



---

A 5<sup>th</sup> Framework Programme Research Project funded by the European Commission

---

Gender - sensitive and women friendly public policies:  
a comparative analysis of their progress and impact

Deliverable 7:	Report of EQUAPOL National Thematic Seminars
----------------	---

---

Authors	Mary Braithwaite
---------	------------------

Contributions by: Nikos Kokosalakis,  
Sara Clavero, Mari Runardotter,  
Salimata Sissoko, Meilute Taljūnaitė

Project coordinator:	KEKMOKOP, Panteion University, Athens, Greece
----------------------	--

Partners:	School of Sociology and Social Policy, Queen's University, Belfast, U.K. DULBEA -Université Libre de Bruxelles, Brussels, Belgium Luleå University of Technology, Luleå, Sweden LAW UNIVERSITY OF LITHUANIA, VILNIUS, LITHUANIA
-----------	--

Contract no:	<b>HPSE – CT – 2002 – 00136</b>
--------------	---------------------------------

Date of issue of the report:	February 2005
------------------------------	---------------

## Table of Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Seminar for Greece</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1	Aims and themes of the seminar	3
2.2	Seminar participants	3
2.3	Seminar programme	3
2.4	Gender equality in education policy	4
2.5	Gender equality in social security (pensions) policy	6
2.6	List of participants	7
2.7	Texts of keynote speakers and presentations	9
<b>3</b>	<b>Seminar for UK and Ireland</b>	<b>14</b>
3.1	Aims and themes of the seminar	14
3.2	Seminar participants	15
3.3	Seminar programme	16
3.4	Seminar discussions	16
3.5	List of participants	22
3.6	Texts of keynote speakers and presentations	23
<b>4</b>	<b>Seminar for Belgium and France</b>	<b>28</b>
4.1	Aims of the seminar	28
4.2	Seminar participants	28
4.3	Themes and issues addressed	28
4.4	Main points of the presentations and discussions	29
4.5	Seminar programme	30
4.6	List of participants	31
<b>5</b>	<b>Seminar for Sweden</b>	<b>32</b>
5.1	Aims and themes of the seminar	32
5.2	Seminar participants	32
5.3	The presentations	32
5.4	Discussions	34
5.5	Future workshop and examples	34
5.6	Summary of outputs	36
5.7	List of participants	36
<b>6</b>	<b>Seminar for Lithuania</b>	<b>37</b>
6.1	Aims of the seminar	37
6.2	Seminar participants	37
6.3	Themes of the presentations and issues discussed	38
6.4	Policy lessons	41
6.5	Seminar programme	41
6.6	List of participants	42
6.7	Statistics on women and men in Lithuania	43

# Chapter 1

## Introduction

The EQUAPOL national seminars formed part of Workpackage 7, which includes the main dissemination activities of the EQUAPOL project. Together with a European conference (see Deliverable 6), the aim of Workpackage 7 was to:

- increase scientific knowledge on gender mainstreaming in the policy areas studied;
- contribute to scientific debate on the improvement of public policies and on policy tools for promoting gender equality;
- raise awareness about the benefits of integrating a gender perspective within public policy;
- assist in policy development by highlighting appropriate methods and tools for integrating gender equality into public policy.

Three main user groups were addressed by the dissemination activities: academics and researchers; policy-makers; and civil society. Both EU and national levels were targeted.

The national seminars aimed to draw lessons from the findings of the study of national policies on gender equality for future policy and practice on the integration of gender equality in public policy in the study countries. The objective was to provide a forum for dialogue between researchers, policy-makers and non-governmental actors, with the results of EQUAPOL being one part of the evidence and experiences under review. The aim was to move beyond an examination of the current state of affairs, to identify ways of reinforcing efforts to promote gender equality in public policy in the context of national and European developments.

Each partner of EQUAPOL organised one seminar, thus five seminars in total were organised:

- KEKMOKOP organised its national seminar in Athens on February xx 2005;
- Queen's University Belfast organised a seminar in Dublin on November 19 2004, at which actors from Ireland and the UK were present;
- DULBEA organised a seminar in Brussels on December 2 2004, at which actors from France and Belgium were present;
- University of Luleå organised a national seminar in Stockholm on October 25 2004;
- The Law University of Lithuania organised a national seminar in Vilnius on December 3 2004.

The reports of the five seminars are presented in this report. In each chapter, the aims and main discussion themes of the seminar are presented, as well as the policy conclusions reached and the participants present.

## Chapter 2

### Seminar for Greece

#### 2.1 Aims and themes of the seminar

The national seminar in Greece, which was held on February 9 2005 in Athens, had three aims:

- a) To inform the institutions, actors and agents of policy making about the Equapol project and disseminate and discuss in depth the findings of the project for each area of policy separately.
- b) To investigate the present situation concerning policy in gender equality in education and social security, after the change in government (March 2004), so that specific policy recommendations may be addressed to contemporary needs.
- c) To bring into contact and cooperation officers of various institutions concerned or involved in equality but work in different sectors of policy making in order to facilitate the coordination of gender equality in these sectors.

The seminar had two main themes: gender equality in education policy; and gender equality in social security policy, focusing specifically on pensions. These two themes reflected the two policy areas studied by the EQUAPOL coordinator in Greece.

#### 2.2 The seminar participants

24 people participated in the morning session of the seminar, which focused on gender equality in education policy. 14 people participated in the afternoon session, which focused on gender equality in pensions policy. Participants included officials responsible for gender equality policy in the government, including various ministries (Employment, Economy, Development, General Secretariat for Equality), researchers and education experts as well as some representatives of the social partners (employers, trade unions) and women's organisations. The list of participants is presented in section 2.7.

#### 2.3 The seminar programme

The one-day seminar was held at Hotel Amalia, Athens, on Wednesday February 9th 2005. The programme was as follows:

9:30 – 13:00	<b>Gender equality in education policy</b> <i>Chair: Prof. Koula Kassimati, Director of KEKMOKOP</i> Speakers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Prof. <b>Nikos Kokosalakis</b>, Scientific Consultant EQUAPOL, KEKMOKOP “Comments on the findings of EQUAPOL for gender equality in education”</li><li>• <b>Maria Moustaki</b>, Officer of the Ministry of Education.(EPEAEK), presentation of paper by Sabbatou Tsolakidou, “Contribution of EPEAEK in the progress of gender equality in education”</li></ul>
--------------	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Alexandros Delistathis</b>, Expert on themes of Equality in Education, Former Coordinator and manager of projects in KETHI, “Experiences from the planning and implementation of programmes of gender equality in education”</li> </ul> <p>Discussion</p>
13:00 - 14:00	Lunch
14:30 – 18:00	<p><b>Gender equality in social security (pensions) policy</b>  <i>Chair: Maria Stratigaki, Scientific Responsible of EQUAPOL, KEKMOKOP</i></p> <p>Speakers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Maria Stratigaki</b>, Scientific responsible for EQUAPOL, KEKMOKOP “Comments on the findings of EQUAPOL for gender equality in Social Security”</li> <li>• Assistant Prof. <b>Manos Matsaganis</b>, Department of International and European Economic Studies, Economic University of Athens, “The system of Social Protection and Women”</li> <li>• <b>Maria Fragiadaki</b>, Trade union representative POSPERT (Trade Union of the Greek Television and Radio) “Equality and social security: two-directional and necessary values for a society of prosperity”</li> </ul> <p>Discussion</p>

## 2.4 Gender equality in education policy

### 2.4.1 Presentations

There were three keynote presentations concerning gender equality policies in education in the morning session

In the first presentation Prof. **Nikos Kokosalakis**, Consultant in KEKMOKOP, presented the main findings of the Greek case study in education and commented on the significance of the research and its implications for gender equality policy in education. This presentation concentrated on the two main aspects of policies namely: the ‘Intervention Programmes’, and ‘Gender Studies’. The former concern programs for sensitization of teachers and pupils in secondary education on issues of gender equality and problems of gender inequality. They also involve the production of supplementary education material concerning these issues. Gender studies are specific programmes introduced in higher education institutions to promote teaching and research concerning gender at undergraduate and post graduate level. Both, ‘intervention programmes’ and ‘gender studies programmes’, have been operationalised in the context of a wider Education and training Programme (EPEAEK) under the auspices of the Ministry of Education and Religions. (For headlines of this keynote presentation see section 2.7.1).

The second keynote speaker was Ms **Maria Moustaki**, officer in the Ministry of Education. She presented a paper entitled “Contribution of EPEAEK in the progress of gender equality in education” written by Mrs **Sabbatou Tsolakidou**, director of the unit for the programmes connecting education with the labour market (see section 2.7.2). In this presentation a full picture of policies concerning gender equality in

Axis 4 within EPEAEK was given. As the programme is still in the process of implementation an evaluation of the impact of policies could not be provided but a good account of budgets and implementation of the various actions of Axis 4 of the general programme was given.

The third keynote speaker was Mr. **Alexandros Delistathis**, expert in equality in education and co-ordinator of actions at the early stage of EPEAEK, and the title of his presentation was “Experiences from the planning and implementation of projects of gender equality in Middle Education (for an outline see section 2.7.3). This presentation was especially interesting because it highlighted the basic problems intervening between the planning and the implementation of policies.

#### 2.4.2 Discussions

The discussion was rich, wide ranging and in depth and concentrated mainly on the policies concerning the “Intervention Programmes” so much so that no time was left in the morning session to discuss policies about gender studies. Almost all representatives from the various institutions involved in the programmes took part in the discussion.

One basic problem, which became clear from the discussion, was the lack of co-ordination and cooperation between the various sectors involved in the planning and implementation of “intervention projects”. This created obstacles at various levels of the planning and especially at the implementation stage of the policy. There was no agreed framework of cooperation and coordination of the policy between the officers of the Ministry of Education, of the General Secretariat for Equality and KETHI (Centre for Research on Gender equality), on the one hand, and the school units involved on the other. At some point in the initial stages there was disagreement between the Ministry of Education and KETHI about the supervision of the projects which resulted in delaying the implementation for a whole year.

Another general problem, highlighted by many participants, was the lack of a comprehensive policy on gender equality within which specific tasks for various agents implementing the ‘intervention programmes’ can be placed. Even more importantly there seems to be a tension between certain aspects of gender equality policy especially concerning ‘positive action’ and general education policy at large the latter being loose and imprecise.

The policy on ‘intervention programmes’ has a ‘top down structure’ but it does provide for a relative degree of autonomy of implementing agents (school units and teachers) at the grass roots. In fact the policy came into being as a result of the requirement of the European Commission that a certain percentage of the ESF be allocated to ‘positive actions’ on gender equality. Most participants identified tensions within and amongst actors of implementation and planning at various junctions of required cooperation. Thus although all Middle Education school units and individual teachers are eligible to participate, application to participate is voluntary and commitment and motivation varies. For many the motivation is primarily economic and for others promoting their own interest within the power structures of the Schools and the policy making organizations. Such factors do not seem to always go together

with the actual objectives of the policy. The discussion showed that such problems concern also other policies of gender equality within axis 4 of the EPEAEK.

From the presentations and the discussion it became clear that policies of gender equality in education have now acquired a certain momentum and dynamism in Greece, which is very significant, given the lack of tradition of such policies in the country. The response of the schools countrywide for the ‘intervention projects’, for instance, has been very encouraging as within the first year of the policy 1618 applied to join and it is expected that by the year 2007, 7000 such projects will have joined the policy. Also 52 seminars for teachers are foreseen by that time and there is evidence of growing interest amongst teachers to participate. On the other hand, the discussion showed that there is a general climate of uncertainty and doubt amongst the officers not only about the prospects of ‘intervention projects’ but also about the future development of gender equality policies in education generally.

## **2.5 Gender equality in social security (pensions)**

### **2.5.1 Presentations**

The presentation and discussion on policies concerning gender equality in social security took place in the afternoon and concentrated on pension policies specifically. There were three keynote presentations followed by extensive discussion although the number of participants was small compared to the morning’s session.

The first presentation was by Dr **Maria Stratigaki** who gave a condensed picture of the findings of EQUAPOL on this policy and commented on the specificity and complexity of pensions for women in Greece (see section 2.7.4)

The second presentation, under the title “The system of Social Protection and Women”, was by Prof. **Manos Matsaganis**, from the Department of International and European Economic Studies of the Economic University of Athens. He gave an extensive account on the topic based on a study which he and **Athina Teperoglou**, a lawyer on social security issues, had carried out for KETHI in 2001. In addition he presented data and legislation on the subject over the last three years.

Apart from a good and detailed analysis and critique of what is a very complex issue Prof. Matsaganis also made certain recommendations and alternative proposals as to how the women’s pension system could be settled in a medium and long term perspective (see section 2.7.5).

The third presentation was by Ms **Maria Fragiadaki**, ex Secretary for Women in the General Workers Union. Her presentation titled “Equality and Social Security: two-directional and necessary values for a society of prosperity” was provocative in that she maintained that due to the multiple role of Women their pension entitlements should be special including a shorter pensionable age than men. Taking a Marxist/Feminist position she argued that women are doubly exploited both as workers and as women. On this basis she advanced a critique of current and proposed policies for women’s pensions (see section 2.7.6).

## 2.5.2 Discussions

The discussions which followed the presentations could not go deep into the question of gender equality in pensions policy in Greece due to the very complex and multifaceted character of the pension system generally. The trade union movement in Greece, to the degree that it acquired any comprehensiveness, developed in a fragmented and multi-dimensional direction, creating a plethora of closely guarded pension funds. Any attempt at pension reform, and there have been several, seems to founder on the conflict of interests between various professions and unions within the public as well as the private sector.

The system of social protection for Women in Greece is specific in comparison to other European countries in many ways. It has been structured around the model of the family with men as 'breadwinners' and women as family carers. Accordingly the system of pensions allowed until recently married women especially early exit from work with low pensions. Whilst feminists now argue for legislation for a modern comprehensive system of pensions applying equally to men and women, there are certain women's organizations which see this as losing any positive treatment which should apply to women due to their special position as family carers.

The above thesis was put forward very strongly by Ms Fragiadaki and this thesis was in tension with the elaborate recommendations for a general comprehensive system, applying to men and women equally, proposed by Prof. Matsaganis. This created an interesting - and rather heated - discussion between the two positions, with that of Ms Fragiadaki supported by a minority of the discussants.

The discussion generally reflected the findings of the EQUAPOL highlighting the complexity of the pension system in Greece and the special position of the women within it.

## 2.6 List of participants

### 2.6.1 Participants at morning session on gender equality in education policy

<i>Family Name</i>	<i>First Name</i>	<i>Organisation</i>	<i>Position</i>
1. Atessoglou	Athina	KEKMOKOP	Admin. Officer
2. Demitriades	Demitris	Olympic Airways	Director of personnel
3. Delistathis	Alexandros	KETHI	Former coordinator of projects
4. Theodoropoulou	Miranta	EYSEKT	Officer
5. Kanta	Vassiliki	KETHI	Training officer
6. Kokosalakis	Nikos	KEKMOKOP	Scientific consultant
7. Koulia	Konstantina	KETHI	Training officer EPEAEK
8. Kouparousou	Eleni	KETHI	Training officer EPEAEK
9. Katoufa	Evgenia	EPA	Journalist
10. Kordonouri	Aikaterini	12 <sup>th</sup> Lycyum of Athens	Teacher of political science
11. Moustaki	Maria	EYD/EPEAEK	Officer

12. Nissan	Anna	Omilos Eurognosi	Educator
13. Pantazi	Katerina	Network of Women of Europe	Volunteer Member of Youth groups
14. Papageorgiou	Rena	Borough of Vyronas	City Councilor, "Panathinaiki" Women's Organization
15. Papoti	Evagelia	Private School	Teacher of literature
16. Patsarou	Laskaro-Ireni	Panteion University/ Gender studies	Sociologist
17. Prokou	Eleni	Panteion University	Lecturer in Education Policy
18. Stathopoulou	Theodora	Ministry of Employment	Department of Equality of opportunities Officer
19. Santrous	Mara	General secretariat for equality	
20. Stratigaki	Maria	Panteion university	KEKMOKOP
21. Kassimati	Koula	Panteion University	Director of KEKMOKOP
22. Tryfonas	Spyridon	KEKMOKOP	Administrative assistant
23. Fragouli	Ioulia	KETHI	Training officer
24. Psariotis	Ioannis		Educator, Postgraduate student

## 2.6.2 Participants at afternoon session on gender equality in pensions policy

<i>Family Name</i>	<i>First Name</i>	<i>Organisation</i>	<i>Position</i>
Atessoglou	Athena	KEKMOKOP	Administrative officer
Argyropoulou	Loukia	General secretariat for equality	Officer of employment and social security
Dimitriadis	Dimitris	Olympic Airways	Director of personnel
Karachristou	Theodora	Ministry of development	Administrative officer
Kokosalakis	Nikos	KEKMOKOP	Scientific consultant
Konstantinidou	Anastasia	Supervision of Work SEPE	Administrative office
Matsaganis	Manos	Economic University of Athens	Associate professor
Papageorgiou	Rena	Borough of Vyronas	City Councilor
Piltsouli	Sophia	Panteion University	Administrative officer
Samtrous	Maria	General secretariat for equality	Officer
Stathopoulou	Theodora	Ministry of the Economy	Administrative Officer
Stratigaki	Maria	Panteion University	KEKMOKOP
Syrou	Pandora	Ministry of the economy	Administrative officer
Fragiadaki	Maria	POSPERT	Trade union officer

## 2.7 Outlines of presentations

### 2.7.1 “Comments on the findings of Equapol for gender equality in Education” by Prof. Nikos Kokosalakis

#### I. Introduction - the Greek case study.

History of gender equality policies in Greece. Gender Equality policy in the framework of EPEAEK (Education and Training Operational Programme).

Objectives of EPEAEK (Axis 4) for gender Equality in education.

The main body and findings of the research

#### II. Brief presentation and comments on the findings

##### 1. The “Intervention Programmes”

Objectives: Sensitization and raising awareness of gender equality issues amongst teachers and pupils in Middle Education. Production of supplementary teaching material. Content of the programmes. The Implementation of the programmes. Analysis and comments.

##### 2. Programmes of Gender Studies

Objectives: Sensitization and raising awareness in the academic community and the students, as well as promotion of knowledge and research on gender education and gender equality. Training of specialized academic personnel. Structure and content of the programmes. Processes, analysis and comments on implementation.

##### 3. Dynamics and prospects of gender equality policies in education

Analysis of the dynamics of policies. The present momentum of policies Degrees and quality of dynamics in various policies. Gender mainstreaming versus positive action. Quality of policies. The problem of creation of “critical mass” of persons (experts) and institutions involved. The question of political will. The problem of organization and structures. Lack of specific organic units. The problem of human and financial resources. The question of wider social dynamics. Prospects unclear and uncertain beyond 2007.

##### 4. The European dimension

The background of the interaction between EU and national policies on Gender equality. Direct and indirect interaction. Issues of EU funding and gender equality policies in education. Positive and negative aspects of EU influence on national policies. The prospects of synergy for the promotion of gender equality policies.

### 2.7.2 “The contribution of EPEAEK in the promotion of gender equality in education” by Ms Maria Moustaki

#### I Introduction

Fighting gender inequality. The EU policy of mainstreaming. The much lower position of women in the labour market compared to men. The higher level of unemployment and underemployment of women compared to men. Women and education. Combating gender inequality through education. EPEAEK: Measure 4.1. “Programme of support of initial education and training for women”. Measure 4.2. “Programmes of support of women in undergraduat and post graduate studies.

Programmes of studies and research programmes for women.” Period of implementation 2002- 2007

#### II Measure 4.1

This measure consists of 8 categories of actions.

1. Sensitization of teachers and intervention programmes for gender equality (budget 25.000.000 Euro)
2. Programmes of consultation and professional orientation (budget 10.300.000 Euro)
3. Study for Educational material and teaching textbooks (budget 600.000 euro)
4. production of ancillary education material for the introduction of subjects relating to gender in the education process (budget 1.000.000 euro)
5. Observatory for attending and evaluation of education policy for equality (indicative budget 1.400.000 euro)
6. positive actions for women (budget 10.000.000), include scholarships for women, strengthening practical training of graduates of institutions of technical education, and enrichment of libraries of school units with electronic bibliography on equality and gender subjects.
7. Programmes promoting equality in society.
8. Pilot programme for promoting gender equality through cultural activities (Mouses)

The last two categories are to announce calls for proposals in the near future.

#### II Measure 4.2

This measure includes:

1. The development of postgraduate programmes of studies in topics of gender and equality.
2. Programmes of undergraduate studies in topics of gender and equality
3. Research programmes for the study of gender and equality.

General comments on the stage of implementation of the above measures.

2.7.3 “Experiences from the planning and implementation of programmes of gender equality in Education” by Mr. Alexandros. Delistathis

#### I. Introduction

The general process of implementation of gender equality policy by the Ministry of Education in the actions funded by Community Support Framework Programmes of the EU. Brief presentation of the process from 1997 to-date

#### II History of the Policy

- Early seminars directly funded by the EU
- Pilot programme in EPEAEK I
- The background for introducing special actions for gender equality in EPEAEK II
- The importance of earmarking non transferable specific budgets for gender equality actions in EPEAEK II

#### III The Implementation of the policy – problems and prospects

- Synergy between the Ministry of Education, the General Secretariat for Equality and KETHI.

- Outcome of the synergy
- Positive and negative aspects of the synergy
- The present stage of the implementation of the policy
- Lack of connection of the outcomes of the policy to general education policy. Poor mechanisms of feed back to the ministry of education
- The prospects of the policy and the problem of budgetary uncertainty.
- The problem of safeguarding political will for the continuation of the policy

#### 2.7.4 “Comments on the findings of EQUAPOL for gender equality in social security” by Maria Stratigaki

##### Greek Pension Policy Framework:

- Increasing dependency ratio
- Increasing social protection ratio
- Large proportion of pension cost among social expenditure
- Majority of women in old age population
- Majority of women in population
- Bismarkian type of Greek pension system

##### Policy Objectives (achieved in recent years):

- Contribution credits of small children (parental leave up to two years)
- Pension splitting in divorce (equality between divorcing spouse and ex-spouse) (Law 3232/2004)
- Raising of retirement age of women (up to 65 years progressively) (Law 2084/1992)
- Abolition of favourable requirements of 15 years of minimum pension to women in the public sector(Law 2084/92)

##### Barriers:

- Centralized pension policy system
- Cultural beliefs – patriarchal structure
- Complexity of pension system – expertise required for intervening
- Budgetary barriers
- Lack of political will on gender equality

##### Facilitators:

- European Union policies – Co-ordination of social security
- Enlightened personalities – feminists politicians

#### 2.7.5 “The system of social protection and women” by Assist. Prof. Manos Matsaganis

##### Social Protection System:

- Protects women who do not work, as members of the family of the husband. Dependent member of the family with mediate social protection as long as she is in wedlock.
- Unpaid work at home, Optional pension rights in the family firm.

- Favourable presuppositions of pension with lower age limits and less pensionable years.
- Discourages the balanced, symmetrical participation of women and men in family life. The system does not help women to reconcile work and family.
- Rewards only the mother, not the father even if he has the care of the children. This consolidates the traditional stereotypes of gender roles.

#### Consequences:

Many women are unable to establish full pension rights. Danger of poverty in case of divorce. Difficulty in calculating the pension when presuppositions hold. Fewer women are entitled to favourable presuppositions for full pension.

#### Conclusions:

The system of social security reproduces and strengthens social divisions: between paid and unpaid work; between protected and precarious work posts; between those who enter the labour market before and after 1993; between men and (most) women.

The divisions establish women as a homogenous category in terms of social rights: Women, who work in permanent and secure jobs of “the protected sector” either as salaried (public sector, banks etc) or as self-employed in professions (doctors, lawyers engineers), are favoured. The rest, women low paid, part time employment in unofficial forms and/ or interrupted types of employment) are disadvantaged.

#### Consequences of some recent changes:

Law 3029/2002: Reduced lowest pension (between 50% and 66%) for those who completed between 3.500 and 4.499 pensionable days.

Recognition of extra pension time for mothers (1 year for the first child, 1.5 for the second, 2 for the third). Reduced lowest pension: consequences for pensions in general and womens’ pensions in particular. Extra pensionable years for women: Positive and negative consequences for women.

Law 3232/2004: Pension due to death of late husband: presuppositions, apportionment of percentage of pension.

#### Recommendations/proposals for women friendly pensions:

- Objective: not to retain acquired rights but promotion and upgrading of the social rights for all women. Reform of the system of social protection. A just and viable pension system: First level, a general citizen’s pension. Second level, a corresponding to contributions Proportionate pension. Third level, An investment additional pension.
- Citizen’s pension: details. Proportionate pension: details. Additional pension: details.
- Consequences of the proposed system for women. Establishing the right of pension for all women. Individuation of social rights and promotion of the relative autonomy of women from husbands. Flexible division of pensionable time. Redistribution of social rights between women and men and between over protected and under protected social groups.
- The proposed system would be fiscally possible, would promote equality between citizens, and would contribute to the modernization of the Greek state.

2.7.6 “Equality – Social Security: Two directional values and necessary values for a society of prosperity” by M. Fragiadaki

I Introduction:

The basic values of a civilized society. The role of the economic system. Capitalism as a system of exploitation of the weak and the poor by the rich. The deterioration of the situation in the beginning of the twenty-first century by the advance of neo-liberalism, globalization and technology. The attack on the welfare state. Consequences: unemployment, increased poverty, inequality, and social injustice.

II The position of women:

Women as the carriers of multiple roles are the recipients of disproportionate severe exploitation. Positive actions are necessary to remedy the situation but instead there are attacks on painfully acquired measures such as special pension rights for women.

III Legislative Measures:

Law 2084/92 decreed that from 1993 women's pensionable age should be the same as that of men. This measure operates against women who in addition to work carry other roles as mothers family carers etc. The measure promotes the deterioration of the life of women and consolidates gender inequality. The retention of five years difference in pensionable age between men and women also demanded by feminist organizations and the women's wing of the general workers' union.

Other measures proposed: Mothers, with child underage or unable to work, should be entitled full pensions by the age of 55 and reduced pensions by the age of 50.

Reduction of required pensionable time according to the number of children proportionately and ways to implement such measures.

Further positive measures for women generally.

Critique of the individuation of the social security system.

IV Conclusion:

A social security system, in order to achieve conditions of security in the critical issues of health pension and welfare should be public and viable.

## Chapter 3

### Seminar for Ireland and UK

#### 3.1 Aims and themes of the seminar

The principal aim of the national thematic seminar, which was held in Dublin on November 19 2004, was to disseminate the findings of the research in relation to Ireland and the UK/Scotland, and to obtain feedback on the research results from policy makers and other key stakeholders in gender equality policy in Ireland (North and South), England, Scotland and Wales. A related aim was to further knowledge in the field of gender equality policy in these national settings and to try and advance this field of policy by making the findings of the research available and also by devoting part of the seminar to a discussion of the future.

The presentations by the keynote speakers were organised in four themes: policy context, current trends, expectations and concerns and barriers, facilitators and future policy directions (see section 3.6).

The presentations of the research results were followed by formal responses provided by representatives of the diverse national settings studied in the Ireland/UK research, as well as the different actors/institutions (both governmental and non-governmental) involved in gender equality policy in those countries. These comprised: an official representing the gender equality section of the Department of Justice, Equality and Law Reform (Ireland), and a representative of the Equal Opportunities Commission of Great Britain, a representative of women's organisations (Scotland).

In general, the responses were positive with respect to the accuracy of the research findings for Ireland, Scotland and the UK. All three responses provided, however, some material not included in the research with a view to giving a stronger support to those findings or else to qualifying them. Thus, for example, the representative of the Gender Equality Section in Ireland supported the finding that gender mainstreaming in Ireland is not evidencing a sufficient degree of embeddedness of gender in policy but he emphasised that a lot of progress is being made. He provided detailed information of some initiatives that are either being implemented or are about to be implemented in the near future.

The representative of women's organisations in Scotland focused her presentation on both the pluses and the minuses of the Scottish equal opportunities policy after devolution. In this regard, the presentation provided a critical perspective on the Scottish case, which is absent in the research report on Scotland (partly due to the fact that the results of the Scottish research were presented comparatively within a UK-wide context, where gender equality policy is significantly less advanced).

Finally, the representative of the Equal Opportunities Commission, while complimenting the results of the UK research for their accuracy in reflecting the current situation in the country, pointed out to some perceived gaps in the research, in relation to issues (such as pay) and voices (such as the non-governmental sector). In addition, she justified the framing of gender equality issues - on the part of her

organisation and others - within a productivity and 'business case' discourse as an effective way of getting gender on the government agenda

### 3.2 Seminar participants

In total 26 participants attended the seminar (see section 3.5 for list of participants). This was a lower number than initially planned, due to a poor response from officials representing UK-wide institutions. In contrast, the response from officials in Ireland, Scotland and Wales was good.

All respondents who took part in the research on Ireland and the UK/Scotland were invited to the seminar. Other key actors and academics were also invited, not only from the national settings covered by the research but also from Wales and Northern Ireland. There was a good balance among representatives of the diverse social institutions involved in gender equality. Participants included civil servants working in government gender equality units and other relevant departments (e.g., education), officials from other public bodies working for gender equality (e.g., EOC), gender equality personnel in trade unions, representatives of women's NGO umbrella groups as well as academics.

### 3.3 Seminar programme

The one-day seminar was held at Dublin Castle, Dublin, Ireland on Friday November 19th 2004. The programme was as follows:

11:00 - 11:30	Registration and Coffee
11:30 - 12:00	Overview presentation of EQUAPOL results for Ireland and UK/Scotland by <i>Mary Daly and Sara Clavero</i>
12:00 - 13:00	Feedback responses <i>Chair: Kathleen Lynch, University College Dublin</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• John O'Callaghan, Gender Equality Section, Dept. Justice, Equality and Law Reform</li> <li>• Fiona McOwan, Engender, Scotland</li> <li>• Rona Fitzgerald, Equal Opportunities Commission</li> </ul>
13:00 - 14:00	Lunch
14:00 - 14:15	Facilitators, barriers and future policy directions to gender equality policy in Ireland and the UK by <i>Mary Daly and Sara Clavero</i>
14:15 - 15:45	Open discussion <i>Chair: Fiona Mackay, Edinburgh University</i>
15:45 - 16:00	Conclusions and final remarks

### 3.4 Seminar discussions

The discussion at the seminar can be organised around four key themes. The first theme is whether a generic or specific approach to equality is most effective. The advantages of a generic approach are discussed before the criticisms are outlined. The second theme concerns whether rules and legislation are effective in bringing about equality, or whether wider changes to societal norms are also necessary. The third theme discusses the strategies and methods for achieving gender equality. Targets and

gender mainstreaming are among some of the methods that are raised here. The fourth, and final, theme discusses women, power and policy making. Contributions on this theme concern the sidelining of gender in policy and the need for policy to address the unequal power relationships between men and women.

#### 3.4.1. Generic versus Specific Approaches towards Equality

One of the dominant themes to emerge from the discussion was whether a generic or specific approach towards equality was best. Contributors to the discussion had different opinions as to whether the generic approach currently adopted in the UK and Ireland weakened or added to gender mainstreaming. The arguments expressed in support of a 'generic' approach to equality will be outlined before moving onto consider the criticisms of this approach as raised by participants.

##### Advantages of a generic approach

One participant commented that the term 'generic' is often viewed in a negative way and seen to generalise equality issues. This participant argued that there was a need to challenge the negativity surrounding a 'generic' approach and discuss some of the opportunities an integrated approach presents for gender equality.

In general, participants in favour of a generic approach discussed four main advantages.

1. The first and most commonly referred to advantage is that a generic approach to equality allows for the complexity of women's situation. In other words, it does not view women as a homogeneous group but recognises their diversity on multiple grounds, e.g. lesbian women, disabled women, black women. Participants here drew attention to the limitations of treating women as a unitary group with the same needs and emphasised the potential for viewing women on a number of different levels.
2. The second advantage of a generic approach is that it provides the potential for groups experiencing inequality to advance their case in a collective and collaborative manner. For example, the disabled and women can both benefit under a unified strategy.
3. The third advantage of a generic approach is that it avoids hierarchies across the nine grounds of equality. In other words, it is powerful in building solidarity for those experiencing inequality.
4. The final advantage of a generic approach is its efficiency. Contributors argued that there is an administrative simplicity with a unified approach to equality which may, in the policy context of the UK and Ireland, make it more efficient than a specific approach.

##### Criticisms of a generic approach

Whilst some participants defended the 'integrated' approach to equality currently favoured in the UK and Ireland, there were many more who criticised this approach.

One participant criticised the idea that a generic approach to equality can be simultaneously advantageous for many diverse groups. She argued that the generic approach to equality, which views equality across nine grounds, means that workers in the trade unions and the community are obliged to sit on numerous committees and

boards, increasing their work load considerably. This participant argued that the increased workload brought on by a generic approach to equality means that less work is actually being done on the ground on the issues that matter.

In general, contributors who criticised the generic approach to equality emphasised the limitations of this approach for delivering gender equality. The growing trend for people to lobby for women's rights under the broad banner of equality was seen by many participants to be problematic. Participants raised doubts about mainstreaming equality in general, rather than mainstreaming gender equality specifically.

One participant expressed her concern about whether real or substantive equality was achievable within a generic framework. To substantiate this point reference was made to a piece of research which examined occupational segregation in Scotland. The interview data from this research indicated that sexist assumptions about gender roles continue to exist. The participant concluded that given the deeply entrenched nature of gender inequality in society it was unlikely that a generic approach would achieve substantive equality.

Other participants argued that gender is an important variable in its own right and that it should be recognised by policy makers as such. The point was made that women's experience of disadvantage based on their caring responsibilities means that they have more in common with, and are more united with, other women than any other social group. Regardless of whether women are black, lesbian or disabled, their shared position of disadvantage as women unites them more than any other factor. For this reason the view was expressed that policy makers should look at equality through a gender lens rather than generically. In a similar argument, another participant questioned the usefulness of the concept of equality when gender, disability and age are not treated specifically. This participant argued that equality has different meanings for different groups of people and it is imperative that policy makers ask the questions: What is equality? And equality for whom?

Criticisms of the generic approach to equality frequently related to the perceived lack of understanding about gender at policy level. Often participants argued that the lack of awareness of gender issues by policy makers was exacerbated under a generic approach. One participant argued that under a generic approach policy makers need to have an in-depth understanding of each area of equality and how it interacts with other issues. It was argued that this knowledge, which is essential for effective policies, is currently lacking amongst policy makers in the UK and Ireland. Three further participants identified the lack of awareness of mainstreaming gender equality in government departments and agencies as a barrier to equality. They all emphasised the need for awareness raising and training for policy makers across the breadth of government departments and agencies.

#### 3.4.2. Rules versus Norms: Issues around Approach, Strategy and What Can be Achieved by Gender Mainstreaming

Another key area of debate concerned the approach and strategies of gender mainstreaming. The real question to be addressed here was whether harder laws and regulations are needed or whether further work is needed to change wider norms in society. Contributors had mixed opinions about what could be achieved through rules

and legislation. And if the rules are not enough, how should we go about changing societal norms?

*The importance of rules: Regional examples*

Many contributors emphasised the important role that rules play towards gender equality. The importance of rules was particularly emphasised by contributors from Wales and Northern Ireland.

Drawing on the example of Wales, it was argued that the positive action approach adopted there has brought about a 50/50 gender split in cabinet, not only altering the composition of parliament but also leading to more family friendly, consensual policy making. This 50/50 positive action approach was seen to highlight the importance of both rules and norms for gender equality. For example, it was stated that the quickest change will occur by changing the rules, but culture is also important and this will change over the long term as a result of the rules.

Similarly in Northern Ireland rules and norms are seen to be a very important step in achieving gender equality. Three participants commented that since 1998 when the statutory duty was put in place, a set of basic rules of conduct have been firmly established from which equality can grow. The general feeling from participants was that the big success of the statutory duty is that the rules have changed and procedures have been put in place that have to be abided by. In this sense, whilst it may take time to achieve equality, the rules are a start. Despite emphasising the importance of the rules for gender equality, the Northern Ireland commentators also raised concerns about whether the rules had actually brought about any measurable or concrete change. In other words, had the rules improved practice? One participant argued that Northern Ireland is at a gateway and impact assessments and evaluations about the effectiveness of the statutory duty are currently underway which should provide some answers to these questions. Other participants commented that based on their own experiences the rules have meant that procedures are now in place and practice has been significantly improved.

*The need for wider change*

Leaving aside the cases of Wales and Northern Ireland, the general consensus regarding rules versus norms appeared to be that, although rules and regulations were an important start for equality, they did not deliver substantive equality. This led many contributors to argue that real equality can only be achieved when rules are accompanied by a wider change in norms and values.

Often participants emphasised the importance of rules and legislation, such as the Equal Pay Act, in closing the pay gap between men and women. Despite the existence of these rules, participants drew attention to areas where inequalities are allowed to persist, such as the way that job evaluations are carried out. From this, the point was made that in order for equality to be achieved there needs to be a paradigm shift in how gender issues are perceived. Some participants criticised equality policies for being driven by business and productivity and not the goal of substantive gender equality. The majority however, recognised the need for further work on changing the norms and values that are at the heart of gender inequality. Only then would real equality exist.

### 3.4.3. Strategies and Methods for Achieving Gender Equality

Much discussion centred on the strategies and methods for achieving gender equality. The effectiveness of targets, gender mainstreaming and alternative methods were the focus of this discussion.

#### *The effectiveness of setting targets?*

The effectiveness of setting targets was raised by many people. Some contributors argued that more effective gender targets needed to be set in order to achieve equality.

One participant argued that the present lack of specific gender targets in equality strategies acts as a barrier to achieving equality. Another participant agreed that something was lacking in the main policy areas with regards to targets, indicators and strategies. This participant commented that it might be beneficial to look at policy areas that have managed to set targets and use these as models for gender. An example given here was the Anti-Poverty Strategy.

Other participants articulated some criticisms about the strategy of setting targets. One participant highlighted the trauma involved in setting targets for policy makers. Drawing on her experience of policy making in Scotland, she argued that policy makers sometimes focus all of their energy on meeting targets and may lose sight of the outcomes that they are trying to achieve. In this sense, targets may get in the way of achieving outcomes as they become the end in themselves. Perhaps a more effective approach than setting targets is for policy makers to make sure that they do better than they did in the previous year.

Another participant argued that the strategy of setting targets is ineffective in delivering equality as it does not go far enough. This participant argued that an effective approach to equality must acknowledge the flawed make-up of the system rather than just setting targets within the existing system. An effective approach therefore must take into account men and women's different lives in society, whilst maximising resources and productivity towards the achievement of change. Against this kind of rubric, equal treatment and discrimination approaches were seen to be failing to bring about structural equality.

#### *Evaluation of methods*

General questions about the various strategies and measures available to policy makers to achieve gender equality were also raised by participants. A key set of concerns raised pertained to the need to assess the strengths and weakness of various methods, including gender mainstreaming, for achieving gender equality.

Participants acknowledged that there are different policies for different times and places and with different outcomes. As some strategies work better than others, it is important to be clear about which strategies, or aspects of strategies, can achieve what. Which instruments are effective for achieving which outcomes? What works and deals with issues in ways that other mechanisms do not? Based on these evaluations a few participants argued that it would be crucial that a package of measures is adopted in order to achieve gender equality.

*The lack of clarity: Questions on mainstreaming and gender equality*

What came through most clearly from the discussion about the method of gender mainstreaming was the lack of clarity about what gender mainstreaming actually means. Participants agreed that a definition of gender mainstreaming was needed. The general consensus from participants was that it was vital to know what mainstreaming is, in order to understand how it will work in reality. Participants also queried what it is that mainstreaming seeks to achieve, what its end goals are. The lack of ready answers to these questions was a key concern of many participants.

A few participants were also concerned about the future prospects for equality through the strategy of mainstreaming. One participant questioned whether gender mainstreaming was too labour intensive and unrealistic to get results in complex bureaucratic structures. She wondered whether the potential of mainstreaming was real or whether it became too tied up in process and procedures. She felt that the substance of what gender equality is or could be could come to be obscured or forgotten through the singular focus on the process of mainstreaming.

The lack of understanding about what gender equality actually means was also viewed by participants as highly problematic. Some participants highlighted the lack of an adequate vision of gender equality as a real problem for policy makers. One commented that as there is no actual definition of gender equality, perhaps it is easier to get it into policy because it is not known what is wanted. Another participant questioned whether gender equality was about women and men or whether it was just concerned with women's issues? The common theme behind both of these contributions was the difficulty of achieving gender equality when there is no singular definition or vision of what it is.

3.4.4. Women, Power and Policymaking

The final theme to emerge at the seminar was power and policy making. Contributions on this theme related to women's increased involvement in politics and the policymaking process, and the implications of this for gender equality policies. Contributors articulated concerns that women's issues and gender equality were not top priorities for policy. Some contributors argued that the success of women's issues appearing on the policy agenda was dependent upon political will and individual champions. Most contributors agreed that, even though women are in consultation with policy makers, a trend resulting from positive action measures and legislation, their views and opinions do not seem to be taken into consideration.

*Political will and the role of individual champions*

A small number of participants commented that political will and the role of individual champions were important preconditions to gender equality appearing on the policy agenda.

One participant argued that initiatives are dependent on political will. Another participant agreed that it is impossible to get through to the people in power unless there are individual 'champions' within the political parties and legislators. A further participant made the observation that lobbyists and people in the field of gender equality did not appear to be as good at interacting with political parties as lobbyists in other areas. It was suggested that this was an area in need of further work.

### *The implications of more women in policy making for gender equality*

Another strong topic of discussion was the implications of more women in power for gender equality. Participants appeared to be of mixed opinion on this topic. Although it was generally recognised that more women in power had had a positive impact on policy, participants also emphasised that the critical mass of women in power does not guarantee outcomes politically in terms of a more gender sensitive policy. There were two main issues raised here by participants. Firstly, whilst women are now being consulted by policy makers their voices are not being heard. Secondly, women's increased involvement in policy has not been accompanied by any significant shifts in the power relationships between them and men.

### *The sidelining of gender issues*

Participants seemed to be concerned that although women were increasingly consulted in the policymaking process their views and suggestions rarely filtered through into policies. The explanations advocated by participants concerned women's lack of power and the fact that gender carries little political weight.

One participant argued that even though the people in power are consulting with gender experts they are still not putting equal pay into the programme. Hence whilst women are being consulted, their voices are not being heard in a meaningful way. In her view the productivity argument continues to be the most important consideration for those in power. Another participant agreed that whilst there is consultation with equality groups on emerging policy and legislative change, the impact of this consultation is not visible or clear. She asked the question whether consultation is really making a difference?

The failure of gender issues to impact on policy was also a concern raised in relation to social partnership in Ireland. One view expressed was that hard issues tend to rise to the top of the agenda and that pay continues to be the prime mover in social partnership.

### *The need to address power relationships*

Participants tended to link women's failure to influence the policy agenda to their lack of power.

One participant argued that rather than focusing on critical mass and obtaining a 50/50 gender split, it is important to look at the power and resources that accompany this split. Another stated that legislators' failure to address the unequal power relationships between women and men makes it particularly difficult to effect a paradigm shift. She adds that this does not mean that equality initiatives are not valuable, as they do help bring about a gendered consciousness about male and female, but there must be dialogue between male and female power relationships in terms of policy.

Two further contributors commented on the absence of analysis of power relationships in policy. These contributors particularly emphasised the distance between feminism and policy making. They drew attention to Sweden as the only country that incorporated gender, feminist discourse and unequal power resources into

the analysis. There was strong agreement amongst participants that more work had to be done in this area, especially in the context of the UK and Ireland.

### 3.5 List of seminar participants

<i>Name</i>	<i>Organisation</i>	<i>e-mail</i>
1. Adele Baumgardt	EOC Wales	<a href="mailto:Adele.Baumgardt@eoc.org.uk">Adele.Baumgardt@eoc.org.uk</a>
2. Kate Bilton	University of Edinburgh	<a href="mailto:K.S.C.Bilton@sms.ed.ac.uk">K.S.C.Bilton@sms.ed.ac.uk</a>
3. Maureen Bohan	Dept Education and Science, Rep of Ireland	<a href="mailto:Maureen_Bohan@education.gov.ie">Maureen_Bohan@education.gov.ie</a>
4. Tijs Broeke	EOC, Great Britain	<a href="mailto:Tijs.Broeke@eoc.org.uk">Tijs.Broeke@eoc.org.uk</a>
5. Sara Clavero	Queen's University Belfast	<a href="mailto:s.clavero@qub.ac.uk">s.clavero@qub.ac.uk</a>
6. Kathleen Connolly	Dept Justice, Equality and Law Reform, Rep of Ireland	<a href="mailto:KMConnolly@justice.ie">KMConnolly@justice.ie</a>
7. Mary Daly	Queen's University Belfast	<a href="mailto:m.daly@qub.ac.uk">m.daly@qub.ac.uk</a>
8. Carmel Duggan	WRC Social and Economic Consultants, Rep of Ireland	<a href="mailto:cduggan@wrc.ie">cduggan@wrc.ie</a>
9. Rona Fitzgerald	EOC Scotland	<a href="mailto:rona.fitzgerald@eoc.org.uk">rona.fitzgerald@eoc.org.uk</a>
10. Yvonne Galligan	Queen's University Belfast	<a href="mailto:y.galligan@qub.ac.uk">y.galligan@qub.ac.uk</a>
11. Hilary Harbinson	OFMDFM, Northern Ireland	<a href="mailto:Hilary.harbinson@ofmdfmi.gov.uk">Hilary.harbinson@ofmdfmi.gov.uk</a>
12. Ewa Hibbert	Scottish Executive	<a href="mailto:Ewa.Hibbert@scotland.gsi.gov.uk">Ewa.Hibbert@scotland.gsi.gov.uk</a>
13. Roisin Kelly	Northern Ireland Assembly	<a href="mailto:Roisin.Kelly@niassembly.gov.uk">Roisin.Kelly@niassembly.gov.uk</a>
14. Julia Long	Dept Justice, Equality and Law Reform	<a href="mailto:Julia_M_Long@justice.ie">Julia M. Long@justice.ie</a>
15. Brenda Lynch	Dept Justice, Equality and Law Reform	<a href="mailto:BXLynch@justice.ie">BXLynch@justice.ie</a>
16. Kathleen Lynch	University College Dublin	<a href="mailto:kathleen.lynch@ucd.ie">kathleen.lynch@ucd.ie</a>
17. Fiona Mackay	University of Edinburgh	<a href="mailto:f.s.mackay@ed.ac.uk">f.s.mackay@ed.ac.uk</a>
18. Anne-Marie McGauran	Institute of Public Administration, Rep of Ireland	<a href="mailto:ammcgauran@ipa.ie">ammcgauran@ipa.ie</a>
19. Fiona McOwan	Engender, Scotland	<a href="mailto:development@engender.org.uk">development@engender.org.uk</a>
20. Rhona McSweeney	Dept Education and Science	<a href="mailto:rhona_mcsweeney@education.gov.ie">rhona_mcsweeney@education.gov.ie</a>

---

21. Mags O'Brien	SIPTU, Republic of Ireland	<a href="mailto:mobrien@siptu.ie">mobrien@siptu.ie</a>
22. John O'Callaghan	Dept Justice, Equality and Law Reform	
23. Lorraine O'Neill	Queen's University Belfast	<a href="mailto:loneill@qub.ac.uk">loneill@qub.ac.uk</a>
24. Sheila Quinn	Independent Researcher, Rep of Ireland	<a href="mailto:quinnsheila@eircom.net">quinnsheila@eircom.net</a>
25. Carole Sullivan	Equality Authority, Republic of Ireland	<a href="mailto:csullivan@equality.ie">csullivan@equality.ie</a>
26. Joyce Watson	Wales Women's National Coalition	<a href="mailto:joyce-watson@wwnc.org.uk">joyce-watson@wwnc.org.uk</a>

---

### 3.6 Outlines of Keynote speakers and presentations

#### 3.6.1. Outlines of Keynote speakers

##### Results for Ireland (Mary Daly)

###### Irish Policy Context

- A mixed approach historically
- Introduction of gender mainstreaming
- Institutional innovation
- Social partnership
- Economic growth

###### Current Trends

- Strong focus on legislative approach
- Gender mainstreaming in important but discrete policy areas
- Commitment to gender equality questioned
- Overall government strategy?

###### Expectations and Concerns

- What happens after the National Development Plan?
- How can the diverse initiatives be coordinated?
- How can we get beyond a pragmatic approach?
- How can the good lessons of gender mainstreaming be more widely appreciated?

###### Facilitators, Barriers and Future Policy Directions

- Facilitators
  - State of the art legislation
  - Social partnership
  - The European Union
  - Individual champions
- Barriers
  - Lack of acceptance and understanding of gender inequality
  - Lack of political will
  - Pragmatic approach to gender
- Future Policy Directions
  - A move to treat inequality generically

- The embeddedness of gender mainstreaming to be questioned
- The extent to which structural inequalities are addressed also needs to be questioned

### **Results for UK/Scotland (Sara Clavero)**

#### Policy Context

- Equal treatment tradition
- Lack of a coherent policy
- Modernising government framework
- Devolution

#### Current Trends

- A more proactive policy
- A diversity mainstreaming agenda
- Business case rhetoric
- Labour market focus
- Consulting to death?

#### Scotland: The Impact of Devolution

- Devolution and equal opportunities
- A broad social consensus
- New institutions and processes
- An equality mainstreaming approach
- Civic participation

#### Expectations and Concerns

- Impact of a positive duty on gender
- Diversity approach and multiple discrimination
- Hierarchisation of equalities and dilution of gender
- Adaptation of gender mainstream to the mainstream agenda

#### Facilitators, Barriers and Future Policy Directions

- Facilitators
  - Strong commitment to gender equality from women in senior positions
  - Legal underpinning of positive action and gender mainstreaming (new gender duties)
  - Previous experience of equality proofing (PAET) and positive duties (race)
- Barriers
  - Lack of a coherent policy on gender equality
  - Gender equality as a 'diversity' issue
  - Hierarchy of equalities (gender as cinderella)
  - Popular understanding of gender equality in terms of fairness and anti-discrimination
- Future Policy Directions
  - What are the potential gains and losses of an integrated approach to equality?

- What lessons can be drawn from similar experiences in the devolved government and elsewhere (e.g., Republic of Ireland)?

### 3.6.2 Formal Responses

#### Department of Justice, Equality and Law Reform, Republic of Ireland (John O'Callaghan)

- Positive Response
  - In a general sense reflective of current position
  - There are questions about how embedded the process is (ownership, review and monitoring)
- Gender equality and Policy
  - Government memos
  - National Development Plan
  - Education and employment
  - Health
  - Development Co-operation
  - Violence against women
  - National Anti-Poverty Strategy
  - State Boards
  - Civil service gender equality policy
- Observations
  - National Development Plan
  - National Women's Strategy
    - Sectoral issues
    - How gender equality policy is organised
    - Institutional arrangements
    - Funding – coherence between Departments
  - Gender as a code word for women
  - Positive action / Gender mainstreaming
  - Beyond 2006
    - National Women's Strategy
    - Equality for Women Measure
    - Gender Mianstreaming
    - Post-National Development Plan: programming process may not be particularly different
  - Outcomes/Indicators
- Conclusions
  - Overall impression correct
  - But there has been a lot of progress
    - National Development Plan, including Equality for Women Measure, has signalled significant change
    - On the agenda across most Departments
  - Issues around ownership, visibility, mainstreaming
  - National Women's Strategy

## Engender, Scotland (Fiona McOwan)

- Scottish Policy Context for Gender Equality
  - Scotland Act 1998
    - Outlined 10 ground for discrimination
    - Includes sex and marital status
  - Social Justice Strategy 1999
    - Social inclusion
    - Focus on children, young people, families and communities
    - No specific mention of gender
  - Equality Strategy 2000
    - Definition of mainstreaming
    - Includes women as one of a number of groups experiencing disadvantage
- Mainstreaming Equality
  - the systematic integration of an equality perspective into the everyday work of government, involving policy makers across all government departments, as well as equality specialists and external partners
  - encouragement to government agencies - Scottish Enterprise, Communities Scotland, sportscotland et al to adopt this approach
- Progress to Date: Plus or Minus?
  - Consultation with equality groups on emerging policy and legislative change
  - Equality clauses embedded in Scottish legislation
  - Gradual improvement in statistics disaggregated by gender
  - Equal Opportunities Committee of Parliament takes evidence from women's organisations
  - Link between equality policy and equality budgets recognised (EPBPAG)
  - Scottish Women's Convention established 2003
  - Women's Fund for Scotland receives Scottish Executive funding
- Barriers
  - Lack of specific gender targets in social justice strategy
  - Few specific gender targets in equality strategy
  - No statutory duty on public bodies to carry out gender impact assessment
  - No public duty on gender - yet!
  - Lack of understanding of mainstreaming gender equality in government departments and agencies
- Impact of Devolution
  - Significant increase in number of women in Parliament and in Ministerial position
  - Equal Opportunities Committee
  - Cross Party Group on Women
  - Participation and consultation mechanisms established

### **BUT**

- Lack of route to influence on reserved powers

- Still Needed
  - Continuing development of tools for gender impact assessment and gender budgeting
  - **Better liaison with UK government**
  - Capacity building on gender equality for policy makers in divisions, departments and agencies of the Scottish Executive
  - Shift in values and norms to challenge continuing roots of inequality

### **Equal Opportunities Commission, Great Britain (Rona Fitzgerald)**

#### **Remarks**

This is an interesting paper, identifies some of the tensions in UK policy and delivery and also gives a sense of the difference in Scotland because of devolution. Always interesting to get an outside view as when work in a Commission – we respond to the government's agenda but also try to influence that agenda. It is true that the UK exemplifies a pragmatic approach.

#### **Comments**

- I think it would be useful to contextualise the equality agenda in the UK as focusing very much on equality as labour market regulation. Unlike the broader societal focus of other EU states.
- While I agree that welfare reform is a focus it is constructed around welfare to work (in this respect the UK is more like US/New Zealand, Canada and less like the other EU states)

#### **Policy dynamic**

The EOC have tried to put the business case and link pay and productivity – identifying the three main causes of the Pay Gap

- Occupational segregation
- Discrimination in the workplace
- The difficulties of combining work with caring responsibilities

I am surprised that pay has not emerged more strongly in the report in view of the Equal Pay Task Force, Kingsmill Review and the recently announced Women in Work Commission. These might be worth mentioning

#### **Comments Education**

- Interesting in view of OSGFI 3 causes of the pay gap - occupational segregation, discrimination and caring also DFES unwilling to take part in HMT project – claim that they are already doing well on gender equality
- In the UK policy context, notably for the Treasury, women seen in context of child welfare/family and to a lesser extent in labour market
- In Scotland, although committed to a mainstreaming approach, there are two overarching strategies – the Social Justice Strategy and the Equality Strategy. While the impetus for both of these strategies is about tackling inequality and exclusion, there is a danger of considering issues of gender equality as part of the poverty/social inclusion agenda and not as part of the commitment to mainstream gender/equality throughout the policy process.

## Chapter 4

### Seminar for France and Belgium

#### 4.1 Aims of the seminar

The seminar for France and Belgium was held on Thursday December 2 2004 at the Free University of Brussels. Entitled “Learning from Experience: Gender Equality Policies in Belgium and France”, the main aim of the seminar was to disseminate the results of the EQUAPOL research on Belgium and France and to obtain feedback and reactions from policymakers and other key actors in the field of gender equality policy in both countries. The seminar also provided the opportunity to analyse the state of gender equality policy in Belgium and in France as far as the means and results are concerned, and to discuss the future in that field.

The seminar programme is presented in section 4.5.

#### 4.2 Seminar participants

In total 21 persons attended the seminar. All respondents who have taken part in the research on Belgium and France were invited to the seminar. The participants included civil servants working in government gender equality units and other relevant departments (tax, education, etc.), officials from other public bodies working in gender equality, members of cabinets, university experts, and representative of women’s NGOs.

The list of participants is presented in section 4.6.

#### 4.3 Themes and issues addressed

The first part of the seminar was dedicated to Belgium and the second to France. In each country session, the research results were presented. The presentation was followed by formal responses provided by representatives of diverse national settings studied in the Belgian and French research, as well as different actors/institutions involved in gender equality in each country. There was also room for general discussion by all participants.

The research on Belgium analysed the “Plan Stratégique pour l’Egalité des chances” (Strategic Plan for Equal Opportunities), a pilot project on gender mainstreaming, and the 2001 tax reform.

The situation in Belgium was presented as follows:

- The main findings of the Belgian research by Robert Plasman, Dulbéa
- The Strategic Plan for Equal Opportunities: one step forward in the institutionalisation of gender equality, by Pascal Vielle, Director of the Institute for the equality of men and women
- Women and tax system by Thérèse Meunier, Ministry of Finance)

In France, the policies studied were the new national policy for equal opportunities and the national convention (and its regional derivatives) for promoting equal opportunities between girls and boys, women and men of 25<sup>th</sup> February 2000.

The situation in France was presented as follows:

- Main findings of the French research by Salimata Sissoko, Dulbéa
- The Charter for equality: the future of the French gender quality policy, by Christophe Pareschi, Gender Equality Unit
- The national convention for promoting equal opportunities between girls and boys after 2005 by Ingrid Faure, Gender Equality Unit

Overall, the responses were quite positive with respect to the accuracy of the research findings for Belgium and France. In particular participants acknowledged the lack of application of a pure “gender mainstreaming” approach and the domination of the transversal dimension as far as gender equality policy is concerned. The respondents provided useful information in terms of new assessments of policies analysed and policy adjustments for the future. In addition the meeting gave the opportunity to gender equality delegates to discuss local experiences with policymakers at central level.

#### **4.4 Main points of the presentations and discussions**

##### **4.4.1. The pilot aspect of the Belgian Strategic Plan for Equal Opportunities**

Robert Plasman (Dulbéa) and Pascal Vielle (Director of the Institute for the equality of men and women) underlined the pilot aspect of the project. Even though this project reflects new actions undertaken by the government in the field of gender equality, it is still not possible to generalize these results to the overall Belgian gender equality policy. As described in the national report for Belgium (2004) and the evaluation of the project by the university experts (2002) the project was a pilot one in several respects:

1. The implementation of gender mainstreaming at the federal level was new and it involves the development of an operational definition of gender mainstreaming, a working method, techniques and instruments, etc.
2. The project was conceived as a collaboration between politicians and academics. In connection with the unit’s set-up, the academics support the efforts of the politicians. In general, these are commissioned research projects followed at the political level. Such approaches take some time to adapt to these new formulas and the elaboration of a code of conduct and cooperation procedures.
3. The evaluation by the experts show that the methodology neglected the transversal aspect, and recommends its integration and to increase the number of partners involved in the process and institutionalising a veritable gender mainstreaming strategy within the federal government, through the formulation of strategic objectives at the beginning of the legislative period and implementation of a 4-year programme and the appointment of persons in each federal public service (at political and administrative level) to take charge of the actions’ coordination.

#### 4.4.2 Achieving gender equality in the Belgian tax policy?

Therese Meunier (Ministry of Finance) raised the issue of the lack of official statistics on personal income tax disaggregated by sex in Belgium. It is then difficult to perform gender impact assessments of the tax policy. Furthermore, according to this speaker a complete individualisation of the tax system would represent a solution to the issue of indirect discrimination still existing in fiscal texts, for example, the dependent spouse allowance and, in general, tax cuts granted to the person in the household with the higher income. Belgium, France, Luxembourg and Portugal are the last four European countries (EU-15) to apply joint taxation of spouses.

#### 4.4.3 Coherence between discourse and facts

French participants questioned the representative of the Gender Equality Unit on the coherence between discourse and actions of the Ministry of Parity and Job Equality and the lack of budget. They were also particularly concerned about the future of the convention for equality in education, which comes to the end in 2005. The representatives of the Equality Unit confirmed that a new convention will be signed in 2006 and that gender equality is still on the Government agenda.

### 4.5 Seminar programme

The one-day seminar took place on Thursday December 2 2004.

9:00 - 9:30	Registration and Coffee
9:30 – 10:00	Welcome and introductions
10:00 - 10:30	<b>Principle results of EQUAPOL on the political context and gender equality policy in Belgium</b> by <i>Robert Plasman</i> , <i>Dulbéa</i>
10:30 – 10:50	Coffee break
10:50 – 11:10	<b>Reflections on the research findings</b> by <i>Pascale Vielle</i> , Director, Institute for Equal between women and women , Belgium
11:10 – 11:30	<b>Reflections on the research findings</b> by <i>Thérèse Meunier</i> , Ministry of Finance, Belgium
11:30 – 12:30	Discussion with participants
12:30 - 14:00	Lunch
14:00 - 14:30	<b>Principal results of EQUAPOL on the political context and gender equality policy in France</b> by <i>Salimata Sissoko</i> , <i>Dulbéa</i>
14:30 – 15:00	<b>Reflections on the research findings</b> by <i>Ingrid Faure and Christophe Pareschi</i> , Women's Rights and Equality Service, France
15:00 – 15:20	<b>Reflections on the research findings</b> by <i>Dominique Torsat</i> , Ministry of Education, France
15:20 – 16:00	Discussion with participants
16:00	Cocktail

## 4.6 Seminar participants

<i>Name</i>	<i>Organisation</i>	<i>e-mail</i>
1. CHARRETTON Christine	Association « Femmes et Mathématiques », France	Christine.Charretton@univ-lyon1.fr
2. CONNEAU Coline	Chargée de mission, Délégation régionale aux droits des femmes et à l'égalité Languedoc-Roussillon, France	drdf.lr@wanadoo.fr
3. COUMONT Marie-France	Conseiller adjoint chargée des actions positives, SPF Economie, Classes Moyennes, PME, Energie, Belgique	Marie-France.Coumont@statbel.mineco.fgov.be
4. DEHAUSSE Bernard	Chargé de mission, Politique scientifique fédérale, Belgique	delh@belspo.be
5. FAURE Ingrid	Chargée de mission « formation initiale » Service des droits des femmes et de l'égalité, France	Ingrid.FAURE@sante.gouv.fr
6. FLAVEN Claude	Chargée de mission, Délégation régionale aux droits des femmes et à l'égalité, Rhône-Alpes, France	drdfe-ra@droitsdesfemmes-ra.org
7. GANGJI Aynah	Chercheuse, Université Libre de Bruxelles, Belgique	amgangji@ulb.ac.be
8. GIBOUREAU Hélène	Chargée de mission académique égalité des chances filles garçons, Rectorat de Clermont-Ferrand, France	helene.giboureau@ac-clermont.fr
9. GUENNEUGUES Nicole	Chargée de mission académique égalité des chances filles garçons, Rectorat de Rennes, SAIO, France	Egalite.chances@ac-rennes.fr
10. LALOUX Martine	Administrateur (Sécurité juridique) SPF Finances, Belgique	Martine.laloux@minfin.fed.be
11. MARTINELLI Marie-Thérèse	Chargée de mission académique égalité des chances filles garçons, Rectorat de Toulouse, France	m-therese.martinelli@ac-toulouse.fr
12. MAUPAS Geneviève	Déléguée Régionale aux Droits des Femmes et à l'Egalité , Haute-Normandie, France	Genevieve.maupas@haute-normandie.pref.gouv.fr
13. MEULDERS Danièle	Professeure, Université Libre de Bruxelles, Belgique	dmeulder@ulb.ac.be
14. MEUNIER Thérèse	Auditrice générale des Finances, SPF Finances, Belgique	therese.meunier@diplobel.be
15. MOSCONI Nicoles	Professeure en sciences de l'éducation Université Paris X-Nanterre, France	Nicole.mosconi@wanadoo.fr
16. PARESCI Christophe	Chargé de mission, Service des droits des femmes et de l'égalité, France	<a href="mailto:Christophe.PARESCI@sante.gouv.fr">Christophe.PARESCI@sante.gouv.fr</a>
17. PICQ Françoise	Maître de Conférence Université Paris Dauphine, ANEF, association nationale des Etudes féministes, France	Francoise.picq@dauphine.fr
18. PLASMAN Robert	Professeur, Université Libre de Bruxelles, Belgique	rplasma@ulb.ac.be
19. SISSOKO Salimata	Chercheuse, Université Libre de Bruxelles, Belgique	nsissoko@ulb.ac.be
20. TORSAT Dominique	Chargé de mission, Direction Enseignement scolaire, France	dominique.torsat@education.gouv.fr
21. VEILLE Pascale	Directrice, Institut pour l'égalité des femmes et des hommes, Belgique	pascale.vielle@meta.fgov.be

# Chapter 5

## Seminar in Sweden

### 5.1 Aims and themes of the seminar

The Swedish national dissemination seminar was held at Ingenjörshuset, Malmskillnadsgatan 46, Stockholm, Sweden, on 25<sup>th</sup> October, 2004.

The main aim of the seminar was to present the research and the findings of the Equapol project particularly the national research and the comparative analysis. Another was to discuss some of the findings in the national research.

The seminar where structured in three parts, the current situation, future and historical. In the first part the findings of the national research as well as the comparative analysis were presented followed by discussions. Then a workshop was held with the involvement of the participants. The intention was to organise the second part like a future workshop. Finally Kristina Östberg contributed with a presentation of Gerda Nilsson – the first married women who obtain a PhD in Sweden. The historical part was placed in the end of the day due to Kristina Östberg's possibilities to participate.

### 5.1 The seminar participants

It was difficult to involve people in the Swedish seminar. Invitations were sent to approximately 50 persons (among them all the regional gender equality experts), and also to trade unions, authorities, ministries etc with "open invitations", by which is meant that they could check in their organisation for persons to send to the seminar. 17 persons registered. However, in the end the number of participants was 13.

The low numbers of participants can be interpreted in a variety of ways. Probably this is a consequence of the many gender equality activities that are held in Sweden. The week after the seminar the National Agency for Higher Education held a conference.

### 5.2 The presentations

Three presentations were made at the seminar:

- Mari Runardotter "Gender Equality and Gender Mainstreaming in Sweden - lack of knowledge?"
- Christina Mörtberg "Gender Equality and Gender Mainstreaming: a comparative analysis".
- Kristina Östberg, "Boken om Gerda" (The book of Gerda). Gerda Nilsson was the first marriage women who obtained a doctoral degree in Sweden.

In the first presentation **Mari Runardotter**, doctoral student, Luleå University of Technology presented the main findings of the Swedish case study within EQUAPOL. Ms Runardotter gave a brief overview of how the research was conducted, the findings, and of the case studies in education (from pre-school to higher education), as well as the National Boards of Health and Welfare's follow up, analysis

and account of gender differences within areas such as health- and medical care and social services. The presentation focused on the key actors' constructions of gender equality and inequality. Many of the informants emphasised that there is a lack of knowledge of gender equality in the Swedish society. There has been ongoing gender equality politics for the last 30 years. Based on this the key actors' explanation was questioned.

The researchers argue that the phenomenon "lack of knowledge" is an expression of that there is a need to cast light on specific goals and objectives. Some of the key actors also perceived risks with the mixing of gender equality and diversity policies. The resource or the quality argument was also presented, concepts that are used in gender equality work. Thus, the arguments states that women contribute with something that has been missing in a profession, in a sector etc. On the other hand what has been missing is rarely explained. Gender equality is a normal (usual) political issue on a governmental level but it is much harder to get acceptance on local levels. The resistance is stronger. Limited budgets on a municipality level seem also to have intervened in the gender equality work. The question is: Do we only have means for gender equality in times of growth and prosperity? Other outcomes presented were how gender equality is a prioritized policy area; that the numbers of actors involved in gender equality policies is high; the National Centre for Values Education has been established; in higher education offered courses in gender research increases; the gender equality policies are under evaluation.

**Christina Mörtberg**, docent/reader, Luleå University of Technology/University of Oslo, presented the main findings of the comparative analysis. The following countries were involved in the comparison: Belgium, France, Greece, Ireland, Lithuania, Spain and Sweden, and UK. Efforts to implement gender mainstreaming in the countries involved in the research are highly fragmented. It was only three of the countries that had implemented or had started the process to implement gender mainstreaming. The fragmentation is obvious by the variety of models, they are called: integration, transversal, EU driven and the generic equality model.

Sweden is the only country in the study that has implemented gender mainstreaming as a strategy. This can be explained by a coherent and overarching gender equality policy together with a consensus – the changes are limited even if the government is changed. Belgium, France and Spain (some regions) has introduced the model as Clavero et al call the transversal, that is, different governmental departments or ministers are involved in the implementation of a gender equality program. The EU driven model characterises how gender mainstreaming has been introduced in Greece, Spain and Lithuania; a consequence of EU policies.

The last model, the generic equality, has more a focus on equality generally not only gender equality. This model is use in Ireland and UK. Finally, the results of the comparative study were disheartening since the comparison shows that gender mainstreaming is more or less a bureaucratic technique than a strategy for the improvement of gender equality. She emphasised this by a quotation from the report "[Essentially,] to paraphrase Walby (2004), what is at issue is the relationship between gender mainstreaming and the mainstream. Under current arrangements the mainstream remains more or less as it was.

### 5.3 Discussions

Many of the policy makers pointed out the lack of knowledge as an explanation of the gap between the formal and the actual gender equality. This was discussed but the participants seem not to share the researchers questioning of the argument. Another question that was discussed was the numerous projects that are conducted but they are not followed up to a similar extent. The lesson learned is that the projects are not transferred to other contexts and settings – the risks are that the wheel is invented again and again without sustainable changes.

The questions that were discussed were how gender mainstreaming can be interpreted in a variety of ways. One participant pointed out that it is a strategy for integration of gender equality everywhere. Consequently, the responsibility is also transferred to every level in organisations and societies. The question “what does EU and the involved countries want with gender equality and gender mainstreaming?” was also addressed. Some of the participants also pointed out that gender mainstreaming is an unknown concept also for them despite it is implemented as a strategy for gender equality. Sweden seems to be the country that has implemented gender mainstreaming as a strategy and have made progress compared to other European countries despite of the progress the participants pointed out gender equality work as a continuous process.

**Kristina Östberg**, a consultant, presented the book of Gerda Nilsson. Nilsson was the first married woman in Sweden who graduated with a PhD. She defended her thesis at the University of Uppsala in 1903. One of the case studies were conducted in the education sector the aim was therefore also to show how the conditions have changed since the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Östberg presented a biography of Gerda Nilsson's life and how she had been supported by her parents but also her husband. Nilsson had a network of female students among them the librarian Valfrid Palmgren who was one of the leading persons in the development of the public library system in Sweden. (Palmgren defended her licentiate thesis in 1903 and PhD in 1905). Östberg also showed in her presentation the conditions students had in the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

### 5.4 The future workshop and examples of practices

#### 5.4.1 Future workshop

The second part of the seminar was organized as a workshop. The intention was to hold a future workshop but since the participants were lesser than what we expected we held a mix between a future workshop and a general workshop. (The evaluators of the Swedish gender equality polices did not participate in the workshop).

One of the findings in the national research was lack of knowledge which was questioned by the researchers. In the introduction of the workshop we raised the issue if gender equality is a question of equal representations (60-40), access to education and professions or does gender equality have other goals or visions. In the beginning of the workshop the participants were asked to write down some key words in the relation to the following questions:

- What are, or should be, the objectives for gender equality?

- What kind of society do we want to achieve? How to integrate gender equality aspects in the design of the future society?
- What is needed in order to make progress for gender equality? What should be in focus?

The discussion was based on the participant's notes (key words). The first and the second question were very much related to issues of democracy and humans equal rights. The participants had difficulties to come with more explicit or concrete suggestions. To highlight the gender and power structure and how it limits persons, women's or men's, possibilities to have equal access to the resources in society is a goal that was suggested.

The third question was the one that most of the participants contributed to. The person who worked as a gender administrator official at a university pointed out the need of facts and statistics – one has to show the current situation, then suggest changes, then evaluate. The facts can be used in order to show if the measures have resulted in progress of gender equality. He referred to a mapping conducted at University of Umeå where they investigate how many women and men that had been involved in examination committees of doctoral defend. This showed how it is a limited group, mostly men, who are doing this kind of activities, activities that one is supposed to do as an academic. The representatives from the pre-school emphasised that gender issues have been integrated in their pedagogue as well as day to day activities. Even if they do not use the concept this is an example of gender mainstreaming. The participants from the upper secondary school stressed that if one has been involved in a gender equality project one brings this way of thinking also to mainstream practices. All these examples were taken from local level. The discussions showed that on a national level the policies are very well carried out whilst it is more difficult to introduce and implement them on a local level.

#### 5.4.2 Examples from projects and practices

At the end of the workshop the participants were asked to present an example from their own experiences with gender equality work or gender mainstreaming. The following example is taken from a gender equality project in a hospital in the Public Health sector. The example is an illustration of how gender mainstreaming as a strategy can be integrated in everyday practices. At a surgery in a hospital the persons who were involved in the project were asked to think of situations in their day to day work. Firstly they could not find any examples of inequalities. But after some time the nurses started to reflect upon why the bags in dressing (changing) room filled with dirty clothing were much heavier in the men's changing room than in the women's. When they checked the bags, the "mens" bags were filled with towels. Consequently, they checked the instructions that were given to the patients. They realised that there existed difference in the instructions for women and those to men. Women were asked to shower before the consultation but the men were asked to shower in the changing room before the consultation. This example shows that small things that may appear to be trivial in the everyday practice can be important to highlight.

## 5.6 Summary of the outcomes of the seminar

The results of the seminar showed the importance of a clearly defined gender equality policy on a general level. Despite an overarching policy the workshop also showed the necessity to take the starting point in situated definitions and local agency. Hence, what kind of concepts one use (for example gender mainstreaming) is not the most important thing on local levels since it is more important to integrate gender equality in the practices and not to make gender equality to an additional issue.

Gender equality project, campaigns and measures are important, however, to obtain sustainable changes or long termed effects the measures have to be combined with an aim to integrate them in the day-to-day work. The relation between gender mainstreaming and the mainstream could only be challenged in everyday activities; in the doing and the being.

## 5.7 List of participants

<i>Name</i>	<i>Organisation</i>
Mari Anzen	SLL (The Public Health in the Stockholm county)
Birgitta Evengård	SLL
Johanna Diehl	SACO (The Swedish Confederation of Professional Associations, trade union)
AnnaMaria Grelsson	Gävle (Pre-school)
Birgitta Hällegård	SKTF/LF (Trade union at a municipality level)
Stefan Larsson	University of Umeå, gender equality administrative official
Helén Lundkvist	Jämst.enh (Division of Gender Equality (governmental) and secretary in the governmental committee of gender equality)
Anna Mannikoff	<u>1.</u> Myndigh. för skolutveckling (The Swedish National Agency for School Improvement)
Eva Sundqvist	Gävle (Pre-school)
Karin Sjöholm	Spyken (Upper secondary school)
Ingegård Rösler-Rosenberg	Spyken (Upper secondary school)
Irma Irlinger	Jämo (the Equal Opportunities Ombudsman), Stockholm
Gertrud Åström	<u>2.</u> Gender Equality Expert and the chairperson of the governmental committee of gender equality policy

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

## Chapter 6

### Seminar in Lithuania

#### 6.1 Aims of the seminar

The Lithuanian national seminar was held on Friday 3<sup>rd</sup> December, 2004, at Mykolas Romeris University, Vilnius. The programme of the seminar is presented in section 6.5.

The principal aim of the seminar was to disseminate the findings of the EQUAPOL research and to obtain feedback from policymakers and other key stakeholders. The focus was on future scenarios, with *Deliverable 4, National Report* as the starting point. A related aim was to further knowledge in the field of gender equality policy in Lithuania and to try and advance this field of policy by making the findings of the research available.

Ideas and suggestions provided by the discussion on future scenarios will be further disseminated, in particular through publishing the proceedings of the Seminar in the Lithuanian language.

The seminar gave rise to the publication of several articles in Lithuanian newspapers about this national seminar:

- “Moterys dirba moterims” / Respublika, 2004-12-16.
- “Pasaulis moteriškėja. Ar moterys gyvena geriau?” / Lietuvos Aidas, 2005-01-11, Nr.8 ir Nr.9.
- “Viešoji politika lyčių lygybės aspektu” / Mykolo Romerio universiteto mėnraštis, 2004. gruodis, Nr.9(77)
- “Pasaulis moteriškėja. Ar moterys gyvena geriau?” / Mokslo Lietuva, 2004-12-23, Nr.22(312) and 2005-01-06, Nr.1(313).

#### 6.2 Seminar participants

Personal invitations were sent to all informants interviewed during the EQUAPOL project, including officials from the Ministry for Education, the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs, the Division for gender equality, the Parliament members and the Lithuanian government and the interviewed researchers, NGO’s representatives, Lithuanian Women’s Lobby, and Women Information Centre. Other key actors and academics were also invited, not only from Vilnius but also from Kaunas and Siauliai.

In total 29 participants attended the seminar (see 6.6 for the list of participants). This was a lower number than initially planned, due to a poor response from officials representing Lithuanian institutions, because it was the period of the formation of the new government (after the Parliament elections in the Autumn).

### 6.3 Themes of the Presentations and Issues Discussed

The presentations by the keynote speakers covered four themes: policy context, current trends, expectations and concerns and barriers, facilitators and future policy directions.

#### *'Transversalism' of gender policy*

The trend to spread responsibility for gender across units or departments is rather obvious. In Lithuania this could be read as a move away from the centralisation of responsibility for gender. It is being achieved through the design of 'transversal' action plans on gender equality: action plans assign responsibility to different units for the delivery of different objectives. This 'transversalism' involves no necessary change in policy-making structures or practices and, secondly, gender equality continues to be designated as a distinct or separate policy space. Lack stability in the commitment to gender equality and country's policy culture is not sympathetic to activities such as evaluation and impact assessment.

#### *Equal treatment legislation has undergone important development, but not enough*

Actors in gender equality policy in Lithuania acknowledge the positive effect of accession negotiations, but they also note that it arrived late on the agenda and that greater priority was placed on social and economic reforms. Such legislation has been reformed to broaden both the concept of discrimination to include indirect discrimination and the sphere of application. In all recent governmental documents explicitly refer to gender mainstreaming either as an objective or as a principle governing gender equality policy. Law on Equal Opportunities for Women and Men (1998) renamed as Law on Equal Opportunities (accepted on 2004, has been enforced on 1 January 2005). The term of the National Programme on Equal Opportunities for Women and Men 2003-2004 adopted by the Government in 2003 is not prolonged yet. The list of spheres, included in this Law might be developed (and spread), for instance, include the equal development of carries for women and men.

#### *Changes in Gender Equality Machinery give insufficient political status to the issue*

In 2001 the Minister of Social Security and Labour was entrusted with the co-ordination of gender equality issues in all spheres. Currently, the Labour Market & Equal Opportunities Division in the Ministry of Social Affairs and Labour is responsible for gender equality policy. From 1995 to 2004 there was also an Advisor to the Prime Minister on Family, Children, Youth, Gender Equality Issues and Relevant NGOs. In October 2004, the Advisor's position was discontinued, following the Parliamentary elections and the formation of the new Government. These changes indicate a lessening in political support for gender equality, and a lower status given to addressing gender equality policy within the government administration.

The Inter-Ministerial Commission of Equal Opportunities (13 Ministries represented) and the Department of Statistics are among the other important gender equality institutions. The latest statistical data are presented in section 6.7.

#### *Gender in economic policy*

G. Rakauskiene provided participants with a comprehensive understanding of gender responsive economic initiatives. She provided a conceptual and theoretical framework, traced the evolution of work in this area, and showed how gender

economics and gender analysis have been used as a tool of a more efficient allocation of economic resources. She discussed the main gender problems and their impact on government economic policy not only on the micro – but at the macro level too. She also covered issues of gender responsive budgets, gender impact on trade, and gender responsive financial policy. The author concluded by noting that the integration and implementation of gender analysis in Lithuanian economic policy could accelerate sustainable economic growth and soften the consequences of the globalisation process.

#### *Women's participation in decision-making and women's influence on equality policy*

Lithuania deserves attention as a country where the EU influence on gender equality policy is being brought to bear mainly by women's groups which, as the key actors of gender equality in the country, have played an important role in lobbying an unsympathetic government to make progress towards the implementation of EU requirements in relation to gender, including gender mainstreaming.

One of the ways of increasing the participation of women in decision-making is the quota system. However, there is very strong resistance towards this system. One of the arguments of the critics is that we had this system in the Soviet times, and it neither worked nor changed the status of women. Quotas like temporal measure might be under the broad discussion. They give voters a chance to vote for women and men. The principle of equal representation or gender balance can replace the unattractive concept of quotas.

In spite of being numerically in a minority, women who have been first in some positions and have historically played rather unique and remarkable role. Gender mainstreaming initiatives may be the result of a great deal of effort and perseverance from individual women in key positions of power, rather than a decision, at high governmental level, to pursue gender equality policy.

#### *Equal opportunities in science and education*

The presentation of the keynote speaker from the Ministry of Education and Science Mrs. Egidija Kasperuniene on "Gender equality policy, Lithuania's education and science laws and EU Structural Funds programme" provided a brief analysis of gender policy and equal opportunities policy in Lithuania. It covered the various legal acts, such as the Law on Education of the Republic of Lithuania, Law on Research and Higher Education, Law on Higher Education, 2001-2004 and 2004-2008 Lithuania's Government Programmes, Vocational Education Strategy, Life long learning Strategy and etc. as well as a Single Programming Document for the assimilation of the EU Structural Funds support. The education and science system shall be socially fair and guarantee equal opportunities for all individuals regardless of their gender, race, nationality, language, background, social status, faith, beliefs or attitudes.

#### *Empowerment of women and men for learning: motives and barriers*

The aim of the presentation by A. Urbonienė was to identify similarities and differences in factors that empower men and women for learning, through an analysis of the scientific literature and statistical analysis undertaken in 2003.

Empowerment for the life's career became an important factor in the contemporary society that is influenced by globalisation and integration processes. Education is widely considered to be the main source of empowerment; especially its role is essential in the case of social exclusion. The tasks that are legitimated to adult education are connected with changes in societal attitudes like processes of gender mainstreaming, striving for equality etc. While creating learning environments that are gender friendly, it is important to explore whether motives and barriers for learning are determined by gender.

In the theoretical part the tendencies between genders in learning motivation were presented. Motivation for action as well as learning consists of three dimensions: internal task stimulus, social interactive stimulus and external material stimulus. The differences on learning patterns for men and women as a result of traditional practices were stressed.

To generalize, the conclusions were that women and men have the same internal and external motives for learning, however only women express them more strongly. Men are more career-oriented while women stress more on the interaction stimulus for their learning motivation. Analysing the obstacles for learning it can be stated that the main barriers for learning are the same both for men and women, namely the limited resources. Women are confronted with bigger difficulties compared with men such as traditional gender roles and a low self-esteem.

#### *Socio-cultural factors and gender stereotypes*

The aim of the presentations by S.Karavajeva and R.Bandzeviciene was to focus on gender stereotypes from the viewpoint of ethno linguistics. The material under analysis has been collected from the Lithuanian and Russian phrase logical dictionaries.

Ethno linguistics is defined as a field of linguistics, which studies links between a language and culture, a language and a nation. Ethno linguistics makes an attempt to answer the question how a nation is reflected in a language – its attitude towards, perception, construction and interpretation of the world.

As speech behaviour of men and women is constructed on the basis of certain stereotypes fixed in a language, it may be assumed that gender stereotypes are a system of perceptions about masculine and feminine behaviour models. Traditionally declared respect for a man as a breadwinner is reflected in folklore. A man is supposed to be the head of the family and builder of the family material wealth. A husband and a mother-in-law are the main figures in a traditional family.

The image of a traditionally ideal woman is the following: a devoted, kind and loving mother, socially passive and always ready to follow her husband, recognising his superiority in every situation and even tolerating violence against her. Though during the last decades the relationship between a man and a woman has changed the remnants of a patriarchal stereotype still exist.

Earlier a woman's role in the family was limited to that of a housewife's and a mother's; recently she has started demonstrating an ability to combine of her role within and outside the family, seeking for a career; however, she is still entirely

excluded from the decision making processes. Men accept women as assisting, helping them.

#### 6.4 Policy lessons

Gender mainstreaming is still quite a new issue within Lithuanian society as well as amongst decision-makers, and this has to be tackled head on by the responsible institutions.

Equal treatment legislation has undergone important development, but not enough. The list of spheres, included in the Law on Equal Opportunities for Women and Men (1998) renamed as Law on Equal Opportunities (accepted on 2004, has been enforced on 1 January 2005) might be developed (and spread), for instance, include the equal development of careers for women and men.

Institutions working in the field of gender equality implement some mutual policies and projects. They are also answerable for separate segments of the equal opportunities policy; therefore there is an objective need for them to cooperate.

Changes in Gender Equality Machinery might not provide sufficient 'political weight'. The position of the Advisor to Prime Minister on Gender Equality Issues and Relevant NGOs should be replaced.

Local level initiatives mainly come from NGOs, but not from local municipalities themselves. There are no structural units responsible for the implementation of the gender equality principal at local level (apart from within the Vilnius municipality).

#### 6.5 Seminar programme

The one-day seminar was held on Friday 3<sup>rd</sup> December, 2004, at Mykolas Romeris University, Vilnius. The programme is as follows:

9:00 - 9:30	Registration and Coffee
9:30 - 10:00	<b>Welcome Addresses</b> by <i>Prof. V.Kurapka, Vice-Rector of the MRU</i>
10:00 - 10:30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Gender policy in Lithuania today</b> by <i>Giedrė Purvaneckienė</i>, Former first adviser at the government, President of Women's National Forum</li> <li>• <b>Gender policy: role of the government</b> by <i>Virginija Šidlauskienė</i>, government adviser</li> <li>• <b>Development of state gender machinery in Lithuania</b> by <i>Ramunė Trakymienė</i>, Former government second adviser</li> </ul>
10:30 - 11:00	Coffee break
11:00 - 12:30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>EQUAPOL project presentation: Gender sensitive and women friendly policy</b> by <i>Meilutė Taljūnaitė</i>, MRU</li> <li>• <b>Gender dimension in Education</b> by <i>E.Kasperuniene</i>, Ministry of Education and Science</li> <li>• <b>Gender statistics as the tool of gender policy</b> by <i>S.Litvinaviciene</i>, Lithuanian Department of Statistics</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Gender responsive macroeconomic initiatives</b> by <i>Ona Gražina Rakauskienė</i>, MRU</li> </ul>
12:00 – 12:30	<b>Panel Discussion</b>
12:30 - 14:00	Lunch
14:00 - 16:15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Gender policy: role of the Ombudsmen</b> by <i>Aušrinė Burneikienė</i>, Ombudsperson</li> <li>• <b>Gender stereotypes on the basis of an associative experiment</b> by <i>S.Karavajeva</i>, Director of Women's Center at Siauliai University</li> <li>• <b>Barriers to women's learning</b> by <i>A.Urboniene</i>, Director of Women's Center at Kaunas University of Technology</li> <li>• <b>Challenges to women's physicians' involvement into the science</b> by <i>Dalia Šatkovskienė</i>, Vilnius University</li> <li>• <b>Women friendly policy: psychological aspect</b> by <i>R.Bandzeviciene</i>, MRU</li> </ul>
16:15-16:30	<b>Overview of the Day</b>

## 6.6 List of participants

<i>Name</i>	<i>Organisation</i>	<i>e-mail</i>
1. Egidijus Kurapka	Mykolo Romerio Universiteto prorektorius MRU Vice-rector	<a href="mailto:Ekurapka@ltu.lt">Ekurapka@ltu.lt</a>
2. Aušra Grybauskienė	Lietuvos Švietimo ministerijos Mokslo ir studijų departamentas Ministry of Education and science	<a href="mailto:ausra@mokslas.lt">ausra@mokslas.lt</a>
3. Egidija Kasperiušienė	Lietuvos Švietimo ministerija Ministry of Education and science	<a href="mailto:Egidija.Kasperiušiene@smm.lt">Egidija.Kasperiušiene@smm.lt</a>
4. Dalia Šatkovskienė	Vilniaus Universitetas Prof. Vilnius University	<a href="mailto:Dalia.satkovskiene@ff.vu.lt">Dalia.satkovskiene@ff.vu.lt</a>
5. Sigutė Litvinavičienė	Lietuvos Statistikos Departamentas Statistical department	<a href="mailto:sigutel@mail.std.lt">sigutel@mail.std.lt</a>
6. Danguole Areškienė	Lietuvos Statistikos Departamentas Statistical department	<a href="mailto:danguolea@mail.std.lt">danguolea@mail.std.lt</a>
7. Aistė Urbonienė	Lyčių studijų centras, Edukologijos institutas, KTU Kaunas Technology University	<a href="mailto:Aiste.urboniene@smf.ktu.lt">Aiste.urboniene@smf.ktu.lt</a>
8. Svetlana Karavajeva	Šiaulių Universiteto Moterų centras Siauliai University	<a href="mailto:msc@cr.su.lt">msc@cr.su.lt</a>
9. Daina Eitutytė	Šiaulių Universiteto Moterų centras Siauliai University	<a href="mailto:msc@cr.su.lt">msc@cr.su.lt</a>
10. Rita Bandzevičienė	Mykolo Romerio Universitetas	<a href="mailto:rbandze@ltu.lt">rbandze@ltu.lt</a>
11. Meilutė Taljūnaitė	Mykolo Romerio Universitetas	<a href="mailto:meilet@ltu.lt">meilet@ltu.lt</a>
12. Virginija Šidlauskienė	LR Vyriausybė Lithuanian government' advisor	<a href="mailto:v.sidlauskiene@lrnk.lt">v.sidlauskiene@lrnk.lt</a>
13. Giedrė Purvaneckienė	Vilniaus Universitetas Lithuanian government' former advisor	<a href="mailto:gipurv@lrs.lt">gipurv@lrs.lt</a>
14. Ramunė Trakymienė	ZONTA Int Lithuanian government' former advisor	<a href="mailto:Ratr23@hotmail.com">Ratr23@hotmail.com</a>
15. Aušra Burneikienė	MVLG kontrolierė Ombudsman	<a href="mailto:mvlg@lrs.lt">mvlg@lrs.lt</a>
16. Ieva Mickuvienė	Nacionalinio ombudsmeno institucija	<a href="mailto:Iemick@lrs.lt">Iemick@lrs.lt</a>

---

17. Indrė Mackevičiūtė	Ombudsman officer Nacionalinio ombudsmeno institucija	<a href="mailto:inmack@lrs.lt">inmack@lrs.lt</a>
18. Valentina Jakimavičienė	Ombudsman officer Žurnalistė	<a href="mailto:Rvisuom@ltu.lt">Rvisuom@ltu.lt</a>
19. Dovilė Rūkaitė	Moterų informacinis centras Women's Information Centre	<a href="mailto:dovile@lygus.lt">dovile@lygus.lt</a>
20. Juratė Šeduikienė	Moterų informacinis centras Women's Information Centre	<a href="mailto:Jurate@lygus.lt">Jurate@lygus.lt</a>
21. Janina Balsienė	Mykolo Romerio Universitetas	<a href="mailto:vremisc@ltu.lt">vremisc@ltu.lt</a>
22. Asta Visockaitė	Mykolo Romerio Universitetas	<a href="mailto:astaviso@ltu.lt">astaviso@ltu.lt</a>
23. Indrė Jakimavičiūtė	Mykolo Romerio Universitetas	<a href="mailto:pmk@ltu.lt">pmk@ltu.lt</a>
24. Gražina Rakauskienė	Mykolo Romerio Universitetas, Lietuvos Respublikos Seimo Ekonomikos komiteto patarėja Parliament adviser	<a href="mailto:Ona.rakausk@ltu.lt">Ona.rakausk@ltu.lt</a>
25. Živilė Verbylaitė	Vyriausioji rinkimų komisija Central Electoral Committee	<a href="mailto:zivile@ltu.lt">zivile@ltu.lt</a>
26. Vanda Juršėnienė	Socialinės apsaugos ir darbo ministerija, Darbo rinkos ir lygių galimybių skyrius Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs	<a href="mailto:V.Jurseniene@socmin.lt">V.Jurseniene@socmin.lt</a>
27. Rima Vaitkienė	Lietuvos Respublikos Seimas Nacionalinė sveikatos taryba Parliament' Board for Health	<a href="mailto:rivait@lrs.lt">rivait@lrs.lt</a>
28. Liuda Villis	Vilniaus universitetas Vilnius University	<a href="mailto:Liuda27@post.omnitel.net">Liuda27@post.omnitel.net</a>
29. Vaida Lisauskaitė	Mykolo Romerio universitetas	<a href="mailto:lvaida@centras.lt">lvaida@centras.lt</a>

---

## 6.7 Statistics on women and men in Lithuania

### Population and families

- The number of women in Lithuania exceeds the number of men, i.e. there are 1142 women per 1000 men.
- Men aged 60 and older amount to 16 per cent, where as women aged 60 and older make up 24 per cent.
- The average life expectancy of women about 12 years becomes longer. At the meantime it makes 78 years for women and 66 years for men.
- Divorced, widowed and single women make up 48 per cent of all women, men – 39 per cent. The proportion of women without spouse is not diminishing.
- After divorces about 10 thousand children remained without one of the parents. (mostly with mother).

### Health

- For men external causes of death are more often than for women; particularly frequent are suicides. In 2003 women mortality as the result of external causes of death was 63, while that of men – 253, of which suicides made up 14 and 74, respectively (rate per 100000 population).
- Abuse of alcohol is more popular among men than among women: in 2003 the records of the register included 7.3 thousand of women and 54.6 thousand of men suffering from the chronic alcoholism disease.
- Accidental intoxication was lethal to 343 men and 93 were women.

- Everyday smokers among women constitute 13 per cent and those among men – 44 per cent.
- AIDS is more often among men than among women: at the end of 2003 the number of women infected with AIDS was 16, while the number of men – 94.

#### Education

- The number of women students in higher schools exceeds that of men students. There are 60 per cent of women students and 40 per cent of men students in higher schools.
- Distribution of students by gender is very diverse in different modules of education. Women students make up 78 per cent of those studying social services and services for individual persons, 73 per cent of those studying pedagogics and 81 per cent – health care. In transport and security services, though, men students make up 88 per cent, engineering – 82 per cent, computing – 79 per cent.
- The majority (87 per cent) of pedagogues of general schools are women.
- Among scientists 38 per cent are women and among doctors habillitis just – 14 per cent.

#### Employment and Labour Market

- Economic activity of women is lower than that of men. Activity indicator of men is 73 per cent, while that of women – 67 per cent.
- Unemployment rate of men (13 per cent) is higher than that of women (12 per cent). Women have limited possibilities to combine family life with participation in economic activity. 84 thousand women or 12 per cent of all working women have part-time work (7 per cent of men).

#### Violence and crime

- Crime indicators among men are higher than among women. Among those accused as ones having committed a crime women make up 10 per cent, among imprisoned convicts – 3 per cent.

#### Participation in administration and decision-making

- The number of women in the Seimas (11 per cent) is markedly lower than that of men, in the Government (ministers vice-ministers and minister's advisers) – 28 per cent, in Municipality Councils – 21 per cent.
- More men than women have their own business. About 40 per cent of women have their own small and medium size enterprises.

#### Time use in a day

- Working women devoted less time for paid work than men, on the other hand, they devoted by 1 hour 45 minutes more for household and family care. Thus, working women both for paid and unpaid work devoted on the average by 1 hour and 10 minutes more than men. Therewith, women had less free time than men by 1 hour.
- Regarding time use by women and men pensioners, it different drastically enough.
- For household and family care women pensioners devoted on the average 5 hours and 40 minutes