

# **Stretching EU Conditionality: Mechanisms of Europeanization in Making Domestic Violence Policies in Central and Eastern Europe**

**Andrea Krizsan & Raluca Popa**

## **Correspondence:**

Andrea Krizsan

Center for Policy Studies

Central European University

Nador utca 9, 1051 Budapest

Hungary

Tel.: 36-1-327-3000/2306

Fax: 36-1-235-6170

[Krizsana@ceu.hu](mailto:Krizsana@ceu.hu)

**Andrea Krizsan** is a Research Fellow at the Center for Policy Studies of the Central European University in Budapest, Hungary. Since 2006 she is a researcher of the QUING project ([www.quing.eu](http://www.quing.eu)). She has a PhD in Political Science from the Central European University. She works on policy change in Central and Eastern Europe, with special focus on equality policies and equality institutions, gender mainstreaming and domestic violence policies. Her articles have appeared or are forthcoming in *Journal for Ethnic and Minority Studies*, *European Yearbook of Minority Issues*, *Policy Studies*, *Greek Review of Social Research* and several edited volumes.

**Raluca Popa** is currently completing her PhD dissertation in Comparative Gender Studies at the Central European University (CEU), Budapest. The dissertation is preliminary entitled *Hungarian and Romanian National Women's Councils Working 'On Behalf of Women', 1957-1989: Toward a Transnational and Relational History*. Between 2007 and 2009, she was a researcher for the project Quality in Gender+ Equality Policies (QUING, [www.quiring.eu](http://www.quiring.eu)), at the Center for Policy Studies. In July 2009 Raluca Popa joined the United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM) to support programs to end violence against women in Southeast Europe.

## *Abstract*

This article analyzes how Europe matters in the development of domestic violence policies, a gender equality field outside the core European Union conditionality criteria. It process-traces the development of domestic violence policies in five Central and Eastern European countries and identifies three mechanisms of influence in the field: EU conditionality, financial incentives and discursive mechanisms used by internal actors to strategically frame the role of the EU. The analysis shows that Europeanization of policies against domestic violence is not a unidirectional EU-defined process, but rather one of norm construction and social learning through the interaction of EU institutions, governments and civil society.

## ***1. Introduction***

Policy debates in the European Union (EU) frame domestic violence as a component of gender inequality (Kantola 2006). A major difference between gender inequality in economic fields and domestic violence as a form of gender inequality nevertheless remains. The EU has no strong competence with respect to domestic violence (Kantola 2006; Kelly 2005; European Women's Lobby 2007, 5). Policy responses to domestic violence, while increasingly present in the last decade or so, remain restricted to soft law (Kantola 2006; Montoya 2008). In its soft law documents, the EC explicitly uses the standards set by the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), the Beijing Platform for Action, and Council of Europe documents, and encourages member states to do so as well.<sup>1</sup> By contrast, policy responses to gender inequality in employment and related fields are formulated in hard legislation. Whereas a specific policy response to domestic violence is not a formal criteria for EU membership, since the late 1990s, responding to the issue has become part of the fundamental norms and beliefs that shape the collective identity of the European Union. In this framework, what impact did Europeanization have in bringing about policies against domestic violence? Is the problem of domestic violence a component in the major Europeanization exercise that took place in the last decade: the eastern enlargement?

Between 2003 and 2005, amid EU accession processes, Central and East European Countries (CEECs) witnessed major reforms in the realm of domestic violence policy, in which they moved from an absence of the issue of domestic violence from policy agendas to the adoption of laws and policies that specifically aim to end it. While these changes were the outcome of a complex process of interaction between state and non-state, national, international, and transnational actors (Krizsan and Popa 2007), the timing of reforms indicates

that the influence of the EU cannot be disregarded. Europeanization has impacted the development of domestic violence policies, as demonstrated by the remarkable simultaneity of reforms in Central and East Europe during the EU accession process. This paper assesses the *specific* impact of Europeanization on domestic violence policy reform in five countries: two first-round accession countries (Hungary and Poland), two second-round accession countries (Bulgaria and Romania), and one candidate country (Croatia). This sample was chosen from a pool of ten new EU member states and three candidate countries where reforms to address domestic violence were passed around the same time. Our findings come from a larger joint research project that aims to explain outcomes in domestic violence policies by comparing actors and processes in the same five countries at the interface of Europeanization, women's movements action, and the diffusion of transnational human rights norms. In this context, the present paper focuses primarily on the impact of Europeanization, and not on United Nations (UN) processes, transnational activism, and the impact of non-governmental organization (NGO) mobilization.

The paper argues that contrary to gender equality policy in employment and related fields, where a rational model driven by "external incentives" (Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier 2005a) explains to a great extent the Europeanization process, in the field of domestic violence, Europeanization mechanisms follow different models. With respect to policies against domestic violence, although we can identify some external incentives for change, such as incidental elements of hard accession conditionality and EU's pressure for change through funding and capacity building, Europeanization during the eastern enlargement can better be explained by a logic of socialization and collective learning (Börzel and Risse 2003, 59). Through such mechanisms, Europeanization is *stretched* to the domain of domestic

violence. Since domestic violence is a policy field in which EU standards are (still) soft, the constructivist aspects of Europeanization become especially visible. European norms are constructed through interactions between the European Commission (EC), civil society, and other policy stakeholders at the national level. In the absence of clearly articulated EU norms for action against domestic violence, Europeanization is mainly driven by the identification of national policy-making environments with an abstract norm of “Europeanness.” The norm of “being European” is widely understood to include, beyond formal EU regulations, norms in members states and norms related to Council of Europe (COE) processes. As such, it also has come to include action against domestic violence. The desire to align with a perceived Europeanness contributes to policy change either because it directly motivates policy makers to act against domestic violence or because it is used strategically by NGOs to induce such action.

Following a discussion of the theoretical background to the argument, the paper looks at Europeanization first through formal EU conditionality, and second through funding and capacity-building mechanisms. Third, it analyzes how the abstract Europeanness norm has been enacted in domestic violence policies both by policy makers, who translated aspirations for EU membership into support for domestic violence reforms, and civil society activists, who strategically used these norms and aspirations in pursuit of their domestic violence agendas.

## ***2. Mechanisms of Europeanization***

This paper contributes to the literature on European integration and within that more specifically to debates about the impact of European integration and Europeanization in the realm of gender equality policy. Our approach, while making use of both constructivist and rationalist arguments, puts more emphasis on discursive factors. Given that a requirement to

enact laws and policies against domestic violence is not explicitly included among formal accession criteria, we argue that a focus on constructivist aspects leads to better results in understanding the mechanisms of Europeanization that played a role in this field.

Based on Radaelli (2004) and following Börzel and Risse (2000, 2003) we define Europeanization as consisting of “processes of a) construction, b) diffusion and c) institutionalization of formal and informal rules, procedures, policy paradigms, styles, ‘ways of doing things’ and shared beliefs and norms, which are first defined and consolidated in the EU policy process and then incorporated in the logic of domestic (national and subnational) discourse, political structures and public policies” (Radaelli 2004, 3). This definition has the advantage of potentially allowing for the inclusion of “feedback loops” from domestic to European levels (Börzel and Risse 2003, 74).

The eastern enlargement of the European Union that has been taking place since the second part of the 1990s is a major Europeanization project, legitimated from the very beginning by an “ideology of pan-European community of liberal democratic states” (Schimmelfennig 2005, 143) and references to a common European identity. In the process, CEECs made their accession claims on the basis of their perceived belonging to Europe—not only in geographical terms, but also in terms of membership in the normative community of Europe. Their aspiration to return to the/a European identity, liberal democracy, and multilateralism after an artificial break was formulated (*ibid.*, 159). Schimmelfennig argues that this common abstract European identity was strategically used in what he calls rhetorical action by accession states and their member-state allies to oppose arguments against the enlargement (*ibid.*).

In formal terms, enlargement has meant the alignment of the institutional and legislative system of applicant states with an *acquis communautaire* made up by an enormous amount of legislative material referring to a multitude of policy fields, including gender equality. However, beyond the formal criteria established by the *acquis*, EU accession and Europeanization processes also impacted other policy fields where the EU had no direct competence, but did have a common set of norms established for the EU level through soft laws. While some scholars argue (Gavrilova 2008) that the EU-CEEC relationship is a state capture relation in which the EU defines, in a top-down manner, the policy agendas of the target states and the direction and substance of change, this paper sides with theoretical arguments for a more complex relationship, in which different mechanisms are at place in various policy fields, and these mechanisms presume different types of relationships between the EU and CEECs. Rather than a mere top-down dynamic, there are continuous feedback processes that lead from domestic to EU levels (Börzel and Risse 2003, 74).

Scholars of Europeanization have distinguished between two logics of domestic change as a result of European integration: a logic of consequences and a logic of appropriateness. Börzel and Risse (2003), following Checkel (1999), Olsen (1996), and Börzel (2002) characterize these two distinct logics in terms of differential empowerment and socialization. Both logics are set into motion by a “misfit” (Cowles, Caporaso, and Risse 2001) between domestic practices and EU policies or norms. The first logic, generally theorized by rationalist institutionalism, explains domestic change as a process of redistribution of resources, in which Europeanization is conceptualized as an emerging political opportunity structure, which offers some actors additional resources to exert influence, while severely constraining the ability of others to pursue their goals (Börzel and Risse 2003, 63). The logic of domestic change as a



process of socialization and learning falls within the theoretical framework of sociological institutionalism. More specifically, within the different strands of sociological institutionalism, the more agency-centered version focuses on socialization processes by which actors learn to internalize new norms and rules in order to become members of (international) society (Finnemore and Sikkink 1998; Checkel 1999). Börzel and Risse (2003) emphasize that the two logics of change (rationalist and constructivist or sociological) are not mutually exclusive. They often occur simultaneously or characterize different phases in a process of adaptation.

Looking at which of the two logics was followed when adopting EU policies or norms, as well as who is the main actor initiating the process of adoption (whether the EU or CEEC), Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier (2005a, 8-10) differentiate between three mechanisms of Europeanization: external incentives, social learning, and lesson drawing. The *external incentives mechanism* operates behind EU conditionality. It is based on a system of external rewards and sanctions, which is clearly EU-driven and top-down; it adds to cost-benefit calculations of CEECs. The *social learning model*, though EU-driven, does not operate on a sanctions-rewards mechanism, but rather on the basis of CEECs' identification with EU norms, which is facilitated by the EU with instruments such as persuasion, capacity building, and the promotion of transnational cooperation and exchanges of good practices. The *lesson-drawing model* is based on the adopting state's own initiative to integrate EU norms in its practice because they provide appropriate responses and good solutions to policy dilemmas at stake in the country. A lesson-drawing mechanism is successful if the norms to be followed are seen by the target country as appropriate and transferable to policy dilemmas for which local solutions are believed to have failed. The functioning of this mechanism is further facilitated by the association of policy actors with EU-centered epistemic communities (ibid., 20-25).

Starting from the typology developed by Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier, in this analysis, we develop further the study of mechanisms of Europeanization by detailing the processes through which change is induced. We find that processes of norm construction (following Radaelli's definition, 2004) and norms entrepreneurship (Risse 2000) intervene both in the logic of setting the EU demands as well as in the logic of domestic changes. These processes are not unidirectional, from the EU to a state. They can rather be described as an interaction and continuous adaptation of domestic policy environments to EU pressures, and also *vice-versa*, as the adaptation of EU norms and requirements to specific domestic circumstances.

### ***3. Europeanization and gender equality***

Studies of gender equality in the enlargement process draw a clear distinction between gender equality fields covered by hard law and related strong conditionality criteria, particularly the different directives relating to gender inequality in employment and connected fields, and gender equality fields that are only covered by soft legislation. In the fields where hard law has governed the accession process, it has been argued that the relatively successful formal adoption of rules has not been followed by adoption at behavioral and discursive levels (Open Society Institute 2005; Bretherton 2006; Krizsan and Zentai 2006; Sloat 2006; Falkner et al. 2008; Beveridge forthcoming 2009). There is widespread agreement that problems around implementation abound. Looking at the mainstreaming of gender equality in the enlargement negotiations, Bretherton (2006) argues that eastern enlargement can be seen as a missed opportunity. Following an initial pre-accession commitment to gender equality and

gender mainstreaming as central values of the accession negotiations, she contends, gender equality was pushed aside from among the core EU values.

It has also been argued that EU influence regarding gender equality has shifted from external incentives driven conditionality mechanisms, characteristic to the pre-accession period, to social learning and capacity building mechanisms typical for employment, social inclusion and structural funds distribution related policy processes, which started shortly prior to the accession and continue since (Krizsan and Zentai 2006; Beveridge 2009). While the first stage has almost entirely missed gender equality fields beyond employment, such as violence, the second stage mechanisms can be seen to apply to other gender equality fields as well, and even generate some attempts to start mainstreaming gender equality (Krizsan and Zentai 2006; Krizsan 2009).

At the same time, theorists argue that increasingly the EU concept of gender equality is widening from its traditional focus on economic inequality to issues such as violence against women (Kantola 2006). Using a discourse analysis of domestic violence-related policy texts in the EU, Kantola finds that the EU is creating its own discourse and its own institutional setup responding to domestic violence as a part of gender inequality. Even if it happens through soft law, argues Kantola, an ever-strengthening commitment of the EU to address domestic violence can be discerned. She also contends that meanings of Europeanization might vary when looking at different fields of gender equality, depending on whether the fields are seen as more central or peripheral to gender equality. The impact of Europeanization in the different gender equality policy fields in the different countries may largely depend on the stage of advancement of the particular policy field in the respective country in relation to EU norms (Kantola 2006). Montoya (2008) argues for the important impact the EU has had on domestic

violence policy within the framework of eastward expansion through building capacity of NGOs and local institutions and facilitating networking and transnational cooperation. In her analysis of the EU Daphne Program that supported community action to prevent and combat violence against children, young people and women, she shows how, through the means of the program, the EU has improved the capacity of NGOs to advocate for change and supported cooperation and transnational networking of NGOs and other organizations in order to achieve change in domestic violence policies in the region (Montoya 2008).

The analysis in this paper aims to verify two theoretical claims in the literature on Europeanization and gender equality. In line with Kantola (2006) and Montoya (2008), we argue that soft mechanisms such as social learning or lessons drawing expand the reach of Europeanization to fields that fall outside the core negotiation criteria used in the eastern enlargement. We show that domestic violence is such a field where Europeanization has had an impact, albeit an uneven one across the five countries. Whether or not Europeanization has an impact on the formulation of domestic violence policies seems to depend on: the proximity of debate to accession date, the level of policy development in the country compared to the EU (Kantola 2006), and the mobilization of civil society domestically in favor of reforms or against them. Understanding Europeanization mechanisms in domestic violence policies adds important knowledge to our general understanding of Europeanization processes in the framework of the eastern enlargement.

#### *4. Mechanisms of Europeanization in the formulation of domestic violence policies: widening formal conditionality*

Albeit marginal on the overall agenda, and not formally part of the hard conditionality criteria, the issue of domestic violence has at times become part of the strong requirements and incentives of EU accession. Its inclusion among these requirements has only been incidental, but it has nevertheless occurred. Thus, it is important that we consider it. In order to assess the impact of EU hard conditionality for domestic violence policies, we analyzed the Regular Reports issued by the European Commission to monitor the fulfillment of the accession criteria in each country. We argue that hard conditionality criteria are widened incidentally to include domestic violence policy-related elements. This is particularly the case when the problem of domestic violence is somehow linked to core conditionality criteria and backed by NGO advocacy. Once the issue of domestic violence reaches the agenda of the monitoring exercise, it seems to persist there and become part of the regular criteria.

Regular Reports have been written yearly for countries of the region since 1998. They constituted the main form of feedback from the EC to states and as such, have been a relatively strong instrument. Integration of domestic violence among the review criteria may play a role in legitimizing the issue and securing or at least supporting policy responses in the respective countries. Our analysis in the five countries shows no clear pattern in the attention from the EC to the issue of domestic violence. Attention is incidental and inconsistent; at first, it is unclear why some countries receive it and others do not.

**Table 1. European Commission pressure on domestic violence countries** about here

Table 1 shows that while for some countries, the EC disregards domestic violence entirely, in others, the issue stays on the agenda. Whereas reports for Hungary and Bulgaria do not mention domestic violence at all, the issue recurs in most Romanian and Polish reports. These differences are not explained by the presence or absence of debates around domestic violence in national contexts, as such debates were taking place in all four countries at the time the reports were written.

What can explain this incidental inclusion of domestic violence among the conditionality criteria? The absence of a formal and sustained commitment from the EU to monitoring domestic violence regulations as part of the accession process is clearly justified by a lack of competence of the EU in the field. Nevertheless, individual negotiations and consultation processes of the EC with local stakeholders seem to create opportunities for fields that are not part of the core to be integrated in the reports. The issue of domestic violence may or may not be on the monitoring agenda, and the reasons are quite circumstantial. A specific event (Poland) or targeted advocacy from civil society actors (Romania), for instance, might trigger the inclusion of domestic violence on the monitoring agenda. For Poland, the main concern that triggered the integration of the issue in the reports was the government's decision in 1998 to suspend a cooperative program between the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) and the state towards the improvement of the shelter system for victims of domestic violence. The decision was taken in the context of a larger opposition of the conservative government supported by conservative groups in the country to EU-driven gender equality policy developments (Leah Seppanen Anderson 2006). In Romania, the inclusion of domestic

violence was initially integrated within a larger set of changes to the Penal Code that prominently included the decriminalization of homosexuality—a highly contentious issue that raised protracted debates among civil society and decision makers equally.

While incidental and irregular across countries, attention to domestic violence seems nevertheless to endure and even develop once it has emerged on the monitoring agenda. In Poland and Romania, monitoring continued. In Poland, the European Commission first expressed its concern that “national policies were not providing support for the victims of spousal violence” in 1999 (1999a, 17). Afterwards, concern with the lack of response from the government to spousal violence was included in two more Regular Reports. At the same time, there is reason to be skeptical about the full commitment of the European Commission to the issue, since Poland actually became a member of the European Union without having specific legislation against domestic violence, which was passed only in 2005. For Romania, the European Commission first urged action against domestic violence in the 1999 Regular Report, when it recommended “changes in the Criminal Code on the issue of domestic violence and abuse” (1999b, 17). Subsequent reports not only reiterated concern with the governmental response to the issue, but also included monitoring of progress made in the field. After specific legislation against domestic violence was passed in 2003, the EC went on to review implementation and made specific detailed recommendations on the topic, as if domestic violence would have constituted a core element of the accession agenda (European Commission Regular Reports on Romania 2003, 2004, and 2005.)

The case of Croatia is quite different from the other four countries. By 2004, when Croatia became a candidate country for EU membership, specific legislation against domestic violence had been passed (2003) and domestic violence had been recognized as a crime in the

Criminal Code (2000). Croatia was ahead of other European countries in the field. In line with previous findings about the higher relevance of accession for reforms in fields where national policies are less developed than EU policies (Kantola 2006), the positive tone of the Progress Report is not surprising: it commends the country for having established “trained around-the-clock teams in police departments to deal with family violence” (European Commission 2006, 10).

In sum, the review of the Regular Reports on progress towards accession for Bulgaria, Croatia, Hungary, Poland, and Romania shows that there is no clear pattern of when and why the issue of domestic violence becomes part of the monitoring framework for EU accession. While the problem of domestic violence is equally present in all countries<sup>2</sup> the EC has only paid attention to the issue in some of them—notably, in Romania, as a result of advocacy from human rights activists, and in Poland, where the issue of domestic violence was part of a larger opposition to EU norms on gender equality. The EC involvement with domestic violence as part of the EU enlargement process is up for negotiation in the different national environments. EU institutions, in particular the EC, are more prone to react in situations where compliance with the *acquis communautaire* is contested (Poland), but they might also take a stance in response to concerns from human rights and gender equality activists in civil society.

### ***5. Facilitating social learning for change: the Daphne project***

Alongside the direct external incentive mechanism represented by the monitoring done in the Regular Reports, financial incentives aimed at capacity building and facilitating transnational exchange can also be seen as mechanisms promoting Europeanization in the field of domestic violence. In order to examine this type of mechanism, we looked at patterns of



funding coming from Daphne, the core anti-violence program of the EC<sup>3</sup>. Daphne has impacted the development of domestic violence policies through the provision of financial incentives for capacity building and transnational exchange for different level actors, but particularly NGOs in the context of ending violence against women. Thus, beyond being an advocacy ally to organizations working to change domestic violence policy, the EC has also provided important financial support for projects that addressed the issue from before the accession of the CEEC countries.

Daphne was established in 1997. Initially called the Daphne Initiative, it was later on named Daphne I from 2000 to 2003, Daphne II from 2004, and Daphne III Program from 2007-2013. Daphne focuses on all types of violence against children, young people, and women, including domestic violence. Until 2006, it has funded some 300 projects and spent approximately 50 million Euros (Montoya 2008, 362-3). The main aims of the Project were, from the beginning, to support awareness raising, training, and research initiatives, promote cooperation between NGOs and voluntary sector organizations (and from 2000, local public institutions) across member states and beyond, and to facilitate the exchange of good practices through networking<sup>4</sup>. Daphne never proposed to fund directly actions and projects aimed at promoting policy and legislative change. Nevertheless, the activities that it has been funding were all linked in one way or another to the development of a common set of norms and practices of violence against women, including domestic violence, for the EU membership. The program ultimately aimed through all of its activities to promote the social learning of policy actors and European member state polities to adopt those norms.

Funding through Daphne is open for applicants from Central and East European countries since 2000. The 2004 evaluation of Daphne, which covered the years 2000-2003,

roughly concluded that one-fourth of the projects targeted women specifically and another 35% included children and youth (European Commission 2004). Mid-cycle data on project partners shows that organizations from candidate countries received funding as partners in Daphne-funded projects, even though they could not coordinate projects. Thus, in the period 2000-2003, an intense period for advocacy on adoption of domestic violence legislation, organizations from Bulgaria were funded in three projects, Hungary in five, Poland in seven and Romania in six<sup>5</sup>. In the years 2004-2005, organizations from Poland and Hungary, as new member states, received funding for coordination roles in eight projects and were partners in at least 8 countries. No systematic data is available on funding for 2006-07; however, we are aware of Daphne to Hungary in at least one coordinated project and to Poland and Hungary through a project coordinated by the Women against Violence in Europe (WAVE) network. No systematic data is available on funding from Daphne to Romania, Bulgaria, and Croatia after 2001.

Daphne supports changes in policies and legislation only indirectly, through research or initiatives aimed at increasing awareness among different sectors of society and state decision-makers on the need to secure policy and legislative responses to domestic violence. In this indirect manner, almost 20 percent of Daphne projects funded in the period 1997-2004 dealt with legislation. This included research projects that gathered information and evaluated national and European legislation on violence against women, as well as projects that lobbied for new legislation (Montoya 2008, 364). In addition, more than one-third of the 303 projects that were assessed in the mid-term evaluation of Daphne I (2000-2003) reported an impact on legislation, policy, or institutional behavior (EC 2002, 41). The evaluation report further specifies the reported impact in terms of increased awareness of issues of violence (84%),

greater visibility/discussion of violence in the public arena (67%), more openness to experiences from other countries/settings (52%), emergence of local, regional, and national publicly funded initiatives (31%), or legislative/regulatory changes (17%).

Perhaps the most important contribution of Daphne is the provision of financial support for capacity building to NGOs, including a large share of women's organizations for which very limited funding is available from governments and increasingly less from international donors<sup>6</sup>. For women's organizations in CEECs, EU membership has had the unanticipated effect of a sharp decline in funding, as traditional foreign donors withdrew from the region on the assumption that the EU would fill in the gap (Silke Roth 2007). Alongside financial support for otherwise hard-hit organizations, Daphne also facilitates transnational networking among these organizations. Many observers (Johnson and Brunell 2007; Fabian 2007, Krizsan and Popa 2007) have noted the importance of transnational women's networks for the development of policy responses to domestic violence. Transnational cooperation among organizations and the facilitation of exchange of good practice models can be seen as practices of norm creation and norm diffusion at the European level. Between 2001 and 2005, 15 Daphne projects were specifically focused on the identification and dissemination of good practices; also, a specific EU-funded website developed to document emergent good practices from Daphne program ("Daphne Toolkit"). In the absence of systematic data about the implementation of the Daphne II Program (2004-2008) we can temporarily rely on examples to illustrate how transnational cooperation facilitated by Daphne funding enables learning of good practices and ultimately the transfer *and* adaptation of norms (lesson drawing). The three projects in which Hungarian organizations had a lead role, all approved in 2004, are illustrative of the mechanism described here. One of the projects, led by Women's Rights Association (NANE) in Budapest in

partnership with the Europe-wide WAVE network, aimed precisely to “apply and adapt the Training Program on Combating Violence against Women developed and piloted by the WAVE Office and the Austrian Women’s Shelter Network under Daphne I.” Another project aimed at developing a practice for “providing integrated services for victims of violence against women” brought together partner women’s and human rights organizations from Hungary, Bulgaria, Austria, and Slovakia, as well as local authorities from Hungary. Finally, a project aimed at developing the practice of gender based treatment for violent men also brought together women’s and human rights organizations from Hungary, Bulgaria, and Spain (see “Daphne Toolkit”). At least one of the organizations involved in two of the projects, the Bulgarian Gender Research Foundation, used the knowledge gained through exchanges of good practices to advocate for changes in the current law for protection against domestic violence in Bulgaria.

Based on these findings, we contend that Daphne has had an important indirect impact on the development of policies and legislation against domestic violence. The main features of the program, however, indicate that the larger aim is not to provide a substantive normative direction for policy change, but rather to facilitate the creation of mechanisms, which open space for norm diffusion and norm construction and ultimately generate change. The overall aim of the Daphne transpires to be the promotion of the idea of a common European normative basis for dealing with violence against women, one that has to be developed starting of from the recommendations of the EU, by means of transnational action and channeled into national policies with the agency of NGOs, the main partners in Daphne. The underlying mechanism in Daphne is one of norm construction and social learning.

It can be argued that, from the Europeanization point of view, Daphne presents a combination of the social learning and the lesson drawing models (Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier 2005a). While it is initiated by the EU, EU norms give little substance to what good domestic violence policy is. A common European normative background is developed through the mechanisms supported by the EU. The appropriateness of the norms developed is clearly considered in the processes of adoption. Meanwhile, Daphne's focus on the transfer of good practice models and the facilitation of transnational networking also exhibits elements of a lesson drawing model, in that ultimately, local policy actors seek feasible solutions from within the EU norms pool. Daphne is an example of a mix of social learning and lesson drawing mechanisms operating on the grounds of external incentives for the development of domestic violence policy in CEE, however it cannot be viewed as part of a substantive "EU strategy for addressing the issue of violence against women in member and candidate states" (Montoya 2008, 361).

#### ***6. The "most European" laws: Legitimizing usage of Europeanness***

As we argued above, hardly any institutional compliance was requested by the EU in relation to domestic violence. Nevertheless, EU and "Europe" more broadly have been referred to widely in some debates on domestic violence, especially in three of the five countries of our analysis (Bulgaria, Hungary, and Romania). In these debates, references to the EU and to European norms more generally were used as internal incentives legitimizing action. We mapped the discursive use of EU references, broadly defined, using data from the QUING project, as well as further documents from the 2003 policy debates in Hungary, and interviews and statements from NGO activists<sup>8</sup>.

Differentiation between the EU being invoked in the accession process either in the sense of requirements of an international institutional setup, to which the country wished to accede, or in a more abstract sense, as “Europeanness” was noted by earlier research (Dombos, Horvath and Krizsan 2007, 250). The latter designates an identity, a norm system, which creates no institutional demands, yet it is desirable, and perceived as the direction of progress. In the framework proposed by Jacquot and Woll (2003), these type of EU references qualify as a “legitimizing usage” by actors seeking to garner public acceptance of policy reforms.

Our analysis of policy debates on domestic violence found that, references to Europe or the EU specifically are very much conditioned by the proximity to the accession date. As accession dates near, related debates stretch to include domains of policy that are not formally within the purview of accession negotiations; “EU accession” tends to become a general framing for issues that are not core to the accession process, such as domestic violence. The most evident examples of this stretching of EU conditionality are the parliamentary debates on the proposals for specific domestic violence laws in Bulgaria (2004) and Romania (2003).

Data on the content of domestic violence policy debates (QUING project and additional data for the 2003 debate in Hungary) show that the EU is invoked only in deliberations that take place close to the EU accession date. The aggregate picture of the various references that actors used in the context of domestic violence debates in Bulgaria (2004-2006), Croatia (2003-2004), Hungary (1997, 2003, and 2006-2007), Poland (2004-2006), and Romania (2002-2005) shows that the only direct references to EU appear in Bulgaria, Romania, where these debates took place in the midst of EU accession and in one debate in Hungary that took place in 2003, just before Hungary became a member of the EU. There are no direct references to the EU in Poland, where the sampled domestic violence debates took place after the country

became a member of the EU, in Croatia, or in those Hungarian debates that took place much before (1997) or after the accession date (2006-2007). The type and frequency of occurrence for references used by different actors in domestic violence debates are summarized in Table 2<sup>9</sup>.

**Table 2. References used in domestic violence policy texts**

Country/ Total no. of occurrences	EU & EU instruments	Other European bodies (Council of Europe)	UN & UN instruments	Other countries/ “internatio nal”	National actors/ processes		Year
					EU- driven	National	
<b>Bulgaria</b>	<b>6</b>	10	13	3	-	12	2004- 2006
<b>Croatia</b>	-	1	9	-	1	19	2003- 2004
<b>Hungary</b>	2 (from 2003)	9	26	8	- [N/A for 2003]	39 [N/A for 2003]	1997, 2003 and 2006- 2007
<b>Poland</b>	-	2	8	1	1	14	2004- 2006
<b>Romania</b>	<b>7</b>	6	4	8	2	16	2002- 2005

Source: **QUING database** + additional data for the 2003 Hungarian debate

“European norms” more generally are, however, invoked in all countries through references to the Council of Europe and its regulations on domestic violence specifically and violence against women more generally. The UN and the UN instruments on violence against women (VAW) and women's human rights (CEDAW) are the leading international references in all countries. In the context of domestic violence, “European norms” can hardly be distinguished from the global framework of women’s human rights, but it is nevertheless interesting that these norms are framed as “European” or “global” depending on the accession context. In four out of the five countries, domestic violence texts also contain references to other European member states (in particular, Austria, Germany, and the UK).

Europeanization provided an important framing for those domestic violence debates that took place in close proximity of EU accession dates. In 2003, the Hungarian Parliament debated a National Strategy for the Prevention and Efficient Handling of Domestic Violence, which was adopted that year. These debates took place in a much wider context of civil society mobilization against domestic violence, which was spearheaded by feminist NGOs but also engaged the general public. In the context of these debates, Europe was invoked as a set of “European cultural traditions” which were construed to also signify a set of rights, including the right to be free from domestic violence<sup>10</sup>. Members of Parliament (MPs) intervening in the parliamentary debate reasoned that since “European states regard domestic violence policy as a very important task,” so should Hungary (MP Nemeth, Parliamentary Debate, 18 March 2003). Some MPs tapped into a much stronger “civilizational” discourse expressing their hope that Brussels would liberate Hungary from patriarchal norms inherited from feudalism that included acceptance and even glorification of domestic violence<sup>11</sup>. Magdalena Vanya, using a discourse



analysis of the policy debates taking place in Hungary around the adoption of the aforementioned National Strategy, argues that feminist organizations “eagerly exploited the political desire for ‘European’ values by carefully framing domestic violence in the broader, more general context of Hungary’s EU admission. The Europeanization frame thus included packaging the specific feminist issue of domestic violence against women in the more abstract terms of modernization and civilization associated with becoming a member of the (Western) European community.” (2006, 140-141).

In a similar vein, parliamentary debates on draft laws on violence in the family in Romania were permeated with language invoking “Europe” and the “European Union” as both ideals and abstract sets of norms to be followed. During debates one of the initiators of the law, a woman MP, delivered her support for the proposal in the following way:

“I would like to remind you that there is a recommendation of the European Union ... regarding domestic violence. This recommendation ... very clearly provides that all member states of the European Union, and that includes us also, if we want to become members of the European Union, should adopt a special law on domestic violence. This recommendation also specifies very clearly what this law should contain. ... The current law proposal fulfills all EU requirements. I would even say that it is *one of the most European laws that our Parliament debated*” (speech by Mona Musca, 18 March 2003; emphasis added).

The MP frames the domestic violence bill as a “European” law and by doing so she taps into the aspirations of Romanian MPs for their country to join the EU. It is very interesting

to note that she claims that “adopting a special law on domestic violence” is an accession requirement of the European Union, which seem to be a strategic mistake in the way of persuading the Parliament to adopt the proposal only a few days later.

Women’s NGOs in Bulgaria developed a similar strategy of “pretending” that the adoption of a special law on domestic violence was a requirement of EU accession. Genoveva Tisheva, President of the Bulgarian Gender Research Foundation and one of the leading activists in the process of advocating for a special law on domestic violence, explained that, in 2003-2004, when the Foundation advocated for the specific law against domestic violence they “tried to *pretend* there was a legally-binding EU standard on domestic violence” (Remarks at the Regional Conference on Domestic Violence Legal Reform, Sofia, 12-14 February 2008). A Law on Protection from Domestic Violence was indeed adopted in Bulgaria in 2005, and during parliamentary debates some of the MPs claimed that Bulgaria should follow the example of the European Union in adopting regulations to eliminate domestic violence<sup>12</sup>. Furthermore, NGO activists in Bulgaria also framed the adoption of a special law against domestic violence as a result of EU accession in their communication with the UN.<sup>13</sup>

For reasons that we partly explained above, in particular the moment when debates around the adoption of specific domestic violence legal provisions took place, references to Europe were much less important in the debates in Croatia and Poland. However, in a broader sense, ideas about shared European norms, and a desired Europeanness were important for domestic violence advocates in these contexts also. An outspoken Croatian feminist, Nela Pamukovic, from the Croatian NGO Autonomous Women’s House thinks that “EU and CEDAW have always been the source of feminists’ legitimacy”. Therefore, she also contends that “the EU accession is an important process for women’s organizations”.<sup>14</sup>

While women's groups in Croatia perceive the EU as a source of legitimacy, findings show that EU references were not common place in domestic violence debates (Table 2 above). This is easily explained by the fact that domestic violence legislation had already been developed in Croatia by the time the country became a candidate country for EU membership. When regulations against domestic violence were debated in Croatia, the EU accession process was not high on the public agenda, therefore it did not provide a strong framework for advocacy. Other opportunity structures, both institutional and discursive, were used by Croatian activists when advocating for domestic violence legislation (Dedic & Jalusic 2007).

Due to internal political circumstances, domestic violence policy reform in Poland lagged behind EU accession, and as such, references to the EU and related norms have been largely absent from Polish debates. Meanwhile, Polish feminists and other advocates of domestic violence reforms in Poland did at times mobilize "EU requirements" to shame the Polish state into adopting regulations against domestic violence. In a joint report with the Minnesota Advocates for Human Rights, the leading feminist NGO Women's Rights Center in Warsaw stated that "Poland must respect the human rights of women (and within that, must act against domestic violence) in order to join the EU" (Minnesota Advocates for Human Rights et al. 2002, 52). Nevertheless, the Europeanization component has not gained a major role in the process of domestic violence policy change in Poland.

In all three countries where Europeanization seems to have played an important role at the discursive level—Hungary, Romania, and Bulgaria—a strategic framing of the EU and Europeanness takes place. Somewhat similarly to processes of rhetoric action that took place in the initial stages of EU eastern enlargement by CEECs and favorable member states (Schimmelfennig 2005, 159), we notice a strategic framing of domestic violence as part of

European integration criteria in all three countries, regardless of whether or not it was included, as argued above, among the formal conditionality criteria. NGOs and favorable allies strategically integrate the development of domestic violence policies into a larger context of European integration and Europeanization in looser, normative sense. The agency of NGOs and their allies in such a strategic introduction of the EU to the debates seems to be a precondition to have the Europeanization element introduced to the debates. The adoption of policies on domestic violence in all of these countries, as a successful outcome of the debates, is evidence that the Europeanization argument impacted mainstream decision makers. In countries where Europeanization had an impact on domestic violence policy development, movement actors and their allies used the strategic framing of domestic violence as an EU accession issue in their attempts to seek resonance with what they perceived to be an accepted mainstream frame in the midst of the EU accession process. This resonant frame of “Europeanness” seems to have been a consistent, but somewhat unspecified aspiration, in which references to the EU and Europe more broadly were used as internal incentives that legitimized action against domestic violence in the country.

Europeanization at this discursive level, as in the case of Daphne, highlights social learning and norms construction processes. Domestic violence is constructed strategically within the EU accession criteria by national policy debates. The common European normative background is appropriated in the debates on a voluntary basis, at the initiative of local policy actors in response to a policy dilemma that arrives on national agendas largely due to NGO mobilization. Following the strategic decision that these polities make—to Europeanize in adopting domestic violence policies—when they proceed to search for substantive norms, solutions, and models of policy good practices, the thin normative basis provided by the EU

proves insufficient. At this point, references widen from a narrow understanding of EU norms on domestic violence to norms connected to successful EU member state models, as well as norms of CEDAW, and the COE (see Table 2). This step indicates the weakness of substantive EU anti-domestic violence norms, and shows the dominance of norms defined at the level of CEDAW or the COE and in terms of successful national policy-making models in the field.

## ***7. Conclusion***

This paper has examined Europeanization mechanisms in a policy field that is not part of formal membership criteria of the EU enlargement, but nevertheless falls within the scope of what is seen as norms defining the collective identity of the European Union. In particular, actions to address domestic violence are seen as part of a wider commitment of the European Union to secure that women rights are observed and that women can thrive as equals in all Member States (Kantola 2006).

We found that Europeanization stretches to domains, in this case, domestic violence, that are not part of the hard criteria of EU accession. We have also described three different mechanisms that account for *how* Europeanization enables domestic change. First, EU conditionality is somewhat open for negotiation during accession processes. Apart from the core criteria contained in the *acquis communautaire*, the EC can also take a stance on softer criteria. In this paper, we have shown that the engagement of the EC with the issue of domestic violence as part of EU enlargement processes was up for negotiation in the different national environments. The Commission did put pressure on Poland and Romania to adopt domestic violence regulations, but not on Hungary and Bulgaria. This widening of the regular

conditionality criteria happened where domestic violence could be linked to one of the core criteria.

The second mechanism for extending the domain of Europeanization to policy fields that are not part of the main accession criteria is the facilitation of social learning for change. Through Daphne, the EU supports transnational networking among organizations working to end domestic violence. Daphne is an example of a social learning mechanism operating on grounds of external incentives (funding), which has indirectly impacted the development of domestic violence policies and legislation in Central and East Europe.

The third mechanism that accounts for the stretching of EU requirements to include policy reforms in domains outside the main accession criteria is strategic discursive action by women's movements actors and their allies. In some countries activists used the idea of a shared and desired Europeanness as an advocacy tool in their efforts to pass a specific law on domestic violence. While the idea of Europe as a shared set of norms is present among civil society activists, as well as pro-reform decision makers, in all countries that we analyzed, we have seen significant differences with respect to whether and how this "discursive opportunity" is used as an advocacy tool. Activists' choice of whether or not to use this type or rhetorical action depended on the stage of accession that the country was in at the time when debates about regulations against domestic violence took place and on how advanced the local approach to domestic violence was as compared to EU norms.

All three analyzed mechanisms pointed in one way or another to processes of norm construction in the European accession process. First, in the case of regular reporting and monitoring, the conditionality criteria were constructed by the EC in conjunction with civil society voices from the country in different ways for the different countries, so that domestic

violence norms had different place in the reports. Second, the Daphne mechanism can be seen as an open call for transnational action to develop substantive content behind the narrowly defined set of European norms for action against domestic violence. Finally, the analysis of discursive action has shown how civil society actors and their allies strategically construct and frame European norms to include the need for action against domestic violence, as well.

By exploring a domain of policy making outside the formal accession criteria, and thus outside the logic of hard conditionality, this paper pointed to several less explored ways in which “Europe matters.” We also showed that Europe has mattered differently across time. In particular, the influence of EU accession/Europeanization was strongest in CEECs as accession neared. There is little known yet about the aftermath of the process of adopting EU regulations or EU norms. Our agenda for future research includes the analysis of how Europeanization continues to impact the domestic violence field, as well as the implementation of these regulations.

### *Notes*

1. See for example: Resolution on the need to establish a European Union wide campaign for zero tolerance of violence against women, Resolution nr. A4-0250/1997; and Decision of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 April 2004, on adopting a program of Community action (2004 to 2008) to prevent and combat violence against children, young people and women and to protect victims and groups at risk (803/2004/EC), (Daphne II). Both documents reference work done in the framework of the UN as guidance for actions to combat violence against women.

2. According to a study of the Council of Europe, across COE member states, “one-fifth to one-quarter of all women have experienced physical violence at least once during their adult lives, and more than one-tenth have suffered sexual violence involving the use of force” (Hagemann-White 2006, 7),

3. More information on different Daphne programs is available on the Daphne III website, at:

[http://ec.europa.eu/justice\\_home/funding/daphne3/funding\\_daphne3\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/justice_home/funding/daphne3/funding_daphne3_en.htm),

and the Daphne Toolkit, at website:

[http://ec.europa.eu/justice\\_home/daphnetoolkit/html/welcome/dpt\\_welcome\\_en.html](http://ec.europa.eu/justice_home/daphnetoolkit/html/welcome/dpt_welcome_en.html)

4. See Decision of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 April, 2004, on adopting a program of Community action (2004 to 2008) to prevent and combat violence against children, young people and women and to protect victims and groups at risk (803/2004/EC) (Daphne II).

5. There is no data in the final evaluation of Daphne II about countries of origin for the supported organizations and their partners. The midterm report covers data for 2000 and 2002 (European Commission 2002). Additional reports have not been released at the time of writing.

6. This is less the case for Croatia, where the government has become more or less a regular donor for organizations since the establishment of the Government Office for Cooperation with NGOs in 1998. At the same time, organizations in Croatia are still recipients of more financial contributions from foreign donors than counterparts from CEE.

7. Personal communication with the Director of the European Women’s Lobby, Observatory on Violence against Women, October 2008.

8. The QUING project (Quality in Gender+ Equality Policies in Europe, [www.quing.eu](http://www.quing.eu)) studies the meaning of gender equality in the policy debates around the issues of general gender equality, non-employment, intimate citizenship and domestic violence. QUING covers



all member states of the EU, Croatia, and Turkey. For the five countries we have selected, in the issue of domestic violence, the QUING database covers the policy debates around the following regulations: the special law on domestic violence in Bulgaria (2004-2006); the special law on domestic violence in Croatia (2003-2004); marital rape (1997) and the restraining order (2006-2007) in Hungary; the special law against domestic violence in Poland (2004-2006), and the special law against domestic violence in Romania (2002-2005).

9. Table 2 summarizes the references used in 52 domestic violence policy texts in the five countries as analyzed within the framework of the QUING project (including laws, policies, parliamentary debates and civil society texts). This was complemented with analysis of the 2003 Hungarian debate (texts of the National Strategy for the Prevention of Domestic Violence, three plenary sessions of the Hungarian Parliament, and four Committee sessions in March and April 2003 debating the Strategy).

10. Press interview with State Secretary Hanko, Ministry of Justice, 2003, quoted in Vanya (2006).

11. Intervention by Deputy Minister Agnes Vajda, 2003, quoted in Magdalena Vanya 2006.

12. Minutes of the meeting of the 39th National Assembly of 30 June 2004 on the Law proposal on Protection against Domestic Violence.

13. Input from the Center of Women's Studies and Policies (Bulgaria) to the United Nations Secretary-General's in-depth study on violence against women. Available at:

[http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/vaw/ngocontribute/Center%20of%20Women\\_s%20Studies%20and%20Policies%20CWSP.pdf](http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/vaw/ngocontribute/Center%20of%20Women_s%20Studies%20and%20Policies%20CWSP.pdf)

14. Interview with Nela Pamukovic, May 2008, conducted by Milja Spoljar.



## Bibliography

Beveridge, Fiona. 2009. "Gender, the acquis and beyond." Pp.393-414 in *50 Years of the European Treaties: Looking Back and Thinking Forward*, ed. Michael Dougan, and Samantha Currie. Oxford: Hart Publishing.

Börzel, Tanja. 2002. *States and Regions in the European Union: Institutional Adaptation in Germany and Spain*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Börzel, Tanja and Thomas Risse. 2000. "When Europe Hits Home: Europeanization and Domestic Change." *European Integration online Papers (EIoP)* 4(15).

Börzel, Tanja and Thomas Risse. 2003. "Conceptualizing the Domestic Impact of Europe." Pp. 57-82 in *The Politics of Europeanization*, eds. Kevin Featherstone and Claudio Radaelli. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bretherton, Charlotte. 2006. "Gender mainstreaming in EU external relations: Lessons from Eastern Enlargement." Pp. 89-105 in *New Pathways in International Development: Gender and Civil Society in EU Policy*, ed. Marjorie Lister, and Maurizio Carbone. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Checkel, Jeffrey. 1999. "Social Construction and Integration" *Journal of European Public Policy* 6(4): 545-560.

Dabrowska, Magdalena.2008. QUING Project: Series of LARG Country Reports. Gender based violence - Poland

Dedic, Jasminka and Ana Frank. 2008. QUING Project: Series of LARG Country Reports. Gender based violence - Croatia

Dedic, Jasminka and Vlasta Jalusic (2007) "Framing gender based violence after the break-up of Yugoslavia: Croatian and Slovenian case." Paper presented at the ECPR General Conference. Pisa, Italy.

Dombos, Tamas, Anna Horvath, and Andrea Krizsan. 2007. "Where did gender disappear? Anti-discrimination policy in the EU accession process in Hungary." Pp. 233-252 in *Multiple Meanings of Gender Equality: A Critical Frame Analysis of Gender Policies in Europe*, ed. Mieke Verloo,. Budapest: CEU Press.

Dombos, Tamás, Anna Horváth, Andrea Krizsán, Melinda Szabó, and Viola Zentai. 2008. QUING Project: Series of LARG Country Reports. Gender based violence – Hungary

European Commission. 1999a. *Regular Report from the Commission on Poland's Progress Towards Accession*.

[http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/archives/pdf/key\\_documents/1999/poland\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/archives/pdf/key_documents/1999/poland_en.pdf)

European Commission. 1999b. *Regular Report from the Commission on Romania's Progress Towards Accession*.

[http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/archives/pdf/key\\_documents/1999/romania\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/archives/pdf/key_documents/1999/romania_en.pdf)

European Commission. 2002. *EC Midterm Report on the Daphne Project (2002)*.

[http://ec.europa.eu/justice\\_home/daphnetoolkit/html/evaluation\\_reports/dpt\\_evaluation\\_reports\\_en.html](http://ec.europa.eu/justice_home/daphnetoolkit/html/evaluation_reports/dpt_evaluation_reports_en.html)

European Commission. 2004. *Commission Final Report to the European Parliament and the Council on the Daphne Programme (2000-2003)*.

[http://ec.europa.eu/justice\\_home/funding/2004\\_2007/daphne/doc/daphne\\_final\\_report01\\_2004\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/justice_home/funding/2004_2007/daphne/doc/daphne_final_report01_2004_en.pdf)

European Commission. 2006. *Croatia 2006 Progress Report*.

[http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/key\\_documents/2006/nov/hr\\_sec\\_1385\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/key_documents/2006/nov/hr_sec_1385_en.pdf)

European Women's Lobby. 2007. "Reality Check: When Women's NGOs Map Policies and Legislation on Violence against Women." Brussels: European Women's Lobby.

<http://www.womenlobby.org/SiteResources/data/MediaArchive/Violence%20Centre/document/Copy%20of%20NAP-final-feb07.pdf>.

Fabian, Katalin. 2006. "Against domestic violence: The interaction of global networks with local activism in Central Europe." *Contemporary Studies in Economic and Financial Analysis* 88: 111-152.

Falkner, Gerda, Oliver Treib, Elisabeth Holzleithner. 2008. *Compliance in the Enlarged European Union: Living Rights or Dead Letters?* Abingdon: Ashgate.

Finnemore, Martha and Kathryn Sikkink 1998. "International norm dynamics and political change." *International Organization* 52: 887-917.

Gavrilova, Dessislava. 2008. "The Other side of European integration: Effects of EU accession process on the non EU-regulated policy areas in Central and Eastern Europe. The Case of Bulgaria." *European Political Economy Review* 8: 68-96.

Green Cowles, Maria, James Caporaso and Thomas Risse. 2001. *Transforming Europe: Europeanization and Domestic Change*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Hagemann-White, Carol. 2006. *Combating violence against women. Stocktaking study on the measures and actions taken in Council of Europe member States*. Strassbourg: Council of Europe.

[http://www.coe.int/T/E/Human\\_Rights/Equality/PDF\\_CDEG\(2006\)3\\_E.pdf](http://www.coe.int/T/E/Human_Rights/Equality/PDF_CDEG(2006)3_E.pdf)

Jacquot, Sophie and Cornelia Woll. 2003. *Usage of European Integration – Europeanisation from a Sociological Perspective* 7(12). <http://eiop.or.at/eiop/texte/2003-012a.htm>

Jalusic, Vlasta and Jasminka Dedic. 2007. "Framing gender-based violence after the break-up of Yugoslavia: Croatian and Slovenian case." Paper presented at the European Consortium for Political Research General Conference, 6-8 September, Pisa, Italy.

Johnson, Janet and Laura Brunell. 2007. *The New WAVE: How transnational feminist networks promote domestic violence reform in postcommunist Europe*. Unpublished manuscript.

Kantola, Johanna. 2006. Transnational and National Gender Equality Politics: The European Union's Impact on Domestic Violence Discourses in Finland and Britain. Pp.154-178 in *Women's Citizenship and Political Rights*, ed. Sirkku Hellsten, Anne Maria Holli and Krassimira Daskalova..Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kelly, Liz. 2005. "Inside outsiders: Mainstreaming Gender Violence into Human Rights Discourse and Practice" *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 7(4):471-495.

Krizsan, Andrea, and Raluca Popa. 2007. "A Success for the women's movement? Putting domestic violence on the policy agenda of Central and East European countries." Paper presented at the 4th ECPR General Conference, 6-8 September 2007, Pisa, Italy.

Krizsan, Andrea, and Violetta Zentai. 2006. "Gender equality policy or gender mainstreaming: the case of Hungary." *Policy Studies* 27(2): 135-151.

Krizsan, Andrea. 2009. "From Transposition to Enforcement Post-accession Shifts in EU Impact in Equality Policy in Hungary." Under review at *European Integration Online Papers*.

Minnesota Advocates for Human Rights, Women's Rights Center, and International Women's Rights Clinic at Georgetown University. 2002. *Domestic Violence in Poland*. Minneapolis: Minnesota Advocates for Human Rights.

Montoya, Celeste. 2007. "European Union and transnational advocacy: Combating gender violence in the post-Communist member states." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, 31 August 2007, Chicago, Illinois.

Montoya, Celeste. 2008. "The European Union, capacity building, and transnational networks: Combating violence against women through the Daphne Program." *International Organization* 62: 359-72.

Olsen, Johan. (1996)."The Changing Political Organization of Europe: An Institutional Perspective on the Role of Comprehensive Reform Efforts." Pp. 225-250 in *The Yearbook of Comparative Government and Public Administration* (Vol. II), eds. J.J. Hesse and T.A.J. Toonen. Baden-Baden: Nomos.

Open Society Institute Network Women's Program.. 2005. *Equal opportunities for women and men: Monitoring law and practice in new member states and accession countries of the European Union*. Budapest: Open Society Institute.

Popa, Raluca. 2008 QUING Project: Series of LARG Country Reports. Gender based violence - Romania

Radaelli, Claudio M. 2004. "Europeanisation: Solution or problem?" *European Integration online Papers (EIoP)* 8(16): 1-26.

Roth, Silke. 2007. "Sisterhood and Solidarity? Women's Organizations in the Expanded European Union." *Social Politics* 14(4): 460-487.

Schimmelfennig, Frank. 2005. "The Community trap: Liberal norms, rhetorical action, and the Eastern enlargement of the European Union." Pp 142-171 in *The Politics of European Union Enlargement. Theoretical Approaches*, ed. Frank Schimmelfennig and Ulrich Sedelmeier. London: Routledge.

Schimmelfennig, Frank and Ulrich Sedelmeier, eds. 2005a. *The Europeanization of Central and Eastern Europe*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Schimmelfennig, Frank and Ulrich Sedelmeier. 2005b. "The politics of EU enlargement: Theoretical and comparative perspectives." Pp. 3-29 in *The politics of European Union enlargement: theoretical approaches*, ed. Frank Schimmelfennig, and Ulrich Sedelmeier. London: Routledge.

Seppanen Anderson, Leah. 2006. "European Union gender regulations in the East: The Czech and Polish accession process." *East European Politics and Societies* 20: 101-125.

Sloat, Amanda. 2004. "Legislating for equality: The implementation of the EU equality *acquis* in Central and Eastern Europe." *The Jean Monnet Working Papers* no. 8. New York University School of Law.

Stoykova, Elena. 2008. QUING Project: Series of LARG Country Reports. Gender based violence - Bulgaria

Vanya, Magdalena. 2006. *Making Domestic Violence: Gender, Collective Action, and Emerging Civil Society in Postcommunist Hungary and Slovakia*. PhD dissertation, University of California, Davis.

**Table 1.** European Commission pressure on domestic violence against women in five countries

	<b>Hungary</b>	<b>Poland</b>	<b>Bulgaria</b>	<b>Romania</b>	<b>Croatia</b>
<b>1998</b>	NO	NO, but a very general remark on the treatment of women.	NO	NO	No monitoring
<b>1999</b>	NO	YES: EC Report notes national policies are not providing support for the victims of spousal violence	NO	YES: EC reports urges changes in the Criminal Code on the issue of domestic violence and abuse.	No monitoring
<b>2000</b>	NO	YES: Notes that the UN-backed project on spousal violence remains suspended by the government.	NO	YES: Underlines the need for legislation to provide redress to victims of domestic violence and facilitate prosecutions against the perpetrators.	No monitoring
<b>2001</b>	NO	NO	NO	NO	No monitoring
<b>2002</b>	NO	YES: Worries that the newly appointed Plenipotentiary for Equal Status of Women and Men would not cover traditionally sensitive issues such as spousal violence.	NO	NO	NO (First Stabilization and Accession Report )
<b>2003</b>	NO	NO	NO	YES: Urges that the National Agency for Family Protection be made operational as soon as possible, in order to implement the new Law for preventing and	NO (Second Stabilization and

				combating domestic violence.	Accession Report)
<b>2004</b>	no monitoring	no monitoring	NO	YES: Urges the establishment of shelters for victims of violence and specialized centers for preventing and combating domestic violence in order to ensure effective implementation of the new legislation against domestic violence.	No monitoring
<b>2005</b>	no monitoring	no monitoring	NO	YES: Urges improvements in the institutional set-up of the National Agency for Family Protection and the speedy implementation of the recently adopted national strategy for preventing and combating domestic violence.	NO, but mentions DV against children as a problem
<b>2006</b>	no monitoring	no monitoring	NO	NO	YES: A positive evaluation of domestic violence measures in the country.

Source: The EC Enlargement archive of Progress Reports for Bulgaria, Croatia, Hungary, Poland and Romania. Available at:

[http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/archives/key\\_documents/reports\\_1999\\_en.htm#1.%20Progress%20Reports](http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/archives/key_documents/reports_1999_en.htm#1.%20Progress%20Reports)