 and 7) through comparative or case-study analyses, the contributions to this volume will discuss the varying institutional and political dynamics
that emerge in different member states (France, Italy, Spain, Portugal, a
selection of Central Eastern European Countries, and, in one chapter, all
EU-27 and two candidate countries). In line with Carter and Pasquier’s
(2006) research proposal, Alonso and Forest’s Chapter 9 will address
the Europeanization of gender equality at the (Spanish) sub-national
level, thus providing a further argument for studying Europeanization
processes beyond matters of compliance, since the EU hits the regions
mainly through soft policy instruments and social learning.

Whatever the level of analysis adopted by the contributors, the
discursive-sociological approach to Europeanization that we endorse
here recognizes that discourse is a particularly relevant factor in under-
standing the type of impact the EU has on domestic politics, and it is
equally useful for researchers interested in bringing Europeanization
into gender studies and vice versa.

A discursive approach to the Europeanization
of gender and other equality policies

In the kind of processes of discursive contestations that occur in national
political arenas, the impact of the EU acquires a multiplicity of mean-
ings. Analysis of these meanings reveals the discursive and interactional
mechanisms of Europeanization, enabling us to depict a more complex
picture of the EU’s impact on policy change. The type of ‘discursive
institutionalism’ (Schmidt, 2010) that we develop in this volume com-
plements analyses of Europeanization in terms of actors’ preferences,
policy legacies, and institutional capacity (Schmidt and Radaelli, 2004)
by also taking into account the role of policy discourses in internal-
izing EU measures in the MS. In this section we will discuss the theo-
retical and methodological aspects of our discursive approach to the
Europeanization of gender equality policy, highlighting similarities and
differences between our approach and those of other Europeanization
scholars dealing with both cognitive and interactional dimensions of
discourse.

Making sense of EU policies at the domestic
level: meaning and contestation

Discursive analyses of Europeanization: theoretical background

Europeanization scholars who privilege a pluralistic approach also
argue that the EU has a discursive impact and that this should be bet-
ner reflected in Europeanization theory (Radaelli and Pasquier, 2008;
Schmidt and Radaelli, 2004; Schmidt, 2002). Schmidt and Radaelli
Maxime Forest and Emanuela Lombardo (2004, p. 184) admit that a discursive approach to the study of policy change in Europe is ‘largely missing from explanations of European integration and Europeanization’. The notion of discourse that Radaelli and Pasquier (2008, pp. 38–9) employ comprises both a cognitive dimension (discourse as a set of ideas, a cognitive activity that enables actors both to make sense of reality and to normatively evaluate it) and an interactive dimension (which entails that the impact of discourse should be assessed in the context of interactions among policymakers, and between policymakers and public opinion).

Schmidt (2002) and Schmidt and Radaelli (2004) have emphasized that discourse is a key mediating factor that helps explain the impact of Europeanization on national policy. Their argument is that significant policy change is most likely to occur when domestic discourse convincingly supports it, as discourse can increase political capacity by influencing actors’ preferences and the perception of problems and legacies (Schmidt and Radaelli, 2004, p. 186). Discourse, according to this interpretation, is mainly associated with rhetorical devices and efforts employed in the stages of formulation, negotiation, and communication of public policies to persuade actors of the convenience of a specific policy change.

Scholars in gender and politics have contributed to the discursive study of Europeanization by placing particular emphasis on discourse in relation to its meaning and contestation. They have discussed the concept of gender equality as one open to continuous contestation during the struggles to achieve a more gender-equal society (Bacchi, 1999; Ferree et al., 2002; Kantola, 2006; Verloo, 2007). Concepts such as gender equality are contested in the sense that they have no fixed or essential meaning but are rather shaped by political goals and intentions. Thus, gender equality is a contested concept in the sense that it is discursively constructed, which means its meaning is not fixed and can therefore be challenged. Gender equality acquired different meanings in different places and periods, meaning equal opportunities in some contexts, and empowerment or emancipation in others (Lombardo, Meier, and Verloo, 2009). These changes in meaning result from the activities of a wide range of policy actors, who try to steer the concept’s meaning in their intended direction. Thus, an important contribution of gender and politics scholarship to the discursive study of Europeanization is precisely the development of a ‘discursive politics’ approach to explore processes of contestation and attribution of meanings to the concept of gender equality.

Liebert (2003, p. 256), for instance, adopts an interpretative framework that ‘emphasises the importance of the meanings that European
norms acquire and the varying reactions that Europeanization provokes across different domestic contexts’. The contributors to Liebert’s volume start out looking at processes of contestation, highlighting controversies that the transposition of EU gender directives might have created at the domestic levels and observing which meanings are attributed to EU gender equality policies in the MS. They map the dominant policy frames that emerge in national policy debates and assess the extent to which these frames have shifted over time through inclusion of EU gender ideas and norms. In their view, such framing shifts can be taken as an indicator of the political elite’s learning in response to EU influence. Framing dynamics vary in the authors’ accounts. In some cases traditional hegemonic discourses hindered the EU’s impact on the national level, and political elites proved resistant to reframing the issue to fit domestic frames. In others, EU norms and ideas managed to catalyze activities to promote domestic policy change. Liebert’s contribution (2003) has been important because it developed and legitimized the analysis of the frame shifting and reframing processes of EU gender norms in domestic controversies as a relevant way to understand dynamics of Europeanization. Yet framing is only one among many other Europeanization factors considered in Liebert’s analysis, which inevitably means that it cannot be tackled in detail.

A discursive-institutionalist approach to the Europeanization of equality policies: methodological issues

Drawing on different methodological and theoretical backgrounds but with a common interest in both domestic institutional paths and the levels of actors, the authors in this volume hope to collectively contribute to a discursive institutionalist approach to the Europeanization of equality policies. To this end, they develop analyses that, in different degrees, simultaneously or alternatively draw on cognitive policy analysis (which primarily addresses learning processes, instruments, and norm diffusion), frame analysis (focussing on discourses and meanings), social movements theory, new institutionalism, and the sociological dimension of Europeanization.

Since some contributions to this volume refer to the discursive framing of gender and other equality policies in a sense that is borrowed from social movement’s analyses, and others adopt the ‘critical frame analysis’ (CFA) methodology developed in the QUING research project, we will discuss the specificity of frame analysis with respect to other scholarly works on the discursive dimension of Europeanization. The common starting point for both types of contributions is the concept of
policy frame. The literature on social movements’ theory (Snow et al., 1986; Snow and Benford, 1988; 1992) developed and diffused the concept to understand social movements’ dynamics, while the application of Goffman’s (1974) notion of frame to policy analysis first appeared in Rein and Schön (1993; 1994).

As developed in the QUING approach, policy frames include both cognitive and normative dimensions, as they are cognitive schemata that both help make sense of reality and assess it at the same time. In Verloo’s (2005b, p. 20) words, a policy frame is ‘an organizing principle that transforms fragmentary or incidental information into a structured and meaningful policy problem, in which a solution is implicitly or explicitly included’. Frame analysis starts from the assumption that policy debates construct policy problems in different ways (Bacchi, 1999), which can be studied through the specific CFA methodology. This methodology has enabled researchers to make the interpretative and normative content of policy documents more explicit by identifying dimensions such as the diagnosis of the problem, the proposed solutions, the roles assigned to the actors, the gender and intersectional dimensions of texts, and the norms and mechanisms involved in the construction of a particular policy issue (Verloo, 2007). Through the coding of policy documents, frame analysis enables researchers to map a variety of different interpretations of what any given policy’s problem is and what its solutions are.

One can also distinguish different discursive approaches to the study of Europeanization by their position on the ‘intentionality’ of frames. A number of contributions in this volume treat discourses as intentional, conscious efforts to alter the perception of policy problems and to influence preferences, just as Schmidt and Radaelli (2004, p. 186) do. These approaches resemble that of the literature on social movements’ theory (Snow et al., 1986; Snow and Benford, 1988; 1992; McAdam, McCarthy, and Zald, 1996; Tarrow, 1998), which conceptualizes frames as the actors’ intentional intervention to ‘consciously’ and ‘strategically’ shape reality (McAdam, McCarthy and Zald, 1996, p. 6). Buzogány’s chapter in this volume adopts a social movements approach to frames by discussing the discursive resources of anti-discrimination advocacy groups in Hungary and Romania. The chapters by Donà on reconciliation policies in Italy, and by Jacquot, Ledoux and Palier on reconciliation policies in France employ different conceptualizations of frames, emphasizing national actors’ usage of the EU for different purposes (Woll and Jacquot, 2010).

QUING-based chapters look at this issue differently, suggesting that the (un)intentionality of discourses simply depends on which level of that
discourse is examined. The notion of unintentionality has been articulated in Bacchi’s work (Bacchi, 1999; 2009) and is inspired by Foucault (1979; 1997) and Giddens (1984). Bacchi suggests that frames have an unintentional dimension that reflects deep cultural and institutional meanings, and she questions the extent to which policy actors can actually step outside existing hegemonic discourses and intentionally shape frames to strategically achieve a certain goal (2009). From this macro-level perspective, it is relevant to consider broader hegemonic discourses as they define the horizon against which individual frames take place. In this sense, broader discourses influence what frames are available in a certain context and moment, and which individual frames would more successfully resonate with existing hegemonic discourses (Dombos et al., 2009). Yet looking at frames from the meso- and micro-level perspective, which considers actors’ framing of particular policy issues and documents, ‘actors do make intentional decisions and choose between the available competing frames to pursue their goals’ (Dombos et al., 2009, p. 4). The intentional/unintentional distinction is relevant for analyses of Europeanization in the sense that, while we are interested in the outcome of people’s framing actions related to the EU, these outcomes might sometimes be unintentional and reproduce hegemonic discourses on the EU.

A number of contributions in this volume discuss frames existing at different levels, ranging from EU and national frames that are specific to certain policy issues (mesoframes) or actors (microframes), to frames that spread across several issues (metaframes). Krizsan and Popa’s Chapter 3, for instance, analyses the role of ‘Europeanization’ frames (which associate Europeanization with positive norms and values) as discursive resources for advocates of policies on domestic violence in five of the CEEC. In Chapter 8, Kuhar’s comparison of all the EU-27 countries as well as two candidate countries shows how the Europeanization frame is used to promote same-sex partnership legislation in countries that resist adopting such legislation, even in the absence of EU norms on the issue. Similarly, Chapter 6 shows that, of the three analysed Southern EU countries, references to, and frames on, the EU are more present in Italy, which is also politically the most resistant to equality of the three. In Chapter 9, Alonso and Forest distinguish between different kinds of strategic framings of the EU at the Spanish sub-national level; these range from legitimizing framing to ‘regional role model’ framings.

Setting discourse in the institutional context
Another important aspect of discourse is its interactive dimension, which brings us to the relation between discourses and the institutional
context in which they are embedded. Framing – as Ferree (2009, p. 89) argues after all – is an interactive process by which actors with agendas encounter specific discursive opportunities in the form of institutionalized texts such as constitutions, laws, judicial decisions, treaties, and administrative regulations.

After discussing discursive approaches to Europeanization, Schmidt and Radaelli also come to believe that ‘discourse must be set in institutional context’ (2004, p. 184):

The institutional context [of Europeanization] is constituted by the vast range of rules, formal and informal, laws as well as social and political norms and conventions, that set actors’ common frame of reference and help shape not only actors’ perceptions and preferences but also their modes of interaction. (2004, p. 197)

According to the authors, rules and cultural norms presupposed in laws and institutions influence discourse by defining ‘the repertoire of acceptable (and expectable) actions’ (2004, p. 193). For Ferree (2009, p. 89), these ‘institutionalised framework[s] of connections made among people, concepts, and events’ shape ‘the opportunities of political actors by making some sorts of connections appear inevitable and making others conspicuously uncertain and so especially inviting for debate’. For both Schmidt and Radaelli (2004, p. 192) and Ferree (2009), policy discourses help scholars to improve their understanding of the relation between individual agency and broader socio-political structures, and they do this through an analysis of the political processes through which actors have changed these structures.

Authors in this volume also recognize that discourses emerge from their specific institutional contexts. Some key explanatory factors considered in our analysis of the institutional context are: the legal frameworks developed in the member states on different equality issues, the nature of the institutions that formulate and implement equality policies, and the existing relations between institutions and civil society. Gender regimes,10 international influences, the structure of the state and of political parties, and institutionalized practices in relation to other inequalities, including class, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, and age are other contextual factors that influence discourses on Europeanization and gender (Walby, 2007, p. 35). In this sense, all contributors developed different forms of discursive institutionalism (Hall and Taylor, 1996; Schmidt, 2010), and in all of these the relationship between institutional context and policy frames is mutually influential.
Institutional factors can help understand equality policy frames, just as the frames help understand ‘why policy outcomes are as they are in specific institutional settings’ (Sauer, 2007, p. 50).

Exploring the interactive dimension of discourse also necessitates an analysis of how ideas are used in public debates. The EU is used in national discourses for different strategic aims: to promote policy change by influencing people’s perception of an issue, to legitimize specific political actions or discourses, or to reinforce one’s positioning in the debate. To describe the different ways in which the EU can be used, Woll and Jacquot (2010) have elaborated a typology of EU ‘usage’ (the aforementioned ‘political’, ‘strategic’, ‘cognitive’ and ‘legitimizing’ usages), whose borders are often blurred in political reality, as, for instance, a cognitive usage is usually also strategic and/or legitimizing. In the ‘cognitive’ type of usage, which focusses on the discursive dimension, policy actors can use the EU by referring to it directly to justify particular policy reforms at the national level. Or they might choose to avoid any reference to the EU and instead only frame their communicative discourse in national terms. Contributions in this volume will also discuss the Europeanization of gender and other equality policies in terms of different domestic actors’ discursive EU usage for several strategic purposes.

Notwithstanding the aforementioned differences among chapters, the discursive politics approach we suggest is therefore characterized by the following four aspects. First, instead of only seeing discourses as rhetorical devices, this approach is interested in the meaning of discourses, and their contestation. Second, it considers discourses as always relevant in the analysis of policy change in Europe, and not just when they more explicitly influence policy interests. This is because the discursive politics approach conceives of discourses as both unintentional (or, in Bacchi’s terms, bearing deep overarching cultural meanings) and intentional influences on people’s perception of reality. Third, the approach has developed specific methodologies to apply discursive institutionalism to the study of Europeanization. And fourth, it explores the cognitive and interactive dimensions of discourse by analysing policy frames, their use by different policy actors, as well as the institutional context from which they emerge.

Conclusions

Europeanization theory has proliferated in the past two decades, generating a variety of conceptual definitions and methodological approaches. From a formerly dominant focus on member states’ compliance with EU norms
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(through the analysis of transposition mechanisms), it has recently developed a broader theoretical and methodological focus that endorses more sociological and discourse-centred understandings of Europeanization (among others Radaelli, 2004; Woll and Jacquot, 2010). This pluralistic approach to Europeanization aims to gain a better understanding of policy change through studying the diffusion of policy paradigms, social learning, and collective mobilization. To grasp these dimensions, merely analysing hard measures is insufficient and needs to be complemented with the study of soft measures. This is particularly important in exploring the Europeanization of gender and other equality policies that we study here, since the EU has adopted soft instruments in all gender equality policy fields, apart from those strictly related to the labour market.

From a methodological point of view, the shift towards a sociological-discursive approach to studying the impact of EU norms and discourses on domestic levels and the role of domestic actors in this process requires the use of constructionist and, specifically, discursive methodologies. In a dialogic exchange with Europeanization scholars who have employed discursive methods in their analyses of gender (Liebert, 2003) and other EU policies (Schmidt and Radaelli, 2004), contributors have operationalized different forms of discursive institutionalism to study Europeanization, employing different methodologies and concepts, from CFA (Verloo, 2007) to usages of the EU (Woll and Jacquot, 2010), and discursive opportunity structures (Ferree, 2009). The fruitfulness of this dialogue moves us to advocate strengthening the relationship between the Europeanization and the gender and politics scholarships, so they can jointly contribute to the sociological and discursive approaches to Europeanization that, we argue, have a great potential in being able to grasp the complexities of Europeanization processes.

Constructionist and discursive approaches have something to contribute to that Europeanization literature which mainly focusses on compliance mechanisms. This contribution challenges the notion that the Europeanization of gender equality policies can be adequately addressed through clusters of countries shaped around different policy styles, institutional paths, or ‘worlds of compliance’ (Falkner and Treib, 2008). Findings from comparative analyses of gender equality policies (Liebert, 2003; Krizsan, 2009) that also consider soft measures through discursive methodologies have shed light on the highly differentiated impact of Europe according to policy areas, political cleavages, or mobilized actors. The picture of Europeanization that these studies offer is perhaps more complicated to interpret and less easy to generate models for, but it is also probably closer to empirical reality.
The contributions in this volume on the Europeanization of equality policies, alongside a number of other scholarly works that have developed a more sociological and discursive shift in Europeanization studies, move us to suggest that the way Europe ‘hits home’ cannot be solely interpreted through the restrictive lenses of institutional heritages or compliance with EU norms. Since Europeanization also addresses collective action and discursive patterns, a more sociological and discursive approach to the study of Europeanization is needed.

Notes
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2. The ‘fit/misfit’ theory states that the pressure for domestic change is stronger when there is institutional ‘misfit’ between the EU and a specific member state than when there is a ‘good fit’ between the two (Caporaso, 2008, p. 29).
3. The European QUING project (Quality in Gender+ Equality Policies, 6th Framework Program EC, 2006–2011) analysed gender and other equality policies in the 27 member states and two candidate countries, see www.quing.eu
4. These studies are based on the idea that the Eastern enlargement is a special phenomenon that deserves to be tackled separately from other Europeanization processes and studied using a specific research agenda that emphasises conditionality.
5. According to Falkner and Treib's analysis (2008), Denmark, Finland, and Sweden belong to the ‘world of law observance’, where a culture of compliance with the law promotes a successful transposition and implementation of EU directives; Austria, Belgium, Germany, the Netherlands, Spain, and the UK belong to the ‘world of domestic politics’, where domestic concerns prevail over compliance with EU norms; France, Greece, Luxembourg and Portugal belong to the ‘world of transposition neglect’ where these ‘neglecting countries’ tend to ignore transposition obligations due to ‘national arrogance’ or ‘administrative inefficiency’; and two old member states like Ireland, Italy, together with new member states like the Czech Republic, Hungary, Slovakia, Slovenia belong to the ‘world of dead letters’, which means that these countries may be compliant in transposing EU directives but not in monitoring and enforcing EU measures.
6. This disregards theoretical and empirical findings of gender scholarship that understand gender relations as systemic and gender equality issues as cutting across all policy areas (see, among others, Walby, 2009).
7. Examples vary in time, but include the UK and France.
8. The other relevant factors are policy problems that demand change, political institutional capacity, policy legacies, and policy preferences.
9. CFA draws on the former European research project MAGEEQ, Mainstreaming Gender Equality in Europe, FP5, www.mageeq.net, and on the work of other social movements, politics, and gender scholars (see Verloo, 2007).
10. ‘A gender regime is a specific system of social relations. Central to the notion is that there is an inter-relationship between the different forms of gender relations in different domains – it is this that constitutes the systemness of the gender regime.’ (Walby, 2007, p. 32). For a definition of gender regime see Walby, 2009.
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