



**QUING Symposium on  
Gender-Based Violence Policies in the EU  
12-13 April 2011, Lancaster UK**

**Abstracts**

**MAGDALENA DĄBROWSKA**

(Maria Curie-Skłodowska University, Lublin):

**Getting less patriarchal and more European?  
Discourses on domestic violence in Poland**

This paper uses a historical and discursive approach to trace changes in frames and discourses on domestic violence in Poland. The analysis starts in the early 90s, when first social debates on DV took place. After 1989 the problem of DV was articulated in the public sphere, especially by the women's movement, which started to develop at the time. Since then the issue was framed differently, depending on civil-society actors, the actual position of the government and the role of the Catholic Church (a more or less under-cover actor in the debate). The paper traces the development and changes within three main frames: alcohol-centred, women-centred and children-centred, indicating the main points and actions that formed and transformed the discourse. This entails analysing the change of the discourse within civil society and the government as well as examining political and cultural factors that made the change possible. I believe there is a mutual relationship between legal change and cultural change. By analysing the process of policy-making, legal actions, discourses and frames I would like to trace cultural change, the transformation of values and beliefs on gender norms. It is visible that Polish law on DV is becoming more European in the sense that there are more legal mechanisms to protect victims and deal with perpetrators. However, legal change does not imply gender sensitivity or a commitment to gender equality. Many legal changes were made in the name of protecting the family or children and often refer to patriarchal cultural values.

**ZELIA GREGORIOU**  
(University of Cyprus):

**Production of “identified” victims, state patriarchy and the disavowal  
of the category of gender violence in anti-trafficking policies.  
The case of Cyprus**

*“I want you to know that I did not ..., but I told you my story”*

This paper examines the incongruity between policy frames for trafficking and narratives of violence by victims of trafficking through a comparative analysis of data from two research projects, QUING (policy frame analysis) and GEMIC (life histories of victims). It argues that dominant state discourses and policies implicate forms of governmentality and victim subjectification which, on the one hand, accentuate victimization and, on the other hand, render unthinkable, nonsignifiable and insignificant forms of gender violence that occur in the intersection of migrant precarity, state patriarchy and use of sexual force against women. By combining policy frame analysis with mixed qualitative methods, we explore discursive shifts in state policies, structural silence and victim accounts of violence.

Our analysis shows that the various discontinuities and splits that characterized state and NGO discourses during the last decade (exposing trafficking as a problem of gender equality and human rights, defying ‘trafficking monitoring’ as a mechanism of western hegemony, using victimization rhetoric to attain cultural resonance and promote awareness raising, and disavowing the structural aspects of trafficking by focusing on “consent”) are gradually eliminated as different stakeholders, at various levels of governance, come to join the global ‘outcry’ against trafficking and to joint their forces towards a “zero-tolerance” policy. While this convergence of frames appears to facilitate a partnership between the state and gender aware NGOs, it also promotes an inconspicuously de-gendered shift of policies. The war on trafficking is generating processes of securitization and biopolitical control/care rather than addressing gender violence.

**ANDREA KRIZSÁN & RALUCA MARIA POPA**  
(Central European University, Budapest)

**Frames in Contestation:  
International human rights norms and domestic violence policy debates  
in five countries of Central and Eastern Europe**

Violence against women and particularly the violence that occurs in spaces considered ‘private’ has been the flagship policy issue of the global feminist effort to sensitize human rights to gender equality. While many see the definition of violence against women as a violation of human rights as a major international success of gender mainstreaming, others have noted the marginalization of the gender equality component in the process of translating norms to national level. Using a frame analysis approach, the paper looks at the

translation of international human rights norms pertaining to domestic violence to the national level in five countries of Central and Eastern Europe. It argues that the translation process brings to countries in the analysis a concept of domestic violence framed dominantly in individual rights terms, in which gender equality is stretched to be more inclusive and to meet strategic interests that make it easier to endorse by mainstream policy stakeholders. The potential for gender equality resonance may then be guaranteed through implicit gendering of implementation processes and the empowerment of gender equality actors in both policy making and implementation processes. The framing adopted is successful in the five countries in that it leads to the adoption of gender equality resonant laws and policies in four out of five countries, meanwhile in the absence of support and ownership by gender equality actors also brings the risk of co-optation by frames that contest the major tenets of gender equality.

**LISE ROLANDSEN AGUSTÍN**  
(Aalborg Universitet)

**Still going strong?**  
**The role of gender inequality in the framing of projects**  
**selected under the EU DAPHNE programme**

EU policy documents typically apply either a *public health* or a *women's rights as human rights* frame to the problem of gender-based violence. When the DAPHNE programme was adopted in the late 90s the *public health* frame was chosen due to strategic reasons as the legal realm of public health would allow for EU policy action without overstepping the boundaries into established member state competences. In principle this framing leads to a decreased focus on gender and the structural reasons behind the problem of violence against women. However it is not clear to what extent this (strategic) framing has permeated into policy outcomes as well.

In order to address this issue, the paper asks whether the dominant public health policy framing of the DAPHNE programme and the increased attention to economic and social costs of violence have had any implications on the intermediate level between policy output and policy outcome, namely the selection of NGO projects for funding. Analyzing the 412 projects selected for funding under the DAPHNE programme from 1997 to 2005, I argue that the scope of the framing has been wide enough to allow for a large number of violence forms to be addressed through the programme. The public health framing of the policy documents to a certain extent neutralizes a feminist problem perception which would underline structural dimensions more but the structural gender equality framing nevertheless remains strong: it has been modified but not completely replaced by public health in the policy interpretation conducted by the European Commission through the selection of projects. Furthermore, it is continuously articulated and underlined as a still vibrant framing in the elite interviews conducted in relation to this research.

This analysis has implications for the methodological and theoretical outlook of critical frame analysis. In particular I highlight the importance of scrutinizing the relations between different frames, the institutional context in which they are

articulated as well as their relative strength. Thus I find that frames are embedded either in the institutional foreground or the institutional background: public health can be characterized as dominant in an official, formal sense, i.e. related to foreground politics. It was institutionalized through a legislative policy process on the basis of member state demands, predominantly. Nevertheless, I argue that it is a weakly institutionalized foreground frame due to the lack of overall transcendence and policy implications. Structural gender equality, on the other hand, is interpreted as a strong background frame: it is not salient in key policy documents but is however articulated, institutionalized and reproduced by key EU actors in day-to-day policy practices as well as in the immediate output of the DAPHNE programme, that is the selection of projects for funding.

**SOFIA STRID**  
(Lancaster University)

**Invisible intersectionality?  
Visibility and voice in gender based violence policy in Britain**

This paper analyses visibility of multiple inequalities and intersectionality in gender based violence policy in Britain. It examines whether gender based violence against women (GBV) policy takes intersectionality and multiple inequalities into account, or if minoritised groups of women are made invisible and marginalised in policy. It asks: what is intersectionality in GBV policy; is intersectionality taken into account; are groups at the point of intersection of two or more inequalities visible or silenced; and how can visibility or invisibility be explained? It argues that previous research finding silencing of groups positioned at the point of intersection of two or more inequalities and invisibility of multiple inequalities in policy need to be re-thought. This paper shows alternative projects where previously silenced groups have voice in the policy process, making multiple inequalities visible. Previous research showing silencing and invisibility is based on a too narrow understanding of the concept of intersectionality and has not taken into account the implications of the politico-discursive process of degendering.