When and Why do Governments Promote Sex Equality?
Violence Against Women, Reproductive Rights,
and Parental Leave in Cross-National Perspective

Mala Htun
New School for Social Research
htun@mindspring.com

and

S. Laurel Weldon
Purdue University
weldons@purdue.edu

Work in Progress
February 2010

ABSTRACT

This paper explores policies on violence against women, abortion, and parental leave across 71 countries. Based on a concept of gender as an institution, we argue that these policies promoting gender equality challenge historical patterns of state-society interaction concerning the organization of the economy, the respective roles of the state, religion, and cultural groups, and the regulation of the body. Different policies pose different challenges, however, for gender equality is not one issue but many. We present a theory of the institutional and political reasons for variation across issues. Our data analysis reveals that each policy type involves a distinct logic of change: models explaining variation on violence against women do not apply to variation on abortion or parental leave, for example. Factors such as women's movements, religion, degree of democracy, and fertility are differentially significant.

I. Introduction

What explains policy changes to promote gender equality? Does the modernization process—involving economic development, secularization, transformations in public attitudes, and democratization—lead to changes on gender issues? Or does policy follow from a process of political contestation that is shaped by political institutions and driven by political agents—such as women's movements, left parties, and churches? Do the same factors account for patterns of change across countries? Over time? Across issues?

Cross-national variation in gender equality policy is multidimensional: it differs across national contexts, over time, and across issues. Laws on women's rights have changed dramatically since the 1960s, mostly (but not always) to improve women's rights. Cross-national variation is also complex: countries may be leaders in some respects but lag their peer group in others. For example, the United States pioneered policies combating violence against women as well as liberal abortion laws but lags other advanced democracies by denying public funding for a range of policies including abortion, parental leave, and child care. Sweden innovated (following Norway) in the area of family leave but was slow to adopt policies on violence against women. Argentina and Brazil adopted progressive laws for gender quotas and against violence against women but failed to reform abortion or promote gender-neutral parental leave policies.

This puzzling variation across gender policy issues has just begun to be addressed in the scholarly literature (e.g. Gelb and Palley 1989; Casimiro et. al. 2009; Blofield and Haas 2005; Htun 2003; Weldon 2010). Most studies have focused on a single issue or set of issues, such as maternity or child care leave (Caul-Kittilson 2008; Gornick and Meyers 2009; Hendersen and White 2004); reproductive rights (Lovenduski and Outshoorn 1996; Feree et. al. 2002; Norgren 2001; Githens and McBride Stetson 1996; Stetson 2001); family law (Glendon 1989; Charrad 2001); violence against women (Weldon 2002; Heise 1994; Katzenstein 1989); child care (Morgan 2006); gender quotas (Krook 2009; Dahlerup 2006; Jones 2008); and so forth. Others presume that advances in equality policy form part of a general trend toward secularization and economic modernization (Inglehart and Norris 2003).

In general, however, analysts have moved away from identifying "women-friendly" states (Hernes 1987) and developing typologies of gender relations (Lewis 1993; Duncan 1996). Increasingly, scholars recognize the multidimensionality of gender. There is no single model of feminist policy that applies cross-nationally, even among the advanced industrial states (Sanbonmatsu 2002; Htun 2003; Mazur 2002; Htun and Weldon 2010; Weldon 2010)

In this paper, we explore differences among gender issues to explain this varied progress. We offer a theoretical framework to explain these differences and use it to develop a typology of equality-promoting policies. Next, we present hypotheses about the causes of change for each issue. Using principal components analysis and OLS regression, we test these against an original database of 71 countries we created between 2005 and

2009 thanks to funding from the National Science Foundation and the diligent work of our research team at the New School for Social Research and Purdue University.

Policies promoting sex equality seek fundamental social change. They challenge historical patterns of state-society interaction concerning the organization of the economy; the respective roles of the state, religion, and cultural groups; and the authority of the state to protect citizen rights. Contradictions in these patterns lead progressive actors--such as women's movements, leftist parties, and international organizations—to contest the status quo and demand reform. Their struggle for change is constrained and mediated by structural features of the national polity and the core imperatives of the state.

Different gender issues confront different traditions and institutionalized social relations, however. Some issues, such as abortion and family law, touch upon religious doctrine and codified cultural traditions and thereby ignite state-church or state-clan relations. Policies like publicly-funded parental leave and child care, by contrast, rely on the legitimacy of the state to rearrange class relations and are influenced by past decisions over state versus private provision of social goods. Still other issues concern women's efforts to contest their sexual subordination and earn recognition as people entitled to lives free from violence.

We develop a typology to classify gender equality policies along two dimensions: 1) whether the policy improves women's lives as a status group or whether it addresses class inequalities among women (status versus class policies) and 2) whether or not it challenges the doctrine of the dominant religion or the codified tradition of a major cultural group (doctrinal versus non-doctrinal policies). This scheme implies that actors like women's movements, religious organizations, and left parties will be differentially significant and that the role of contextual factors—such as degree of democracy, fertility, and policy style—will also vary.

The paper presents our preliminary analysis of four policy issues—abortion, violence against women (VAW), public funding for abortions, and parental leave—each of which represents a single quadrant of the typology. The results offer support for our theoretical claims about issue differences: religion is the principal determinant of variation in abortion policy, a gender status and doctrinal issue. Religion is irrelevant for VAW, however, a gender status but non-doctrinal issue. Women in parliament, women's groups, and degree of democracy are VAW's main influences. Our results for abortion funding and parental leave were less strong (for now), though they suggest the important role of religion in abortion funding and that demographic concerns drive improvements in parental leave.

II. Disaggregating Gender Equality

Scholars of public policy have long argued that distinguishing between issues offers insight into the policy process.[1] Gender and politics researchers have refined this

---

[1] For example, in his seminal 1964 work, Ted Lowi differentiated between distributive, redistributive and regulatory policies and showed that each involved different modes and locuses of decisionmaking (1964).

4

idea by introducing typologies that pertain to gender-related policies. For example, Gelb and Palley distinguished between "role equity" and "role change" policies in their study of feminist achievements in the United States during the 1970s (1989). They showed that "role equity" policies granting women equal access to privileges formerly held by men and minorities (such as fair credit laws and Title IX) were easier to accomplish than policies promoting change in the social meaning of women's roles (see also Skrentny 2002). Advocating these policies, which meant greater sexual freedom and independence, generated controversy and proved costly to politicians (Sanbonmatsu 2002).

Their typology is helpful because it focuses on the varying degrees to which policies challenge established patterns. Since they provoke more radical changes, "role change" policies are more controversial and provoke greater opposition than "role equity" policies. Yet policies that provoke opposition in some contexts encounter less in others. Maternity and parental leave was finally adopted in the U.S. in 1993 after two presidential vetoes and considerable controversy (Bernstein 2001). Yet the same policy had been available in Norway since the end of the 19th century and its expansion was hardly controversial. The difference owed not to the nature of the policy but to the varying contexts of class politics in the two countries (Weldon 2008; Mazur 2002; Stetson 1997). As this suggests, prevailing institutions, and not just the inherent features of a policy, determine the political dynamics at work.

In her study of family law and abortion in Latin America, Htun (2003) suggests a further way to disaggregate gender policy dynamics. Did policy change challenge the core tenets of the dominant religion (in this case, Roman Catholicism)? Or were the bishops agnostic about reform? Her analysis suggests that policy controversies derive from a clash of normative traditions—authoritative scripts furnishing standards of morality and the good life—and their implications for the respective roles of men, women, the state, and religion.

Building on these accounts, we focus on the degree to which gender equality policies challenge prevailing patterns of social organization. Gender policies question not only sexuality, work, and family life but also the authority of religious institutions and the reach of markets. Why? To understand these challenges, we must first explore what exactly gender is. This will illuminate the nature of those injustices gender equality policies are meant to combat.

What is Gender? What is Gender Equality?

Gender is a constellation of institutions. It is constituted by rules, norms, and practices that are shared and predictable. Gender is a feature of social structures and institutions more than human identity (Young 2002: 422). It positions men and women in unequal relations of power, often intersecting (or combining) with other institutions to

---

Peter Hall distinguished between policy changes affecting the instruments of policy, the settings on those instruments, and the underlying paradigm setting the parameters of policy (1993). Depending on the level of policy, different causal factor are at work.

uphold patterns of status hierarchy and economic inequality. As Young puts it, "What we call categories of gender, race, ethnicity, etc. are [less individual identities than] a set of structures that position persons…. in relations of labor and production, power and subordination, desire and sexuality, prestige and status" (2002: 417, 420). Social groups do not exist by virtue of a shared identity or attributes but because they are similarly positioned by institutions.

Gender is comprised of distinct institutions that Young calls the "basic axes of gender structures" (2002: 422). These are threefold: the status hierarchy, the sexual division of labor, and normative heterosexuality.[2] Equality requires modifying the ways that these axes constrain the rights and opportunities of human beings in asymmetrical ways. In this paper, we consider the first two axes as they pertain to the relationship between women and men. In future works, we hope to explore the broader range of issues raised by normative heterosexuality.

For women to enjoy equality, the status hierarchy devaluing women and privileging white heterosexual men must be dismantled (Fraser 1995; 2001; 2007b; Young 1997; 2005). Patriarchal norms treat women as the sexual property of men, as objects rather than subjects, as goods to be exchanged, ignored, or belittled, or as disposable beings who may be abused or even killed—in short, as less than full persons (Young 1990, 1997; 2005; Brush 2003). Getting to sex equality involves the transformation of these patterns that designate some groups as normative and constitute others as inferior, different or unworthy. Women must be seen as fully human.

We refer to this as the "status" dimension of equality and policies that address it alone are "gender status" policies (cf Fraser 2001, 2007b). They attack those practices and values that constitute women as a subordinate group vulnerable to violence, marginalization, exclusion and other injustices that prevent them from participating as peers in political and social life. These policies include: 1) family law, which historically cast women as inferior to men and gave them few or no rights over marital property, minor children, or the ability to work; 2) violence against women, a problem rooted in patriarchal attitudes; 3) abortion and other reproductive freedoms, which, by precluding state interference in women's bodies, uphold their autonomy and dignity; and 4) gender quotas, which elevate the cultural image of women in society by promoting their presence in decisionmaking.

Women's autonomous organizing to promote their own emancipation pushed these issues to political prominence (Weldon 2002). Many women's issues had previously been neglected by other organizations and groups, even those seeking economic justice or racial equality (Strolovitch 2007). Yet when women are organized as women, they need not defend the broader significance of the issue in order to make it a priority (Weldon 2002). By organizing "as women" here, we mean to include all sorts of

---

[2] Young uses the term "hierarchies of power," not status hierarchy.

sub-groups of women who organize as women, including organizations like Women for Racial and Economic Equality (WREE) or INCITE! Women of Color Against Violence.[3]

Equality also requires modifying the sexual division of labor. This system—which characterizes virtually every contemporary society—delegates care work and other domestic labors to women and public sphere responsibilities to men. As a result of their disproportionate burden of care work and their biological role in childbirth, women suffer discrimination and disadvantage in economy, society, and polity. Reproductive labor should not be devalued; nor should it be exclusively women's. To promote parity in opportunities and chances for economic independence, the organization of work (both paid and unpaid) and the allocation of resources must change (Orloff 1993; Okin 1989; Young 2005).

This dimension of equality touches upon more than the position of women relative to men. It also raises the question of differences among women (Crenshaw 1993: Hawkesworth 2006). In societies structured by class, some women lack the opportunities enjoyed by others. Where the state denies public funding for contraceptives, for example, wealthy women, but not poor ones, may purchase them on the market. The same holds for child care. Public provision can give poorer women access to care that wealthy women can buy without state assistance. Some gender equality policies thus intend to equalize access to resources among women of different social classes. We call these "class-based policies."

Religious Doctrine and Cultural Traditions[4]

One of the more controversial turns of modern life has been the claim of the state to regulate kinship relations and sexuality (Htun 2003: 1). Prior to the establishment of the modern state, other organizations—including churches, clans, tribes, and traditional authorities—upheld the rules and managed the processes related to the reproduction of life. In Europe and Latin America, for example, the Roman Catholic Church maintained registries of births and deaths, ran hospitals and cemeteries, presided over marriages and separations, and castigated people for interfering in pregnancies. Sub-Saharan African clans and tribes administered marriage, family relations, and the use and inheritance of land. In much of the Middle East, it is not the state but the mullahs who administer the Sharia (Ibid; Glendon 1987, 1989; Tripp et al forthcoming; Charrad 2001).

The state's seizure of these religious and tribal functions has been contested and incomplete. Much of Asia, Africa, and the Middle East is governed by multiple legal systems. In Nigeria, for example, civil law exists alongside religious (Muslim) and customary law. Depending on where one lives and the resources one has access to, one's rights are either determined by the secular state, the Sharia, or by tribal authorities. In the

---

[3] Though rape and abortion had previously been subject to state policy, they were not understood as critical to women's self-determination and rights. In many countries, rape was classified as a crime against custom, honor, or morality, not against a woman's dignity and autonomy (Weldon 2002). Abortion was an issue of public health, legal corruption, and medical professionalism, not a woman's right (Luker 1989; Htun 2003).
[4] This section borrows from Htun and Weldon 2010.

West, the Church's power over much of social life persisted well into the 19th and 20th centuries. Even when the state seized authority, it imported ecclesiastical principles into its own philosophy of governance. Catholic doctrine on the indissolubility of marriage, for example, influenced civil and constitutional law until 1977 in Brazil, 1983 in Argentina, and 2004 in Chile (see Htun 2003). Elsewhere, the church was incorporated into the structure of the state (as in the United Kingdom, Norway, and Sweden).

The liberalization of many laws on gender and the advancement of women's rights thus tracks the course of relations between the state on the one hand and religious and cultural groups on the other. In 20th century North Africa, for example, changes in family depended on whether or not the state needed the help of clan groups to consolidate its power. When the state was strong, it smashed clan groups by usurping their power over family law and introducing secular codes. When the state was weak, it allowed the clans to preside over kinship and reproduction (Charrad 2001). In Uganda, politicians who wanted to preserve clan power helped defeat a clause in the 1998 Land Act that would have given women co-ownership rights to land with their spouses (Casimiro et. al., 2009: 133-4). In Latin America, the legalization of divorce depended on the eruption of conflict between Church and state over education, human rights, and authoritarian rule (Htun 2003).

Not all gender policies provoke such conflicts between the state and other organizations over their respective jurisdictional authority, however. These issues are more distant from religious doctrine and codified tradition. They concern zones of life rarely touched upon by scripture (such as government versus private provision of childcare) or more modern dilemmas that traditional religions and customs failed to anticipate (such as equality in the workplace).

We call the first set of issues "doctrinal" and the second, "non-doctrinal." Doctrinal issues touch upon the core tenets of religious doctrine and codified cultural traditions, particularly concerning the regulation of reproduction, inheritance, and other intimate matters. They include family law, the legality of abortion, reproductive freedom, and funding for abortion and contraceptives. Non-doctrinal issues include violence against women, gender quotas, equality at work, parental leave, child care, and constitutional provisions for sex equality.[5]

The process of achieving gender equality thus differs according to whether the issue concerns women's status, class differences, or the power of the state vís a vís religion and cultural groups. In the next section, we present a typology of policies based on these two dimensions of difference and pose hypotheses about the causes of change for each policy type.

---

[5] We do not define an issue as doctrinal according to whether it does *in fact* provoke religious opposition. It is defined as doctrinal if the policy contradicts the explicit doctrine, codified tradition, or sacred discourse of the dominant religion or cultural group. For more clarification, see Htun and Weldon 2010.

III. Issue Typology and Hypotheses

Our analysis of gender, injustice, and equality suggests two dimensions along which to classify policies: 1) whether it improves the status of women as a group or whether it addresses class inequalities (status versus class policies); and 2) whether or not the policy challenges religious doctrine, codified traditions, or the sacred discourse of a major cultural group religion (doctrinal versus non-doctrinal policies). Crossing these two dimensions generates four distinct categories (See Table 1). Examples of the types of policies included in each category are provided in the table.

Table 1. Typology of gender equality issues

		Do these policies challenge the established doctrine of religious organizations or the codified tradition of cultural groups?	
		Yes "Doctrinal" policies	No "Non-doctrinal" policies
Do these policies empower women as a status group OR address class inequalities ?	Gender status policies	Abortion legality Reproductive freedom Family Law	Gender quotas in politics Violence against women Constitutional equality
	Class policies	Public funding for abortion and contraceptives	Parental leave Federal funds for daycare Workplace equality

The type of issue and the social institution being challenged (state-religion, state-market or state-body relations) determines the actors that will be relevant. Status policies challenge social institutions that affect women as women. We expect that they will be driven primarily by women's political mobilization in pursuit of equality. Status policies do not tend to require market intervention (though implementation may involve the use of state resources). This is not the case of with class policies, whose advocates are concerned about the justice of existing economic arrangements and are committed to using state power to modify them. For these reasons, we hypothesize that left parties will be the main drivers of change on class policies. Finally, we expect that change on doctrinal issues will depend on the strength of religious, cultural, and tribal organizations. The more powerful they are, the less willing and able is the state to violate the tenets of doctrine. When they are weaker, however, the state has less to lose by promulgating secular and feminist reforms.

Our analysis thus implies that each issue involves a distinct cast of characters. Since women's movements would mobilize around status issues, we would expect their strength to be positively related to change. Class-based policies, by contrast, would be driven by left parties concerned with the redistributive dimensions of social justice. Their presence would be associated with progressive changes in these areas. On doctrinal policies, whether status- or class-oriented, we would expect the power of religious organizations to be inversely related to progress (see Table 2).

Table 2. Salient actors for each policy type

	"Doctrinal" policies	"Non-doctrinal" policies
Gender status policies	RELIGION (-); WOMEN'S MOVEMENTS (+); WOMEN IN PARLIAMENT (+)	WOMEN'S MOVEMENTS (+); WOMEN IN PARLIAMENT (+)
Class policies	RELIGION (-); LEFT PARTIES (+)	LEFT PARTIES (+)

Characteristics of the national polity complicate this scheme. Political actors, after all, do not operate in a vacuum but are differentially empowered by their institutional and societal contexts. The needs of advanced economies facing low birthrates, for example, may find an elective affinity with the demands of women's movements and union-based parties for extended parental leave. The voices of religious organizations able to certify the moral worth of politicians in an emerging democracy may enjoy greater weight than feminist demands for reproductive rights. Our analysis also takes into account those national-level characteristics that affect the salience of different gender issues and shape the influence of their principal advocates.[6]

Democracy. The more democratic a country is, the more developed its civil society and the more open the government to the autonomous organizing of women's groups, particularly grass-roots and working-class movements. In addition, since democratically-elected politicians depend on public approval and need to promote an image of responsiveness, we would expect democracies to be more likely to reform gender injustices than authoritarian regimes. On the other hand, democracies in religious contexts may face pressure to promote more conservative policies. Governments need allies to defeat their opponents and religious organizations—which control vast social networks and may mobilize collective action (Gill 1998, 2005)--are good alliance partners.

Fertility. The regulation of population and reproduction is a core imperative of the state (See Dryzek et al 2003; Offe 1984 for a discussion of core state imperatives.). Polities at different levels of development have contradictory desires in this respect. Poorer countries have sought to reduce fertility as this enables women to participate in the labor force, improves public health, and accelerates economic growth. Countries of the former Soviet bloc made access to abortion easy; India, Brazil, Mexico and other industrializing polities introduced family planning programs. Yet in many advanced economies, fertility dropped below replacement levels during the last third of the twentieth century. To insure an adequate labor force and support for an aging population, these countries want citizens to have more children. (Some also encourage immigration, but racist pressures in many countries make the issue politically contentious.)

---

[6] For a fuller discussion see Htun and Weldon 2010.

Above a certain income threshold, low fertility motivates progressive changes in gender equality policy, particularly class-based policies such as parental leave and child care. This makes the impact of fertility on policy outcomes complex to model. To start, we have included fertility as a control variable without disaggregating the analysis by level of development (or level of fertility), but this will probably require refinement in future iterations.

State strength. Sex equality requires an effective state. Since gender-related policies challenge social norms and traditions, only a strong state can overcome social resistance and quash rivals to its power. State strength is necessary to promote change on doctrinal policies. It is important for other policies as well, since the government must be capable of intervening in society, in the workplace, and in the family to protect women from violence and promote the value of their work and concerns. When the state is weak and unable to enforce certain policies, advocates may decide they are not worth changing and conservative policies may remain on the books.

Policy Style: Universalistic vs. Group-Based. Some countries were founded on the accommodation of diverse religious, racial and/or ethnic groups (e.g. Canada, Israel, India). In return for their support for the state, elites are offered guarantees of political representation, areas of exclusive jurisdiction (education and/or family law), or other accommodations. Such a response to conflict entrenches group-based thinking in politics and faciliates gender status policies, as women's rights advocates draw analogies between their situation and other marginalized groups. Other countries (e.g. Norway) took a universalistic path to nation building that emphasizes the solidarity of all citizens. These traditions may reject claims by women as a distinct status group (Young 1990; McDonagh 2002), but may be more amenable to their class-based claims than polities more oriented toward group rights (Esping Andersen 1990; Milner 1989).

The following table presents our hypotheses.

Table 3. Issue-specific Hypotheses

Dependent Variable: Policy Score	Independent Variables	
	Relevant Actors	National Polity Characteristics
<u>Gender Status Doctrinal</u> -abortion legality -reproductive freedom -family law	-Religion (-) -Women's groups (+) -Women in parliament (+)	-Democracy: strengthens women's groups (+) and organized religion (-) -Policy Style: Universalistic (-)/Group -based(+) -State strength: (+)
<u>Doctrinal Class-Based</u> -abortion funding -contraceptive funding	- Left Parties (+) - Religion (-)	- Democracy: a strong, grass-roots women's movement (+); a weak, elite dominated women's movement (-) -Policy Style: Universalistic (+)/ Group-based (-) -State strength: (+) -Fertility: higher levels (+); lower levels in authoritarian context (-)
<u>Gender Status non-doctrinal</u> -violence against	-Women's groups (+) -Women in parliament (+)	-Democracy : strengthens women's groups (+) -Policy Style: Universalistic (-)/Group-based (+) -State strength: (+)

women -gender quotas -constitutional equality		
<u>Class-Based Non-Doctrinal Policies</u> -maternity and parental leave -public funding for child care	-Left Parties (+) -Women's Groups (+)	-Democracy: interacts with strong, grass-roots based women's movement (+);interacts with a Weak and/or Elite dominated women's movement (-) -Policy Style: Universalistic (+)/ Group-based (-) -State strength (+) -Fertility: (-)

Note: Each variable is marked to denote whether it makes adoption of equality-promoting policy more likely (+) or less likely (-). These effects are expected to be linear and additive except where noted.

IV. Data and Variables

We test these hypotheses against an original dataset of gender equality laws and policies in 71 countries. The dataset covers thirteen policy areas to include the multiple ways that states promote (or undermine) gender equality. Data were gathered by the PIs (Htun and Weldon) and a team of graduate and undergraduate students from the New School and Purdue for four points in time (1975, 1985, 1995, and 2005).

Our research team culled data for the dependent variables from a variety of sources. These included statutes and other government documents, country reports to the United Nations Division for the Advancement of Women (to report on compliance with CEDAW), publications of non-governmental research organizations (such as the Center for Reproductive Law and Policy), other NGO reports (such as country-specific "shadow" reports about state compliance with CEDAW), existing databases (such as the ILO's maternity protection database), and books and articles published by experts in the field. Data for the independent and control variables came mostly from existing sources, though we are currently involved in a supplemental project to gather original data on the strength and autonomy of women's movements in the 71 countries.

The data and variables used in the present analysis are presented in Table 3. The principal components analysis uses data from all four points in time; the OLS regression uses 2005 data only.

Table 4. Definition of Variables and Sources

Abortion Legality	Htun-Weldon index of abortion law (see appendix)[7]
VAW	Htun-Weldon index of VAW law and policies (see appendix)
Public funding for abortion	Htun-Weldon index (dichotomous)
Maternity leave generosity	Htun-Weldon index (see appendix)

---

[7] We designed coding protocols for each policy and designated two coders (one from the New School and one from Purdue). After the coding was completed, a third RA analyzed and resolved discrepancies in the coding, often with PI assistance. Next, we created a formula to score each policy area on a 0 to 10 scale. The higher the score, the better the policy. These formulas are described in the appendix.

Parental leave generosity	Htun-Weldon index (see appendix)
Overall leave generosity	Htun-Weldon index (see appendix)
Gender role change in leave policies	Htun-Weldon index (see appendix)
Women's groups	Number of women's groups/square root of the country's population. Osted, Denise. 2005. Global List of Women's Organizations. (A Subdivision of Fullmoon's web). Hhtp://www.distel.ca/womlist/womlist.html (accessed July 22, 2005)
% parliament female	Single or lower house of parliament. Situation as of 31 December, 2005. Inter-Parliamentary Union. See: www.ipu.org
Religiosity[8]	World Values Survey religiosity scale from Inglehart and Norris (2003). Obtained at: The Quality of Government Dataset, University of Gothenburg: The Quality of Government Institute, http://www.qog.pol.gu.se.
Left party in power	Database of Political Institutions. http://go.worldbank.org/2EAGGLRZ40. DPI variable: party of the chief executive, with additional coding by Mala Htun and Meg Edwards.
Degree of democracy	Polity score (from 2003). http://www.systemicpeace.org/polity/polity4.htm
Elective abortion	score of 8, 9 or 10 on Htun-Weldon index
Fertility	Fertility 2000-2005. UN Database: http://www.un.org/popin/data.html
State strength	WGI "Government effectiveness" measure. See: http://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/index.asp and Kaufman, Kraay, and Mastruzzi (2009).
Policy Style	Take from McDonagh (2002): whether a country's constitution institutionalizes group rights and workers' rights

Abortion Legality. This variable measures the extent and ways in which the state interferes in the intimate decision about whether or not to carry a pregnancy to term. Abortion touches upon the question of when life begins; the respective roles and authority of the state, religion, and cultural groups; and the status of motherhood as elective or compulsory (Glendon 1987; Htun 2003; Luker 1984; Tribe 1992). Abortion legislation affects all women by virtue of their biological capacity for pregnancy (for this reason we call it a "status" issue), though many disagree on whether or not it should be legally permitted. Traditional religions and cultures, a central concern of which is to control reproduction, are reluctant to grant women autonomy to make choices about their bodies and their pregnancies (hence it is a "doctrinal" issue in most places).

Violence Against Women (VAW). This variable scores government efforts to prevent and punish violence against women, including domestic violence against women, sexual assault, physical abuse, harassment, and other forms of violence (which may be culturally specific). Policies focus on prevention through public education and awareness; assistance for victims (shelters, counseling, legal services, medical assistance, access to employment and job training); and reforms to improve judicial and police responsiveness,

---

[8] We use religiosity as a proxy measure for the strength of religious organizations. Though the latter does not always reflect the former, is the only societal measure we have across so many different types of countries. Other indicators, such as Grim and Finke's (2003)'s SRI index measure state policy more than societal characteristics. The World Christian Encyclopedia's classification of church-state relations (including the categories aetheist, secular, and religious, among others) does not measure differences within the same type.

among others (see appendix). VAW is a problem in many contexts including the workplace, educational institutions and public spaces. Its main causes are patriarchal attitudes holding women to be inferior and subordinate to men. The men who are most likely to assault women are those with patriarchal attitudes and the societies in which violence is most prevalent are those in which sexual inequality is most severe. We consider VAW a status issue for its affects on all women regardless of their other social positions. It is non-doctrinal, however, as no religious tradition (explicitly) defends the right of men to inflict violence upon women.[9]

Funding for Abortion. Most scholarly analyses defend the need to distinguish between the legality of abortion and its availability (Lovenduski and Outshoorn 1986). Legality refers to the negative liberties codified in the law: does the state interfere in the decision over whether to terminate a pregnancy? Under what circumstances? Availability refers to the practical measures the state provides to guarantee that all women may make autonomous decisions. Public funding for abortion permits the universal exercise of this reproductive right; a lack of it renders such rights contingent on market participation. Governments with national health insurance systems may fund abortion as they would any other medical procedure or they may exclude it from general coverage. Countries without national health but with other public programs make the same choice.

Even when abortion is legal it may not be widely available due to lack of public funding and/or a shortage of providers. By contrast, in a small group of cases the legality of abortion is restricted but public funding is available. This is a doctrinal issue but unlike mere legality we consider it to be class-based. Public funding for abortion affects poor and middle class women far more than their wealthier counterparts.

Parental leave indices. Does the state require employers to grant mothers and/or parents time off from work to give birth and care for young children? We gathered data on four types of leave:
- maternity leave: pertaining to women only, this leave is medically necessary for childbirth;
- parental leave: for the purpose of taking care of a child, this leave is gender-neutral and may be taken by anyone- adoptive parents, mother, father, or someone standing *in loco parentis*;
- paternity leave: enabling fathers to be present at childbirth and the aftermath, this leave is rarely not more than a few days;
- "daddy" leave: a newer effort to promote gender role change in parenting, these leaves usually cannot be transferred to mothers or other family members.

We were concerned to measure the length of the leave; whether it was publicly funded, unpaid, or whether the law imposed an employer mandate to pay the maternity/parental

---

[9] Some religious and legal traditions permit men to discipline their wives and require that women submit to men. The Southern Baptists in the United States, for example, recently reaffirmed their doctrine that women must submit to and obey their husbands (but husbands need not reciprocate). On some interpretations of the Q'uran, men have the authority to lightly beat (leaving no marks) rebellious wives (see Surah An-Nisa (chapter 4: verse 34)). Most contemporary religious traditions, however, deny that their doctrine condones wife-battering or cruelty.

salary; and whether a country had specialized legislation prohibiting pregnancy discrimination. We were also interested in whether or not leave policies reflected traditional gender roles and/or sought to extend fathers' roles in caregiving. Gender-neutral parental leaves break with the assumption that women are primarily responsible for care work; "daddy" leaves offer financial incentives for men to assume a greater child care role.

Our indices (please see appendix for formulas) gave twice as many points to countries offering publicly funded leaves. Public funding reflects an acceptance of childbirth as a public good and care work as a community responsibility (as opposed to the individual woman or parents). Employer mandates, by contrast, place the burden of leave on individual businesses, creating a disincentive to employ women of childbearing age. We consider leave to be non-doctrinal since few religions and cultures oppose it. Many normative traditions had opposed women's assumption of public responsibilities including paid work but today even conservative societies such as Saudi Arabia do not ban women's employment altogether (though they require it to be segregated from men's and of a particular moral quality). We classify parental leave as a class-based issue, as the policy makes it possible for all parents, not just wealthy ones, to take time off from work to care for their children.

V. Analysis and Results

Abortion legality, VAW, public funding for abortion, and maternity/parental leave each represent one quadrant of our typology of gender equality policies (See Table 1). By analyzing cross-national variation on each policy, we can assess the extent to which they adhere to different logics of change or whether they are driven by a singular process such as economic modernization, democratization, demographic changes, or changes in cultural attitudes (cf. Inglehart and Norris 2003).

In the first stage of the analysis, we conducted OLS and logistic regression on four dependent variables (we used only the "overall leave generosity" of our parental leave variables in this analysis). We employed a base model to assess how well the model functioned across all four policy areas (not shown). We found that there were in fact, different dynamics for each policy area. The base model includes five variables, representing the most important political actors and contextual aspects in our framework: women's movements, women's share of parliament, religiosity, left parties and democracy. Ultimately, we plan to explore interactive and non-linear effects, but here we start with exploring direct, linear effects with OLS. The two variables measuring women's mobilization (women's movements and women in legislature) allow us to examine the hypothesis that women's political mobilization drives change on status-related policies (but not necessarily on class ones). The religiosity variable tests the extent to which the strength of religious organizations is associated with more restrictive policies on doctrinal issues. We hypothesized that left parties would be significant and positive for class-related policies. Finally, the model includes a measure of democracy, which we expected would create incentives to promote women's rights policies but could also empower actors opposed to change.

15

In Table 5, we present the best model for each particular issue-area. For VAW and abortion legality, this is the base model. In model 3 (public funding for abortion), we control for whether or not the law permits elective abortion and fertility. Model 4, which focuses on the overall generosity of maternity and parental leave, also includes a measure of fertility. We also tested for the effects of policy style and state strength (not shown). Policy style (as currently measured) did not have a significant effect in any model. Including a measure of state strength created inconsistencies in the model due, we believe, to high multicollinearity with other independent variables.

Table 5. Results of OLS and Logistic Regression

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
	Abortion Legality	Violence Against Women	Abortion Funding	Overall Leave Generosity
	Beta (SE)	Beta (SE)	Beta (SE)	Beta (SE)
# Women's Groups	0.02 (0.01) *	0.01 (0.01) *	-0.00 (0.01)	-0.00 (0.00)
% Female Parliament	0.03 (0.04)	0.1 (0.03) **	0.02 (0.03)	-0.02 (0.02)
Religiosity	-0.09 (0.02) ***	0.02 (0.02)	-0.04 (0.02)*	-0.03 (0.01) **
Left Party in Power	0.89 (0.78)	-0.37 (0.62)	0.77 (0.71)	-0.12 (0.41)
Democracy Level	0.04 (0.08)	0.25 (0.07) ***	0.12 (0.12)	0.02 (0.05)
Elective Abortion	-	-	1.37 (0.76)	-
Fertility Rate	-	-	0.29 (0.51)	-0.57 (0.23) *
Adjusted R-squared	0.37	0.39	0.3/0.4	0.28
N	56	55	57	56

Note: *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

All models are OLS regression except for Model 3, which is a logistic regression.

Model 1 reveals that religiosity has a negative and highly significant on abortion law and that the presence of women's groups has a significant and positive effect. Our classification of abortion law as a doctrinal and gender status issue, touching upon religious traditions and activating the women's movement, anticipated both of these results.

According to Model 2, democracy, women in parliament, and women's groups have significant and positive effects on policies to prevent and punish violence against women. In stark contrast to abortion law, the effects of religion are not significant, as we would expect for a non-doctrinal issue. In line with our classification of VAW as a status issue, both the presence of women in parliament and the number of women's groups are significant. The degree of democracy has a larger effect than we expected. By 2005, VAW had some to be seen in most countries as a human rights issue that democracies needed to take action on.

Our results for models 3 and 4 offered more mixed support for our hypotheses. Religiosity was the only variable with a significant effect on public funding for abortion. As we would expect for a doctrinal issue, the effect of religiosity is negative. This model controlled for whether or not a country permits elective abortion in the first trimester of pregnancy and this variable was significant at the more generous .1 level .We had expected the presence of a left party to be significant for this class-based issue, however, and it was not.

Model 4 explains less of the variance than our other models. As we expected, fertility had a significant negative effect, meaning that lower levels of fertility were associated with more generous policies. The surprising result in this model is the negative effect of religiosity, as we did not classify parental leave as a doctrinal issue.

We ran different specifications of each model, including additional variables (such as GDP per capita). Yet there is high multicollinearity between GDP, democracy, fertility, and government effectiveness (and religiosity, to a lesser extent). By excluding GDP and government effectiveness we reduced some of these concerns. Other tests we performed on the model revealed largely consistent findings.[10]

In the second stage of the analysis, we used principal components analysis to explore the relationship between the four types of gender equality policies. Are these distinct policies or should they be merged in an overall "women's rights index"? Though our analysis argues for disaggregation, modernization perspectives imply aggregation. *[Note: these reported results come from earlier analysis whereas the OLS results come from analysis at a later point in time. The dataset was modified in the interim, though coding of dependent variables remained almost exactly the same.]* Since these elements are correlated with each other, we used an oblique rotation (oblimin). We found three distinct components that together account for 78 percent of the variance, indicating support for the argument that gender equality is not one issue but many (See Table 5). The first component accounts for 47 percent of the variance, the second for 16 percent and the third for 15 percent.

Table 6. Principal Components Analysis of Equality Policies

Pattern Matrix(a)

	Component		
	1	2	3
Abortion Funding	-0.11	0.12	0.90
Abortion Legality	0.15	-0.11	0.82
VAW	-0.06	0.94	0.03
Gender role change	0.48	0.52	0.15

---

[10] Including regional dummy variables produced no change in the results for abortion and VAW but did change the results for abortion funding and overall leave generosity. Religiosity dropped out and only elective abortion remained significant in Model 3 (though left parties was significant at the .1 level); religiosity and fertility both dropped out of Model 4 (though religiosity remained significant at the .1 level).

Maternity leave generosity	0.68	0.27	-0.07
Parental leave generosity	0.89	-0.22	0.09
Overall leave generosity	0.98	-0.04	0.04

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Oblimin with Kaiser Normalization.

The overall generosity of maternity and parental leave (class-based, non doctrinal policies) loads onto the first dimension. Countries with high scores on this index offer long, publicly funded leaves for women who give birth as well as for both parents to care for young children. In recent decades, these policies have expanded in industrialized democracies facing low birthrates. Emerging democracies and less-developed countries tend to offer maternity leave--often publicly funded--but rarely parental leave. Many working women in such economies are employed in the informal sector, however, and are therefore unable to take advantage of these policies.

The second dimension is defined primarily by policies to prevent and punish violence against women (a gender status, non-doctrinal policy). As noted earlier, these policies combat the cultural denigration of the feminine, elevating women's status and their dignity. The degree of gender role change promoted by parental leave policies also loads onto this dimension. This reflects the ways that role change policies invert the status hierarchy by encouraging men to assume traditionally feminine caregiving roles.

The last dimension is defined by abortion and abortion funding. Both are doctrinal issues, as regulation of reproduction has historically been one of the principal objectives of religious and cultural organizations (not to mention the state) (Okin 1989). As a class-based issue, we had expected reproductive rights funding to load onto an additional (4th) dimension. This analysis suggests, however, that the religious content of the issue overwhelms its connection to class politics. These results are consistent with the OLS and logistic regression presented in Table 4.

VI. Conclusion

Our analysis is premised on the idea that gender equality is a complex concept and that policies to achieve it are multifaceted. Advancing women's status involves massive social changes and challenges entrenched patterns of state-society relations. Whether or not a policy involves women's status with respect to men, class positions, and/or the authority of the state against religious and cultural groups sets in motion distinct political dynamics. This preliminary analysis revealed support for our arguments. Our models on abortion and violence against women policies were robust. Yet our results also suggested our arguments should be refined. As class policies, we had expected left parties to drive abortion funding and parental leave, but religion mattered more than we thought, particularly for leave policies. At the very least, we hope to have shown that gender policies do not occupy single basket. Each challenges fundamental, though distinct, values and institutions set by the status order, class inequalities, and religious and cultural doctrine.

18

(Partial) References

Bernstein, Anya. 2001. *The Moderation Dilemma: Legislative Coalitions and the Politics of Family and Medical Leave* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press).

Blofield, Merike and Liesl Haas. 2005. "Defining a Democracy: Reforming the Laws on Women's Rights in Chile, 1990-2002." *Latin American Politics and Society* 47, no. 3: pp. 35-68.

Butler, Judith. 1993. *Bodies that matter: On the discursive limits of "sex"*. NY,NY: Routledge.

Charrad, Mounira. 2001. *States and Women's Rights: The Making of Postcolonial Tunisia, Algeria, and Morocco*. (Berkeley: University of California Press).

Collins, Patricia Hill. 1998. "Its All in the Family: Intersections of gender, race and nation." Hypatia. 13(3):62-82.

Crenshaw, Kimberlé Williams. 1994. "Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence Against Women of Color". In: Martha Albertson Fineman, Rixanne Mykitiuk, Eds. *The Public Nature of Private Violence*. New York: Routledge, 1994, p. 93-118.

Dryzek, John, David Downes, Christian Hunold, David Sclosberg with Hans-Kristian Hernes. 2003. *Green States and Social Movements: Environmentalism in the United States, United Kingdom, Germany and Norway*. Oxford: Oxford UP.

Fraser, Nancy. 2007b. "Feminist Politics in the Age of Recognition: A Two-Dimensional Approach to Gender Justice," *Studies in Social Justice* 1, 1 (2007): 23-35.

Fraser, Nancy. 2001. "Recognition without Ethics?" *Theory, Culture & Society* 18, 2-3 (2001): 21-42.

Gelb, Joyce and Marian Lief Palley. 1982. *Women and Public Policies*. (Princeton University Press, 1982).

Gelb, Joyce. 1989. *Feminism and Politics: A Comparative Perspective*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Gelb, Joyce. 2003. *Gender Policies in Japan and the United States: Comparing Women's Movements, Rights and Politics*. New York, NY: Palgrave.

Giddens, Anthony. 1982. "Action, Structure, Power " in *Profiles and Critiques in Social Theory*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Htun, Mala. 2003. *Sex and the State: Abortion, Divorce and the Family Under Latin American Dictatorships and Democracy*. (Cambridge University Press).

Jones, Bryan and Frank R. Baumgartner. 2005. The Politics of Attention: How Government Prioritizs Problems. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kittilson, Miki Caul. 2008. "Representing Women: The Adoption of Family Leave in Comparative Perspective". Journal of Politics.

Leira, Arnaug. 1993. "The 'Women-Friendly' Welfare State? The Case of Norway and Sweden." 49-71 in Lewis, Jane ed. Women and Social Policies in Europe: Lewis, Jane. ed. 1993. *Women and Social Policies in Europe: Work, Family and the State*. Brookfield, Vt.: Edward Elgar.

Mazur, Amy G. 2002. *Theorizing Feminist Policy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Abortion before Birth Control: The Politics of Reproduction in Postwar Japan. by Christiana A. E. Norgren. 2001.

Sanbonmatsu, Kira. 2002. *Democrats/Republicans and the Politics of Women's Place*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Stetson, Dorothy McBride. 1997. Women's Rights in the USA (Second Edition). New York: Garland.

Strolovitch, Dara Z. 2006. "Do Interest Groups Represent the Disadvantaged? Advocacy at the Intersections of Race, Class, and Gender." *Journal of Politics* 68 (4): 893-908.

Casimiro, Isabel, Joy Kwesiga, Alice Mungwa, and Aili Tripp. 2009. *African Women's Movements: Transforming Political Landscapes* (Cambridge University Press).

Van Der Ros, Janneke. "Norway: The State and Women: A Troubled Relationship in Norway" in Nelson, Barbara J. and Najma Chowdhury. eds. 1994. *Women and Politics Worldwide.* New Haven and London: Yale University Press. 527-544

Weldon, S.L. 2008. "Social movements, representation and family policy" in *Protest, Representation and the Advocacy State: Women and Workers in the US and Abroad* (Unpublished book ms. under review).

Weldon, S.L. 2002a. *Protest, Policy and the Problem of Violence Against Women: A Cross-National Comparison*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Weldon, S.L. 2006. "The Structure of Intersectionality: A Comparative Politics of Gender." *Politics and Gender.* Symposium on the Comparative Politics of Gender. Vol 2 (2)

Young, Iris Marion. 2005. *On Female Body Experience: "Throwing Like a Girl" and other essays.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Young, Iris. 1990. *Justice and the Politics of Difference.* Princeton University Press.

Young. Iris Marion. 1994. "Gender as Seriality: Thinking about Women as a Social Collective," *Signs* 19: 713-738.

Young. Iris Marion. 2000. *Inclusion and Democracy.* Oxford Series in Political Theory. Oxford University Press.

Appendices

A. List of countries included in the analysis (71)

Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Lithuania, Malaysia, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russia, Saudi Arabia, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, South Africa, South Korea, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Taiwan, Tanzania, Thailand, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, Venezuela, Vietnam

B. Index of Abortion Law (10-0)

10 = elective abortion[11] in first and second trimesters, no restrictions
9 = elective abortion in first trimester with no restrictions OR elective abortion in first and second trimester with some restrictions
8 = elective abortion in the first trimester, with some restrictions
5 = abortion permitted on soft grounds in addition to various hard grounds (including, at a minimum, rape and threat to the mother's life)
3 = abortion permitted when a woman has been raped in addition to other hard grounds (including, at a minimum, threat to the mother's life)
2 = abortion permitted for additional hard grounds (health, fetal abnormality, incest, but not rape)
1 = abortion permitted when mother's life is in danger (ONLY)
0 = abortion forbidden under all circumstances

C. VAW Index

The index of government responsiveness to violence against women is coded out of a total of 10 points as follows:

3 points for **services to victims**: (1 for each of the following):
- Government funds domestic violence shelters/establishes special courts or police stations
- Government funds rape crisis centers/ establishes special courts or police stations
- Government provides crisis services for other forms of violence (stalking, FGM, eve-teasing (street harassment), *sati*, etc)

3 points for **legal reform** (1 for each of the following):
- Government has adopted specialized legislation pertaining to domestic violence (for example, specifying that rape in marriage is a crime, or that violence in a domestic situation is a crime, or specifying the penalties for such crimes)
- Government has adopted specialized legislation pertaining to sexual assault/ rape (i.e. rape shield laws)

---

[11] Note that "elective abortion" includes those laws that require the woman to be in a condition of "distress" by her pregnancy when the woman is the only one who determines whether or not she is in distress.

- Government has adopted specialized legalization pertaining to other forms of violence

1 point for policies or programmes targeted to vulnerable populations of women (allocate one point for any of the following programmes/policies):
- Government provides specialized services to women of marginalized communities, ethnicities etc. (bi-lingual hotlines, specialized crisis centers, specially trained nurses and police, etc)
- Government recognizes violence against women as a basis for refugee status (gender persecution)
- Government protects immigrant women in abusive relations from deportation

1 point for training professionals who response to victims of any type of violence against women;
- Government provides training for police, social workers, nurses, etc

1 point for prevention programs
- Government funds public education programs
- Other preventative measures

1 point for administrative reforms
- Government has a coordinating body/ government agency to provide research, policy analysis and coordination of government response on violence against women

D. Parental leave variables

Maternity leave generosity = Duration of leave + Duration of leave*publicly paid

Parental leave generosity = Duration of leave + Duration of leave*publicly paid

Overall leave generosity = maternity leave generosity/5 + parental leave generosity/5

Gender role change = Daddy leave (3 points) + Maternity leave (2 points) + Parental leave (2 points) + Law against Pregnancy Discrimination (3 points) (possible 10 points total)