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Hanna Pitkin: Types of Representation

1. Descriptive representation (social resemblance, to mirror the population)

2. Substantive representation (acting for, in the interest of)

3. Symbolic representation (the meaning that a representative has for those being represented)

4. (formalistic representation – formal)

• *Hanna Pitkin: The Concept of Representation, 1967*
Different arguments for increasing women’s political representation

• 1. The justice argument
  • *Women’s right to equal representation*

• 2. The experience argument
  • *Women’s experiences should also be represented*

• 3. The conflict of interests argument
  • *On some or many political issues women’s and men’s interests are not identical*

• This were the main arguments during the suffrage campaign, and they are still used today.
Arguments, cont.

• 4. The democracy argument
  - A political system which excludes women – or other under-represented groups – can not be considered legitimate.

• The Beijing Platform for Action, 1995, introduces the democracy argument

• 5. The utility argument
  - It is inefficient for society not to use women’s talents

• 6. Individual career opportunities for women
UN ‘Platform for Action’, Beijing 1995:

• “Achieving the goal of equal participation of women and men in decision-making will provide a balance that more accurately reflects the composition of society and is needed in order to strengthen democracy and promote its proper functioning” (Art. 183).
A new discourse by contemporary women’s movements

- European Women’s Lobby under the slogan ‘No Modern European Democracy without Gender Equality’. 2008 campaign

- “The current under-representation of women in most elected assemblies in Europe, including in the European Parliament, is a serious democratic deficit threatening the legitimacy of European institutions and political parties”. (www.womenslobby.org).
Two macro-theories

1. The time-lag theory
   - *Gender equality will come with development*

2. The theory of - constant reproduction of - patriarchy/male dominance
   - With sub-theories:
     - *Theory of shrinking institutions*
     - *Glass ceiling metaphor*
World competition

• For a very long time the Nordic countries and the Netherlands were alone at the top of the world rank order on women’s representation

• *That is no longer the case*
Why Scandinavia is no longer the only model?

• Through the Scandinavian *incremental track* it took 100 years to reach 40-47 % women in parliament. Even in Scandinavia fast track policies are now being adopted in some areas.

• Many countries around the world, especially post-conflict are using electoral gender quotas in order to include women in political decision-making using the *fast track*. 
• Our theories of the connection between socio-economic development and women’s political representation are challenged by actual developments, especially by the use of quotas.

• The richer a country, the higher representation of women? No.
World Average 2013
(single or lower Houses of Parliament)

World Average: 21.2% women

Nordic countries  42.0 %
• Americas  24.8 %
• All Europe (OSCE)  24.3 %
• Sub-Saharan Africa  21.9 %
• Asia  19.1 %
• Arab countries  17.8 %
• Pacific  12.8 %

• WWW.IPU.ORG
## Women in parliament.
### Top ranking countries 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Women in parliament, percentage (election year)</th>
<th>Qoutes</th>
<th>Election system</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Rwanda</td>
<td>64,0 (2013)</td>
<td>Legal Quotas</td>
<td>PR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Cuba</td>
<td>45,2 (2008)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Plurality/Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Finland</td>
<td>42,5 (2011)</td>
<td>No Quotas</td>
<td>PR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Iceland</td>
<td>39.7 (2013)</td>
<td>Party Quotas</td>
<td>PR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Denmark</td>
<td>39,0 (2011)</td>
<td>No Quotas</td>
<td>PR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Belgium</td>
<td>38,3 (2010)</td>
<td>Legal Quotas</td>
<td>PR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Austria</td>
<td>? (2013)</td>
<td>Party Quotas</td>
<td>PR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Election day figures
36 countries over 30 % women in their parliament (lower or single house)
The diagnosis

- Why are women under-represented?
- Why are men over-represented?

- The diagnosis is important for the strategy

- From a focus on women’s (lack of) qualifications to a focus on the (lack of) capacity of parties, organizations and academia to include
Sweden 2013

% of women in different arenas

- Parliament: 45 %
- Government: 54 %
- University professors: 24 %
- Boards of biggest companies: 22 %

- Why do we except women’s share to be identical?
Electoral Gender Quotas

• 68 countries have introduced electoral gender quotas in their constitution or electoral law.

• In around 50 other countries some political parties make use of voluntary party quotas for their electoral list.

• A global overview:

• The global web site: www.quotaproject.org
Atittude towards gender quotas among Left, Centre and Right Parties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quotas are a fair method:</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quotas are a ’necessary evil’:</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quotas are unaccaptable:</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100% 100% 100%

Source: Survey among EU/EEA countries: PARQUOTA 2008. Dahlerup & Freidenvall
‘Breaking Male Dominance in Old Democracies’ – the book project

- *In-depth, longitudinal studies of eight old democracies*
- New Jersey, US: Susan Carroll and Kelly Dittmar
- New South Wales: Austral. Marian Sawer
- United Kingdom: Joni Lovenduski
- Sweden: Lenita Freidenvall
- Iceland: Audur Styrkársdóttir
- Denmark: Drude Dahlerup
- Netherlands: Monique Leyenaar
- Germany: Brigitte Geissel
- *Four cross-national analyses*
- (forthcoming Oxford University Press)
Definition av ’dominans’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Percentage of women/men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dominance/Monopoly</td>
<td>&lt; 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small minority</td>
<td>10-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large minority</td>
<td>25-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender balance 40-60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* In statistical terms, the four degrees are defined as: < 10%, 10-24.99 % women, 25-39.99 % women, and 40-60 % women and men.
Dimensions of male dominance in politics

1. **Representation:** Women’s numerical under-representation in elected assemblies

2. **Politics as a workplace:** Male-coded norms and practices in elected assemblies

3. **Vertical sex segregation:** Unequal gender distribution of positions in political hierarchies

4. **Horizontal sex segregation:** Limited access of women to a range of portfolios and committees

5. **Discourses and framing:** Gendered perceptions of politicians

6. **Public policy:** Policies biased in favour of men. No concern for gender equality.
Vertical sex segregation

- ‘It went without saying that it was the male MPs who occupied the highest positions, and that the women MPs did not have leadership ambitions’,

- Recollection of Grethe Phillip, about the time of her entrance to the Danish parliament as an MP in 1960 (Refsgaard, 123 in Dahlerup & Hvidt 1990).
The first woman minister in the eight countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party and Portfolio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Nina Bang</td>
<td>Social Democrat: Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Margaret Bondfield</td>
<td>Labour: Labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>US, federal</td>
<td>Frances Perkins</td>
<td>Democrat: Labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Karin Kock</td>
<td>Social Democrat: Public home economics a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>Australia federal</td>
<td>Dame Enid Lyons</td>
<td>Liberal: Without portfolio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>Marga Klompe</td>
<td>Catholic Party: Social/culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>W-Germany</td>
<td>Elisabeth Schwarzhaupt</td>
<td>CDU: Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>E-Germany</td>
<td>Margot Honnecker</td>
<td>SED: Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>Audur Auduns</td>
<td>Conservative: Justice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Breaking Male Dominance in Old Democracies – a 4-stage model

- Male monopoly < 10%
- Small minority 10-25%
- Take-off stage: 25-40%
- 40-60% Close to gender balance
- The obligatory women
- Women accepted in social policy niche
- Active measures to recruit women
- Institutionalized parity or gender neutrality
How to interpret the following picture?

• The first Social Democratic government in Denmark (1924-26) with the country’s first woman minister, minister of education Nina Bang.
Arbejdermuseet & ABA
Irreversibility?

- Historical changes in the ‘acceptable minimum’ of women
- Irreversibility?
- Conditional irreversibility
Defining quotas

• Gender quotas are an equality policy measure (affirmative action).

• Quotas imply setting a fixed goal for the recruitment of women or other under-represented groups in order to rapidly change an unwanted inequality.

• Quotas may be gender neutral or for women.
Many types of quotas

A. Legislated or voluntary party quotas?

B. At what level in the electoral process?
   B.1 Aspirant quotas - the pool of candidates
   B.2 Candidate quotas – candidate lists
   B.3 Reserved seats – the elected (with or without election)
## Gender Quotas: regional preferences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Aspirants</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Reserved seats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>Primaries (Panama)</td>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>Arab world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Balkans</td>
<td>Asia, Africa (sub-sah)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary</td>
<td>UK (short lists)</td>
<td>Nordic countries</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Western Europe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rank-order rules

- **Candidate quotas:**
  1. Zipper system – alternation throughout the list (Most Green parties, most parties in Sweden, Costa Rica from next election)
  2. The top two cannot be of the same sex (Belgium´+ 50% for whole list)
  3. 40:60 for every 5 posts on the list. If less than 5 ‘eligible’ posts, as close to 40:60 as possible (Spain).
  4. One out of every group of 4 candidates must be a woman (East Timor)
Sanctions for non-compliance:

- *legal quota systems:*

- 1. Rejection of the list (Costa Rica, Spain, Slovenia, East Timor, France at the local level)

- 2. Financial penalty (France at the national level, Portugal)
Examples of leaps as result of quota adoption

• *Country level:*
  • Belgium  12 to 23 % (1994 quota law)
  • Costa Rica 19 to 34 %
  • Senegal  22 to 43 %

• *Party level:*
  • British Labour 14 – 24 %
  • SPD  16 - 27 %
  • PvdA, Neth.lan d 19 – 31%
  • Greens, new Icelandic Soc Dem. 50 % from start