

Metadata of the chapter that will be visualized online

Series Title		
Chapter Title	Gender Equality in European Union Development Policy	
Chapter SubTitle		
Copyright Year	2013	
Copyright Holder	Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg	
Corresponding Author	Family Name	Debusscher
	Particle	
	Given Name	Petra
	Suffix	
	Division	Post-doctoral fellow Research Foundation—Flanders (FWO) Centre for EU Studies, Department of Political Sciences
	Organization	Ghent University
	Address	Universiteitstraat 8, 9000, Ghent, Belgium
	Email	petra.debusscher@ugent.be
Abstract	<p>This chapter critically examines gender mainstreaming in EU development aid to assess whether or not the EU can be considered a leading and distinctive gender actor. To answer this question I will analyse the budget, gendered language and frame of high level policy programming documents. First I evaluate whether a shift has been made from a conservative Women in Development paradigm to a transformative Gender and Development paradigm to determine if the EU lives up to European and international commitments on gender equality and can be considered to be leading by example. Second I examine whether the EU advocates a distinctive ‘Europeanness’ in its gender policy towards developing countries. The chapter concludes that the shift towards a transformative Gender and Development paradigm has only partly been made. Moreover, I argue that rather than a distinctive ‘Europeanness’, the EU’s gender equality approach can be called a patchwork of approaches derived from other international institutions such as the UN or the World Bank. This implies that the EU is not the innovative leading gender power it claims to be.</p>	

Gender Equality in European Union Development Policy

Petra Debusscher

The Lisbon Treaty considers “equality between women and men” among the EU’s core values and objectives, and since 1996, the EU has committed to integrate gender considerations into all aspects of its operations and policies. In its policy documents and public statements the European Commission frequently stresses that gender equality is a goal in its own right that has been a part of the European project of integration since its beginning (McCrae 2010). Given the rich history and growing importance of gender equality in all kinds of policy domains it is not surprising observers have stated that the EU stands out in its support for gender equality among international organisations (Debusscher and True 2009). The Union (Commission and member states) is also the world’s largest development aid donor, collectively disbursing 55 % of official development assistance globally. In several high level policy documents the EU has stressed it “has been increasingly active in promoting gender equality in its external action” as gender equality is one of the five essential principles of development cooperation and a goal in its own right (European Commission 2010, p. 3). But to what extent has the EU actually used its development aid to advance gender equality goals? Has the EU promoted gender equality in its development policies in a transformative way as put forward by international and European standards? Or has the approach towards gender equality in its foreign aid remained rather ‘mainstream’? This chapter critically examines gender mainstreaming in European Union development aid to assess whether or not the EU can be considered a leading and distinctive gender actor, using a budget, language and frame analyses of policy programming documents. Unlike Moser and Moser (2005), I do not review the progress of gender mainstreaming in implementation in general. I limit myself to an assessment of the planning process. After an introduction on gender equality in EU development policies I delve into the analysis of budget, language and frame.

P. Debusscher (✉)

Post-doctoral fellow Research Foundation—Flanders (FWO) Centre for EU Studies,
Department of Political Sciences, Ghent University, Universiteitstraat 8, 9000 Ghent, Belgium
e-mail: petra.debusscher@ugent.be

1 Gender Equality in EU Development Policy

Early efforts to integrate gender equality in EU development policy took place in the context of the United Nations (UN) Decade for Women 1975–1985 and the Third World Conference on Women in Nairobi in 1985. Following these events the European Commission (EC) established its ‘Women in Development’ (WID) policy, including its first WID desks, communiqués and references to women in the Third and Fourth Lomé conventions (1984 and 1989) (Pető and Manners 2006). This WID perspective addressed the exclusion of women from the development process by creating specific projects for women. The WID paradigm was increasingly criticised as a conservative ‘add women and stir’ approach by feminist scholars, who pointed out that its narrow focus on women was ineffective as it ignored the underlying societal problems, namely unequal gender relations (Moser 1993; Subrahmanian 2007). Following the 1995 United Nations (UN) Beijing Conference, the international community replaced the WID paradigm by a GAD paradigm and embraced the strategy of gender mainstreaming as “the fundamental GAD buzzword” (Subrahmanian 2007, p. 112). GAD was considered innovative; it focuses on gender without dislodging women as the central subject, as it recognises that improving women’s status requires analysis of the *relations* between women and men. Gender mainstreaming would widen the scope from add-on, small-scale projects for women, to the integration of a gender equality perspective into all policies (Johnsson-Latham 2010). It stressed “the shared responsibility of women and men in removing imbalances in society” (Council of Europe 1998, p. 18). The participation and commitment of men was thus fundamental to changing the position of women. As the ultimate aim of gender mainstreaming is to change discriminatory gender norms, structures and practices in society, it is regarded as a transformative approach.

Since 1995 the EU has adopted a range of high-level policy documents¹ confirming that gender is a cross-cutting issue that has to be mainstreamed in all areas of development and into all programs and projects at regional and country level. In a ground-breaking resolution of late 1995 the EU Council of Ministers first declared the integration of a gender perspective in development co-operation as a

¹ Including the 1995 Council of Ministers Resolution on Integrating Gender Issues in Development Cooperation; the 1998 Council of Ministers Regulation on Integrating Gender Issues in Development Cooperation; the 2000 European Commission Communication on the European Community’s Development Policy; the 2001 European Commission Communication on the Programme of Action for the Mainstreaming European Parliament of Gender Equality in Community Development Cooperation; the 2004 European Parliament and Council Regulation on Promoting Gender Equality in Development Cooperation; the 2006 Joint Statement by the Council and the representatives of the governments of the Member States meeting within the Council, the and the Commission on EU Development Policy: ‘The European Consensus’; the 2007 European Commission Communication on Gender Equality and Women Empowerment in Development Cooperation and the 2010 European Commission Staff Working Document ‘EU Plan of Action on Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment in Development 2010–2015’.

crucial principle underpinning the development policy of the Community and the Member States (European Council 1995). This was followed by a string of high-level policy documents on integrating gender equality in development, including a 1998 'Regulation on Integrating Gender Issues in Development Co-operation' (European Council 1998). In 2001 the Commission published its 'Programme of Action for the Mainstreaming of Gender Equality in Community Development Cooperation' which stipulates a twin-track strategy to achieve gender equality. Such twin-track strategy implies that "the EC is committed to including gender equality goals in the mainstream of EC development co-operation policies, programmes and projects" (gender mainstreaming), while "concrete actions targeting women (specific actions)" reinforce these processes (European Commission 2001, pp. 8–13). More recently, the EU has adopted high-level policy documents which update the earlier arrangements and reconfirm the twin-track strategy towards gender equality (European Parliament and Council 2004; European Commission 2007a, 2010).

2 Analysing Gender Mainstreaming in EU Development Aid

Guided by these significant political commitments to gender equality, the external services of the European Commission have institutionalized gender equality methodologies and principles across their policy and operational work. In what follows I delve into the analysis of gender mainstreaming in European Union development aid to assess using a budget, gender language and frame analyses. The budget, gender language and frame analysis will be used to evaluate if a shift has been made from a conservative Women in Development paradigm to a transformative Gender and Development paradigm to determine if the EU lives up to innovative international and European commitments on gender equality and is leading by example. The frame analysis will help to determine if the EU advocates a distinctive "Europeanness" in its gender policy towards developing countries (Debusscher 2011). Taken together, the two questions enable me to conclude whether or not the EU can be considered a leading and distinctive gender actor.

2.1 Dataset

I analysed 98 Country Strategy Papers (CSPs) and National Indicative Programmes (NIPs) from 2002 to 2013 including countries from Asia, Africa, Latin America and the European Neighbourhood on their inclusion of gender equality. CSPs and NIPs are bilateral agreements between the EC and the government of the partner country and are the main instruments for programming EC development aid. Given their importance in planning and implementing EC aid, CSPs and NIPs are regarded as the main building blocks to effectively gender mainstream policies

98 in development practice. A CSP contains a country analysis sketching the situation
99 of a country, the national strategy, an overview of previous co-operation and a
100 response strategy establishing the development priorities to tackle the problems
101 described in the country analysis. The NIP makes the priorities from the CSP's
102 response strategy operational by outlining the concrete development programmes
103 in the chosen focal and non-focal sectors and adds timetables, budgets and mea-
104 surement indicators.

105 **2.2 Budget**

106 As GAD and gender mainstreaming imply the integration of a gender equality
107 perspective into all policies, obviously, the budget should systematically address
108 gender equality to make the commitment credible (Beetham 2010; Elson and Sharp
109 2010). A scoring system was developed to estimate the percentage of the develop-
110 ment budget that is gender mainstreamed. The scores range from 'not mentioned at
111 all' (no gender mainstreaming), to 'a one-sentence reference to gender equality'
112 (sector will perhaps be gender-mainstreamed), to 'two to three concrete references
113 to gender equality in the objectives or expected results' (sector is likely to be gender
114 mainstreamed), to 'four or more concrete references to gender equality in the
115 objectives or expected results' (very likely to be gender mainstreamed) and last
116 to 'gender is integrated in one or more performance indicators' (fully gender
117 mainstreamed). Since every NIP has a set of performance indicators linked to the
118 sector's goals by which to monitor and evaluate the success of the development
119 programme, it is reasonable to say that the inclusion of so-called 'gender indicators'
120 corresponds to having the development objectives linked to gender equality in
121 practice. For example, an NIP with the focal sector 'Justice' and the objective to
122 reform the justice system could have 'perception of the credibility of the judicial
123 system' as one of its indicators. If this indicator is disaggregated by gender or if it
124 contains a specific indicator linked to gender (for example, 'number of gender-
125 based violence cases resolved'), it corresponds to having the development
126 objectives linked to gender equality in practice. These so-called 'gender indicators'
127 can be either indicators broken down by sex (for example school enrolment rate for
128 girls and for boys) or specific indicators measuring improved gender equality (for
129 example a decrease in gender-based violence). Since gender indicators constitute a
130 critical link between policy aspirations and policy practice (Walby 2005; Beetham
131 2010), I regard the use of such indicators as the most definite sign available in the
132 programming phase of being fully gender mainstreamed in the GAD philosophy.

133 **2.2.1 What Percentage of the EC Development Budget** 134 **Is Gender Mainstreamed?**

135 The sum of the reviewed NIP budget was 14,245.51 million euro for the program-
136 ming period 2002–2013. As seen in Table 1, up to 49.81 % of this budget was
137 not gender mainstreamed at all. Gender was not mentioned once in the objectives

Table 1 gender inclusiveness of EC development aid (in million € and % of the total budget)			t1.1
Focal and non-focal sectors in NIPs	2002–2013		t1.2
Not gender mainstreamed	€ 7,096.37	49.81 %	t1.3
Perhaps gender mainstreamed	€ 1,606.20	11.28 %	t1.4
Likely to be gender mainstreamed	€ 1,565.21	10.99 %	t1.5
Very likely to be gender mainstreamed	€ 495.54	3.48 %	t1.6
Fully gender mainstreamed with indicators	€ 3,482.19	24.44 %	t1.7
Total budget	€ 14,245.51	100 %	t1.8

or expected results of the budgetary sectors, so it is plausible that this share of the budget was not gender mainstreamed in practice.

Approximately 11 % of the budget includes gender as a one-sentence phrase without further specification. This indicates probably only a cosmetic upgrading. For example, an NIP that mentions that ‘gender is a crosscutting issue that will be mainstreamed’, without further specification on what this entails. There is a possibility that this part of the budget was gender mainstreamed in the implementation phase, but I suppose this is highly unlikely. It is more plausible that the inclusion of a gender phrase is only make-up to fulfil the EC programming standards formally.

Looking at the budgetary categories with up to three references (likely to be gender mainstreamed) or with four or more references in the objectives or expected results (very likely to be gender mainstreamed) are respectively 10.99 % and 3.48 %. For these two categories, it is reasonable to say that it is (very) likely they will be gender mainstreamed in practice, although gender was not included explicitly in the measurement indicators. Approximately one quarter of the budget is fully gender mainstreamed using gender indicators. As gender is not included into large part of EC development aid from 2002 to 2013 (not gender mainstreamed + standard reference: 61 %), I conclude from the budget analysis that add-on WID policies have not yet made place for an integral gender mainstreaming approach where the budget systematically reflects gender equality objectives.

2.3 Gendered Language

A word count gives an indication of the extent to which the discourse has changed from a focus on women to a focus on gender relations. When a GAD approach is in place, there should be an equal share of references to women and to men. An imbalance would indicate that implicitly one sex is taken as the norm, whereas the other sex is constituted as a problem. I have counted references that relate exclusively to women (including ‘women’, ‘woman’, ‘girl’, ‘mother’ and ‘female’), exclusively to men (including ‘men’, ‘man’, ‘boy’, ‘father’ and ‘male’) and references that relate to both sexes equally (including ‘gender’ and ‘sex’). A word count is of course only a first step. Next, I will examine what specific roles are attributed to both men and women, and to what extent gender stereotypes are challenged or reproduced.

t2.1 **Table 2** Number of references to women/men/gender

t2.2	CSPs and NIPs	Number of references	Percentage
t2.3	References to women	2639	55.64 %
t2.4	References to men	610	12.86 %
t2.5	References to gender/sex	1494	31.50 %

170 **2.3.1 Is the Language Gender Mainstreamed?**

171 As seen in Table 2, language analysis of 98 CSPs and NIPs from 2002 to 2013
172 shows that there is an overrepresentation of references that relate exclusively to
173 women (55.64 %) compared to references that relate exclusively to men (12.86 %).
174 From this evidence I conclude that the formal language used in the CSPs and NIPs
175 is more the typical Women In Development language than a genuine Gender and
176 Development language that involves both women and men equally in the analysis
177 and solutions for gender equality. The language used in the CSPs and NIPs is
178 thus not genuinely mainstreamed. Although the EC labels its approach as gender
179 mainstreaming, the language analysis reveals that the EC’s perspective on gender
180 inequality shows features of the conservative WID paradigm as gender still mainly
181 equals women.

182 When examining the content of these references it became clear that it is mainly
183 exclusively women who are mentioned when analysing problems concerning gender
184 inequalities. Women are linked to problems with gender inequality while men rarely
185 appear in the country analysis and are almost never explicitly problematized.² The
186 610 times men are mentioned, this is mostly in a general phrase referring to
187 “equality between men and women”, or in quantitative terms (for example percentage
188 of boys/girls enrolled). What is more, women are not only seen as the main problem
189 holders in the gender (in)equality question, they are also made solely responsible
190 for the solution as men almost never appear as a target group to promote gender
191 equality in society.³ It is clear that—looking at the gendered framing of solutions
192 for gender equality—the EC’s perspective resembles the WID paradigm. One of the
193 core features of GAD and the gender mainstreaming strategy, which is “the shared
194 responsibility of women and men in removing imbalances in society” (Council of
195 Europe 1998, p. 18), is completely missing in the CSPs and NIPs. Neglecting the
196 role of men in solving the gender inequality puzzle is harmful for results. To create
197 a gender equal society men need to be brought on board and higher financial and
198 intellectual investments need to be made to change discriminatory gender norms.

² With the exception of the issue of domestic or gender-based violence, where men are sometimes problematized, when they are conceptualized as perpetrators (but never as possible victims). Most CSPs however, leave men out of the picture when talking about domestic and gender-based violence and talk about the issue as a women as problem only.

³ With the single exception of the Indian NIP, that proposes to increase efforts for a greater responsibility and participation of men in reproductive health, not a single other NIP mentions men explicitly as target group in the gender-inequality question.

It is also remarkable that references to the gendered distribution of unpaid care work—housework and care of persons that occurs in homes and communities on an unpaid basis—are scarce in the diagnoses and absent in the prognoses. In the country analysis, only five CSPs out of 98 mention women’s double burden or household tasks (first generation CSP Peru, Gambia and Tanzania and second generation CSP Botswana and Sierra Leone), although it is widely recognised that “unpaid care work is a major contributing factor to gender inequality and women’s poverty” (Budlender 2004, p. v; 2008; Razavi 2007; Gammage 2010). This neglect is problematic for several reasons. While the silence on this topic implicitly legitimises the unequal division of care work between men and women, it also implies that such work is valueless and ignores its connection to economic growth and development in general (Budlender 2004; 2008; Razavi 2007). Furthermore, leaving women’s disproportionately large share in non-market care work out of the analysis has implications for the quality of the overall gender analysis. This is because the gender bias in unpaid care work creates a gendered “time and income poverty” (Gammage 2010) that has a direct impact on several of the issues that are put forward in the CSPs and NIPs, such as women’s access to (full-time) education and jobs or their vulnerability to gender-based violence. The invisibility of these links in the analysed documents results in a biased analysis.

Furthermore, I found that several CSPs refer to women as a vulnerable group or even as “the most vulnerable segment. . . of the population” (European Commission 2007b, p. 29). Women are also often lumped together with other groups that are deemed vulnerable such as children, elderly, orphans, and “the disabled” (European Commission 2007c, p. 5). In several CSPs and NIPs, women are conceptualized as passive victims of poverty, sex traffickers, violence, or tradition. This conceptualization of women as the vulnerable victim is stereotyping and leans close to Chandra Mohanty’s (1991) highly criticized objectification or victimization of “Third World women.” This means that women as a category of analysis are defined in terms of their object or victim status, or in the way they are affected by, or not affected by, certain systems or institutions (Mohanty 1991).

2.4 Frame

Policy documents typically contain a diagnosis (what is the problem) and a prognosis (solution/s) of the issue at stake, including ideas on the causes of the problem, “the ends that can be reached through the use of certain means, and on the desirability of certain outcomes” (Verloo 2005, p. 22). In this section I examine which gender issues are identified as problems and solutions in the CSPs and NIPs.

2.4.1 How Is Gender Equality Framed?

In-depth analysis of the EU programming documents reveals that gender inequality in the CSP’s country diagnoses is mainly put forward as a problem of maternal

mortality (48 out of 98 CSPs), access to education (41) and income disparity and poverty (36). Violence against women (32), unemployment and access to jobs (29) and the lack of access to decision-making (24) are also important. The main solutions put forward in the NIPs to tackle gender inequalities are focussed on education (30 NIPs), employment (24 NIPs) and reducing maternal mortality (13 NIPs). Outlining the main problems and solutions reveals two important frames, a poverty reduction frame and a labor market or economic growth frame. The analysis of the main solutions shows that two out of three of the dominant solutions, are located within the UN Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), namely Goal two to achieve universal primary education, Goal three to promote gender equality and empower women (with the concrete target to eliminate gender disparities in all levels of education by 2015) and Goal five to improve maternal health (with the targets to reduce maternal mortality and achieve universal access to reproductive health). Although “the more optimistic readings of the MGDs” have stressed their contribution “to ‘en-gendering’ the global development agenda” (Chant 2007, p. 10), feminists around the world have criticised the MDGs for their narrow scope and minimal poverty agenda (Chant 2010; Subrahmanian 2007; Mukhopadhyay 2007). In their view, the MDGs ignore systemic political and power issues concerning gender inequality and do not use a human rights framework, which depicts “people as ‘rights holders’ who can mobilise to demand the realisation of their rights” rather than as passive recipients of policies (Barton 2005, p. 29). Furthermore, the emphasis is on girls’ rather than women’s voices and rights and “far-reaching but controversial areas” such as land rights, male violence and sexual and reproductive rights are ignored (Johnsson-Latham 2010, p. 44). Feminists “struggling against the vice of neoliberal theory and policy” even view the MDGs as “a significant step, but in the wrong direction” (Saith 2006, p. 1174). Also gender equality in employment is often framed as a solution to eradicate poverty. Like for example in the Ethiopian CSP were it is stated that “women’s contribution to household income and production is crucial for fighting poverty.” (European Commission 2002a, p. 11) In this poverty-frame the integration of gender equality in employment is also located within the MDGs, namely Goal one to eradicate extreme poverty. In this case, gender equality is used instrumentally to reach the goal of poverty eradication and not as an aim in itself (Debusscher and Van der Vleuten 2012). Such instrumentalist policies serve to maintain traditional gender roles rather than to dismantle gender inequalities (Molyneux 2006; Roy 2010). Moser and Moser aptly summarise the debate on the pros and cons of instrumentalism. It can be defended for pragmatic reasons because “in the ‘real’ world of politics, compromises and strategic alliances are parts of reality”, but it “risks depoliticizing the transformative nature of the feminist agenda” and thus strips gender mainstreaming of its transformative potential (Moser and Moser 2005, pp. 14–15).

In an equal amount of cases employment and education as main solution for gender equality are framed instrumentally to achieve economic goals. This was mostly the case in the Southern European Neighbourhood countries and in some Latin American countries (Debusscher 2012a, b). Women must be educated and

integrated in employment to “contribute to growth,” “build a knowledge society,” 283
(European Commission 2007c, pp. 20–21), bring “industrial modernisation” (Euro- 284
pean Commission 2002b, p. 27), or “ensure a technologically skilled and adaptable 285
workforce” (European Commission 2007d, p. 24). In several policy documents 286
education is framed as a tool for development and a preparation for the labor 287
market. In general, education is not framed as a basic human right, neither is it 288
framed as a tool to bring gender equality into the intimate sphere. For example, in 289
the Ecuadorian NIP the main objective of the budgetary sector on education is “to 290
train a competitive labor force directed at the country’s productive needs and with a 291
foothold in the market” (European Commission 2007e, p. 34). The aid program also 292
explicitly stresses the importance of participation of girls and young women in 293
technical and vocational education. The goal of gender equality is strategically 294
brought into the education sector and it is framed economically. Gender equality 295
however is not a goal in itself. Other gender policies could be seen as supporting 296
this dominant economic frame. For example reproductive health allows women to 297
control their fertility and be more active on the labor market. Sometimes also less 298
evident policy areas are framed economically, as for example in the Colombian 299
CSP where violence against women is a situation that “entails high economic costs 300
for the country” (European Commission 2007f, p. 12). This economic emphasis is 301
convergent with the early WID tradition, where “the underlying rational. . . was that 302
women are an untapped resource who can provide an economic contribution to 303
development.” (Moser 1993, p. 2). Also it is convergent with the manner in which 304
gender equality is typically framed by the World Bank. As put forward by several 305
authors the World Bank’s traditional justification for gender mainstreaming its 306
lending programmes, sector projects and policy formulation is “the synergy 307
between reducing gender disparities and achieving greater economic growth.” 308
(Schech and Vas Dev 2007, p. 16) Since 2006 the World Bank explicitly considers 309
gender as “smart economics” raising productivity, growth, and improving other 310
development outcomes such as poverty reduction (World Bank 2006, 2012). Nev- 311
ertheless the World Bank’s gender equality and growth frame has received many 312
criticism of scholars in the fields of gender studies and development, as policies 313
creating economic growth on the macro level may still turn out to have negative 314
consequences for women’s health and well-being, destroy human capacities or 315
reduce people’s access to goods and services (Elson and Cagatay 2000; Schech 316
and Vas Dev 2007). Furthermore its policies have been criticised for being conser- 317
vative as they do little improve the position of women and change discriminatory 318
gender roles (Brym et al. 2005). 319

3 Conclusions

320

This article has examined gender mainstreaming in the programming of EU devel- 321
opment cooperation for the period 2002–2013 using a budget, language and frame 322
analysis, in order to evaluate whether or not the EU can be considered a leading and 323

324 distinctive gender actor. To answer this question I combine two sub questions.
325 First I evaluate whether a shift has been made from a conservative Women in
326 Development paradigm to a transformative Gender and Development paradigm to
327 determine if the EU lives up to European and international commitments on gender
328 equality and can be considered to be leading by example. Second I examine
329 whether the EU advocates a distinctive 'Europeanness' in its gender policy towards
330 developing countries. The analysis of budget, language and frame shows that the
331 shift from a conservative WID to a transformative GAD paradigm has barely been
332 made in practice. Over 60 % of the budget from 2002 to 2013 does not include
333 gender issues and only one quarter of the development budget from 2002 to 2013
334 was fully gender mainstreamed using gender indicators. Furthermore, when the
335 policies talk about gender, they mainly refer to women. Conceptions of masculinity
336 and femininity, as well as the gendered division of care work are not questioned in
337 policy texts. On the one hand, women tend to be victimized and are referred to as
338 'vulnerable.' Men, on the other hand, are barely mentioned. In general, men are the
339 silent norm that women have to catch up with as problem holders. This conception
340 of women as sole problem and solution holders in the gender inequality puzzle fits
341 the conservative WID paradigm, and is contradictory to a genuine GAD paradigm
342 where men and women share responsibility in removing imbalances in society. The
343 applied approach is also limited to the extent that apart from the 'usual suspects'
344 (health, education and work) gender issues have been included in few new domains
345 (e.g. transport). Such approach clearly does not fit a gender mainstreaming strategy
346 which includes a gender equality perspective into all policies. Furthermore, the
347 approach remains predominately instrumentalist as gender issues are framed
348 within the dominant development policy paradigms and as they are 'sold' as a
349 way of more effectively achieving other policy goals such as economic growth or
350 poverty reduction. The frame analysis thus shows that rather than a distinctive
351 'Europeanness' in its gender policy towards developing countries, the EU's policy
352 has few innovative elements. The two major gender frames that are used in the
353 EU's programming documents—a poverty frame and an economic growth frame—
354 correspond to the frames that are used in the UN's MDGs and the World Bank's
355 gender policies. It seems that rather than an innovative and distinctive gender
356 actor, the EU's gender equality approach in its development policy can be called
357 a patchwork of approaches borrowed from the UN and the World Bank. This may
358 not be surprising. Although the EU has always been involved with developing
359 countries, its main mandate concerns economic integration on the European conti-
360 nent, whereas development occupies a central place in the mandates of international
361 organizations such as the World Bank or the UN (Orbie et al. 2012). What is often
362 stressed in the literature to explain why the EU "is usually a taker of policy
363 from other sources rather than an institution that sets the international agenda
364 on contemporary problems in development", are the bureaucratic procedures, the
365 limited analytical capacity and competences of the EU in development aid policies
366 (OECD-DAC 2002, p. 60). This means that the EU simply lacks the staff, exper-
367 tise and knowledge to develop new and innovative ideas in development policy
368 (Santiso 2003), in contrast to the "intellectual monopoly" of the World Bank

(Baroncelli 2011, p. 646) or the UN. This chapter shows that these general conclusions on EU development policy are also valid for the EU's gender equality policies. In conclusion, the EU fails to live up to European and international commitments on gender equality and cannot be considered to be leading by example. Also, as the EU's gender frames are derived from other international institutions, the EU is not the distinctive and innovative gender power it claims to be.

References

- Barton, C. (2005). Where to for women's movements and the MDGs? *Gender and Development*, 13(1), 25–35.
- Baroncelli, E. (2011). The EU at the World Bank: institutional and policy performance. *Journal of European Integration*, 33(6), 637–650.
- Beetham, G. (2010). Gender, poverty and aid architecture. In S. Chant (Ed.), *Handbook on gender and poverty* (pp. 497–503). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Brym, R., et al. (2005). In faint praise of the WB's gender development policy. *The Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 30(1), 95–111.
- Budlender, D. (2004). *Why should we care about unpaid care work?* New York: UNIFEM.
- Budlender, D. (2008). *The Statistical Evidence on Care and Non-Care Work Across Six Countries (Programme Paper No. 4)*. Geneva: UNRISD.
- Chant, S. (2007). *Gender, cities, and the millennium development goals in the global south' (New series working Paper, Issue 21)*. London: LSE Gender Institute.
- Chant, S. (2010). *The international handbook of gender and poverty: concepts, research, policy*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Council of Europe. (1998). *Gender mainstreaming. Conceptual framework, Methodology and Presentation of Good Practices. Final Report of Activities of the Group of Specialists on Mainstreaming*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Debusscher, P. (2011). Mainstreaming gender in European commission development policy: conservative Europeanness? *Women's Studies International Forum*, 34(1), 39–49.
- Debusscher, P. (2012a) Gender Mainstreaming in European Union Development Policy towards Latin America: Transforming Gender Relations or Confirming Hierarchies? *Latin American Perspectives*.
- Debusscher, P. (2012b) Mainstreaming Gender in European Commission Development Policy in the European Neighborhood. *Journal of Women, Politics and Policy*.
- Debusscher, P., & True, J. (2009). Lobbying the EU for Gender-Equal Development. In J. Orbie & L. Tortell (Eds.), *The EU and the social dimension of globalization*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Debusscher, P., & Van der Vleuten, A. (2012). Mainstreaming gender in European Union development cooperation with sub-Saharan Africa: promising numbers, narrow contents, telling silences. *International Development Planning Review*, 34(3), 319–338. doi:10.3828/idpr.2012.19.
- Elson, D., & Cagatay, N. (2000). The social content of macroeconomic policies. *World Development*, 28(7), 1347–1364.
- Elson, D., & Sharp, R. (2010). Gender-responsive budgeting and women's poverty. In S. Chant (Ed.), *Handbook on gender and poverty* (pp. 522–27). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- European Commission (2001). *Programme of Action for the Mainstreaming of Gender Equality in Community Development Cooperation*. COM(2001) 295, 21 June.
- European Commission (2002a). *Ethiopia—European Community. Country Strategy Paper and National Indicative Programme for the period 2002–2007*.
- European Commission (2002b). *Syria Country Strategy Paper 2002–2006 and National Indicative Programme 2002–2004*.

375 AU1

AU2

415

- 416 European Commission (2007a). *Gender Equality and Women Empowerment in Development*
 417 *Cooperation*. COM(2007) 100, 8 March.
- 418 European Commission (2007b). *Syrian Arab Republic Strategy Paper 2007–2013 and National*
 419 *Indicative Programme 2007–2010*.
- 420 European Commission (2007c). *Algeria Strategy Paper 2007–2013 and National Indicative*
 421 *Programme 2007–2010*.
- 422 European Commission (2007d). *Morocco National Indicative Programme 2007–2010*. AU3
- 423 European Commission (2007e). *Egypt Country Strategy Paper 2007–2013*.
- 424 European Commission (2007f). *Ecuador Country Strategy Papers 2007–2013*, 10.04.2007
 425 (E/2007/621).
- 426 European Commission (2007 g). *Colombia Country Strategy Papers 2007–2013*, 28.03.2007
 427 (E/2007/484).
- 428 European Commission (2010). *EU Plan of Action on Gender Equality and Women's Empower-*
 429 *ment in Development 2010–2015*. SEC(2010) 265, 8 March.
- 430 European Council (1995). *Resolution on Integrating Gender Issues in Development Cooperation*.
 431 12847/95, 20 December.
- 432 European Council (1998). *Regulation on Integrating of Gender Issues in Development Coopera-*
 433 *tion*. 2836/98, 22 December.
- 434 European Parliament and Council (2004). *Regulation on Promoting Gender Equality in Develop-*
 435 *ment Cooperation*. 806/2004, 21 April.
- 436 Gammage, S. (2010). Time pressed and time poor: unpaid household work in Guatemala. *Feminist*
 437 *Economics*, 16(3), 79–112.
- 438 Johnsson-Latham, G. (2010). Power, privilege and gender as reflected in poverty analysis
 439 and development goals. In S. Chant (Ed.), *The international handbook of gender and poverty*
 440 (pp. 41–46). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- 441 McCrae, H. (2010). The EU as a gender equal polity: myths and realities. *Journal of Common*
 442 *Market Studies*, 48(1), 155–174.
- 443 Mohanty, C. (1991). *Third world women and the politics of feminism*. Bloomington: Indiana
 444 University Press.
- 445 Moser, C. (1993). *Gender planning and development: theory, practice and training*. London:
 446 Routledge.
- 447 Moser, C., & Moser, A. (2005). Gender mainstreaming since Beijing: A review of success and
 448 limitations in international institutions. *Gender & Development*, 13(2), 11–22.
- 449 Molyneux, M. (2006). Mothers at the service of the new poverty agenda: progres/a/oportunidades,
 450 Mexico's conditional transfer programme. *Social Policy & Administration*, 40(4), 425–49.
- 451 Mukhopadhyay, M. (2007). Mainstreaming gender or “streaming” gender away: feminists
 452 marooned in the development business. In A. Cornwall, E. Harrison, & A. Whitehead (Eds.),
 453 *Feminisms in development: contradictions, contestations & challenges* (pp. 135–149). London:
 454 Zed Books.
- 455 OECD-DAC (2002). *EC Development cooperation review*. Paris: OECD.
- 456 Orbie, J., Del Biondo, K., Delputte, S., Reynaert, V., Verschaeve J., Bossuyt F. (2012) Still
 457 a Norm Taker? European Union Development Policy in the Shadow of the World Bank.
 458 Paper presented at the EUIA conference, Brussels, 3–5 May 2012.
- 459 Painter, G., & Ulmer, K. (2002). *Everywhere and nowhere: assessing gender mainstreaming in*
 460 *European community development cooperation*. London and Brussels: One World Action and
 461 Aprodev.
- 462 Petó, A., & Manners, I. (2006). The European Union and the value of gender equality.
 463 In I. Manners & S. Lucarelli (Eds.), *Values and principles in European Union foreign policy*.
 464 London: Routledge.
- 465 Razavi, S. (2007). *The political and social economy of care in a development context: conceptual*
 466 *issues, research questions and policy options*. Geneva: UNRISD.
- 467 Roy, A. (2010). Millennial woman: the gender order of development. In S. Chant (Ed.), *The*
 468 *international handbook of gender and poverty* (pp. 548–53). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

- Saith, A. (2006). From universal values to MDGs: lost in translation. *Development and Change*, 37(6), 1167–99.
- Santiso, C. (2003). Sisyphus in the castle: improving European Union strategies for democracy promotion and governance conditionality. *The European Journal of Development Research*, 15(1), 1–28.
- Schech, S., & Vas Dev, S. (2007). Gender justice: the World Bank’s new approach to the poor? *Development in Practice*, 17(1), 14–26.
- Subrahmanian, R. (2007). Making sense of gender in shifting institutional contexts: some reflections on gender mainstreaming. In A. Cornwall, E. Harrison, & A. Whitehead (Eds.), *Feminisms in development: contradictions, contestations and challenges* (pp. 112–21). London: Zed Books.
- Verloo, M. (2005). Mainstreaming gender equality in Europe: a critical frame analysis. *The Greek Review of Social Research*, 117(B), 11–34.
- Walby, S. (2005). Measuring women’s progress in a global era. *International Social Science Journal*, 2(57), 371–87.
- World Bank (2006) Gender Equality as Smart Economics: A World Bank Group Gender Action Plan (Fiscal years 2007–10) September, 2006 <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTGENDER/Resources/GAPNov2.pdf> Accessed 22 March 2012.
- World Bank (2012). Implications of World Development Report 2012: Gender Equality and Development for the World Bank Group [http://siteresources.worldbank.org/DEVCOMMINT/Documentation/23004019/DC2011-0011\(E\)WDR2012_Gender.pdf](http://siteresources.worldbank.org/DEVCOMMINT/Documentation/23004019/DC2011-0011(E)WDR2012_Gender.pdf) Accessed 7 April 2012.

Author Queries

Chapter No.: 17

Query Refs.	Details Required	Author's response
AU1	Following references are not cited in text "European Commission (2007g), Painter and Ulmer (2002)". Please cite these references in text or delete them from list.	
AU2	Please update references "Debusscher 2012a and b".	
AU3	European Commission (2007c) has been repeated twice, hence it was reordered. Please check.	