



Quality in Gender+ Equality Policies

European Commission Sixth Framework Programme
Integrated Project

Maro Pantelidou Maloutas, Anna Nikolaou,
Manina Kakepaki, Ioanna Tsinganou, Maria
Thanopoulou, and Laura Maratou Alipranti

Report Analysing Intersectionality in Gender Equality Policies for Greece and the EU

Institute for Human Sciences (IWM)
Vienna
2008

Preferred citation: Pantelidou Maloutas, Maro, Nikolaou, Anna, Kakepaki, Manina, Tsinganou, Ioanna, Thanopoulou, Maria, and Maratou Alipranti, Laura (2008): *Report Analysing Intersectionality in Gender Equality Policies for Greece and the EU*, QUING Project, Vienna: Institute for Human Sciences (IWM), available at http://www.quing.eu/files/results/ir_greece.pdf.

1. Introduction

When we refer to intersectionality we are dealing with a very old social phenomenon under a very new name, through which (turned into a concept) we try to form a whole new analytical approach. There is obviously a long history of recognising the importance of differences among women in different parts of the world and in different historical periods, at the same time as recognising differences between women according to social class, race, and ethnicity. To the above we could add, age, disabilities, sexual orientation and religion. This recognition derives from the critique against the essentialist character of the notion “women”, initiated in theory through philosophy, history and social anthropology studies, and in politics mainly via the discourse of black women feminists in the US.

The scholarly environment is obviously very important in influencing which inequalities, in their intersections with gender, seem to be of interest during different periods. Thus, today, with the discourse on class being on the decline, questions addressed in the 1970s and 80s as to how gender shapes class relations and how class shapes gender (Stanworth 1984) receive relatively less attention. With the end of the states of “existing socialism”, a problematic centred on capitalism is no longer in vogue, and the same largely applies to the study of capitalism’s repercussions on women’s lives. Class seems not to matter any more in analysis, being replaced by less ideological concepts such as exclusion, marginalisation and poverty. As for the main inequality intersecting with gender which is addressed now, it is by far ethnicity. An important contributing factor to that is the importance of what is appropriately called by Walby (A review of theory and methodology for the analysis of the implications of intersectionality for gender equality policies in the EU, D13 and D14, WP 16, STRIQ) “a canonical text, that of Crenshaw (1991) ...as a common point of reference to frame and delimit the current development of debates. The use of this text has repositioned ‘intersectionality’ as a terrain of debate that is primarily about gender and ethnicity (rather than gender and class or gender, class and ethnicity), about politics and culture (rather than economics), and as a debate with identity politics.” Obviously, globalisation, as well as the large migrations Europe after 1989, played an important role in this choice, which for some countries, including Greece (with one million recent immigrants), created a whole new social reality.

There is no doubt that social subjects live their identities as a total, constituted of multiple inequalities which are not only additive, but mutually constitutive. And this has always been so, regardless of whether “inequality” has been conceptualised as such. The main reason that political theories and movements were as a rule “mono targeted” was because gender was under-estimated, perceived as “natural”, not necessitating specific measures in order to confront what we now view as gender oppression, or because critical approaches to other social inequalities (namely class) have often underestimated the specificity of gender inequality in its various forms and

the diversity of gender relations around the world, reducing it to a by-product of capitalism. The same applied to ethnic inequalities, considered as a by-product of imperialism. An additional disadvantage of this type of simplistic “Marxist” approach is that while it was expressed by scholars that were profoundly critical of an unequal social reality, it did not promote a perception of the complexity of inequalities and specifically of the intersection of gender with other inequalities referring to class and to different “modes of production” as producers of different forms of gender regimes.

Intersectionality, apart from a social phenomenon, inevitably existing in societies with multiple inequalities, has being recently structured as a *concept* to facilitate a specific approach. An approach with the object to help perceive how, as Walby (ibid,) explains:

“Each complex inequality has ontological depth across the full range of domains of economy (market and domestic), polity, violence and civil society. This also means that within each domain (economy, polity, violence, civil society), there are multiple sets of social relations (e.g. gender, class, ethnicity or race, disability, religion or belief, sexual orientation, age). Rather than confining class to the macro level, ethnicity to the meso and gender to the micro level, all complex inequalities are constituted at all of the macro, meso and micro levels. Within this model, it is necessary to analyse intersectionality within each of the domains of economy, polity, violence and civil society as well as examine the intersections of these domains.”

Thus, intersectionality is also a tool for analysis, as well as policy development, that addresses multiple discriminations and helps us understand how different sets of identities impact on access to rights, life conditions, opportunities, and even dreams. As an analytical tool for studying, understanding and responding to the ways in which gender intersects with other identities and how these intersections contribute to unique experiences of oppression and privilege, intersectionality starts from the premise that people live multiple, layered identities derived from social relations, history and the operation of structures of power. All are members of more than one group at the same time, and can simultaneously experience oppression and privilege. It also posits that we should not understand the combining of identities as additively increasing one’s burden but instead as producing substantively distinct experiences. In other words, the aim is not to show that one group is more victimized or privileged than another, but to reveal meaningful distinctions and similarities in order to overcome discriminations and put the conditions in place for all people to fully enjoy their human rights.

It is clear that as a tool of analysis intersectionality is oriented towards action. That is, towards policy intervention. And obviously, on a theoretical level (to answer the key question for this report: *What are the implications of the intersection of multiple inequalities for the quality of gender+ equality policies?*), the implications of the intersection of multiple inequalities for the quality of gender+ equality policies are significant. It must be emphasised that to confront gender inequality substantially,

gender policy must take into account intersections of gender with other inequalities, and also educate policy makers on the importance of the variety of gender inequality which is linked to other inequalities. Indeed, it is imperative to pay attention to other structural inequalities in the making and implementing of European gender equality policies in Greece. In the labour market, measures to combat gender inequalities and the pay gap must be diversified to cover the needs of immigrant women; also with regard to social policy measures. Women in different groups have different needs. Thus, in considering measures to combat women's unemployment (which is double that of men in Greece), Roma women, and women of the Muslim minority, may require specific measures that attend to the specificity of their social subordination, and the same applies to disabled women etc. It seems increasingly the case that measures against gender inequality become too vague and superficial, referring to a past reality, if they are not targeted to different ways of being and living one's gender.

Usually, while the assertion that women are not a homogenous group is widely accepted by policy makers, the implications of this observation seem to get quickly lost in its application. The tendency is to merely note that "poor women are especially impacted" or that "foreign women form a vulnerable group", while many legal approaches, at best conceptualise each component of discrimination as additively increasing the overall burden of inequality. Thus ignoring that something unique is produced at the intersection point of different types of discrimination.

To choose to speak in terms of intersecting inequalities and to promote intersectionality policies in order to confront social inequalities means that we think in a specific (subversive) way about identity, equality and power. It requires that we focus on complexity, dynamic processes, and the structures that define access to rights and opportunities, rather than on defined categories or isolated issue areas. Analytically, it requires that we see the eradication of discrimination and the celebration of diversity as fundamental to societal development and the enjoyment of human rights by all. Obviously, intersectionality as a policy approach could not be the first choice of a neo-liberal or conservative government. It is certainly not the approach adopted by the current Greek government, which mainly 'goes through the motions' of gender policy in order to act in accordance with EU regulations and directives (and thus get more funds).

2. The Greek case

2a Intersectionality in Greece?

Producing a report which analyses intersectionality in gender equality policies for Greece is not an easy task. The first thing to note is that there is no systematic attack on social inequalities in Greece today, because politically the Right is in power and promotes a neo-liberal programme in its Greek version. If anything, there is an attack on social rights and attempts to pass the cost of an economic crisis to the less privileged. Gender policy follows EU obligations but lacks conviction and targets

mainly the “modernisation” of traditional gender roles because that is how it is understood by those who have to apply it. For example, a big campaign is taking place in the media through June and July 2008, informing the public that working mothers lack information on the fact that the Ministry of Employment, through various intermediaries, provide free day care in order to help “working mothers” with their duties. This is the general idea, an idea which further legitimises women’s traditional roles. It seems that nobody has “informed” the Ministry of Employment that children are the responsibility of *both* their parents, and not just their mothers. Is there an intersection of inequalities implied here? Yes and no. Clearly class is implied because those with the most need for state day care are lower income families, especially those without intra-family support. But the whole policy is not conceived as combating gender inequality. The care of children is not considered as an unjust burden if it attributed exclusively to women. On the contrary, it is accepted (and thus legitimised) as absolutely “normal”, as if children have one parent, with the additional good will of the state to help the mother (since women must compete in the labour market with men in order that society can take advantage of what everyone has to offer, according to the EU discourse).

If we had to answer the question whether there is a bias towards one strand of inequality in equality policy, we could say that at least superficially gender inequality seems to be more present than any other inequality, while simultaneously intersectionality is marginal in gender equality policies. Class is sometimes implied, but never referred to as such. Usually women (often together with children) are implied when speaking of more vulnerable members of a group, while in trafficking there is reference to intersectionality, since we speak of foreigners, gender is a *de facto* factor, often again along children.

Why do gender equality policies appear less elaborate than elsewhere, apart from the immediate political reasons of today’s conjuncture. Greece is a rather traditional southern European society, where there is no real tradition in gender equality policies. Thus Greek gender policy is highly influenced by EU directives, even jargon, and is highly dependent on what goes on at the EU level. State feminism rules absolutely and all activity related to gender equality moves around the General Secretariat for Equality of the Ministry of the Interior (G.G.I.). The G.G.I. is the competent body for designing and implementing policies related to gender equality in all areas. Its priorities refer to the major objectives of EU policies for gender equality, and include employment issues, the fight against gender stereotypes in all areas, and measures against gender violence. In its advisory capacity, the G.G.I. must take care of the diffusion of the mainstreaming perspective in all policies. In this landscape of almost total reign of EU connected initiatives and measures, and of a relative lack of research on gender policy, studies on employment related policy form an exception and, to a lesser extent, educational policy and family policy (especially with a focus on the “reconciliation of work and family”). The existing NGOs work around and in

connection with the General Secretariat for Equality, while many have European links.

It is interesting to note that in Greek, the General Secretariat for Equality is called precisely that; not the General Secretariat for *Gender* Equality, even though it deals exclusively with gender issues and is generally accepted as the policy institution dealing with women, as if there are no other equality issues. However, at the same time, the dominant perception is that if equality issues concerning gender existed in the recent past, the problem is solved today. Data from two research projects with representative samples of the Greek population comparing data of 1988 and 2006 indicate the following¹:

How do you perceive the social position of Greek women today? Do you think that it is in general satisfactory? (%)

	<i>women</i>		<i>men</i>	
	1988	2006	1988	2006
Yes	50,5	70	58,6	84,2
No	49,5	30	41,4	15,8

Today 70% of women and 84.2% of men in Greece are satisfied with the social position of women. Gender equality issues seem to appear as solved, while only for less than one out of three women (compared to one in two twenty years ago) there seems to be an issue. Elsewhere in the same research, we see that in 2006 more than 60% women (which is double the percentage for 1988) declare that there is no inferiority in women's social position, a view embraced especially by the young.

In examining the reasons for this important change in attitudes during the last twenty years one must go beyond the obvious amelioration of women's legal equality with men during this period. The fact is that state feminism and the end of the feminist movement of the 70s have resulted in a general cultural acceptance of the state as being by definition ready and willing (with the EU help) to take measures in order to promote gender equality, which appears as an expected aspect of social progress that is already almost completely realised.

¹ For the 1988 research project, financed by the GGI and undertaken by ΕΚΚΕ, see Η. Νικολακόπουλος, Μ. Παντελίδου-Μαλούτα, *Έρευνα για την πολιτική συμπεριφορά των γυναικών στην Ελλάδα*, ΕΚΚΕ/ΓΓΙ, Αθήνα 1988; and Μ. Παντελίδου-Μαλούτα, *Γυναίκες και πολιτική*, Gutenberg, Αθήνα 1992. The second research project is financed under Pythagoras II at the University of Athens. Analytical presentation of data in, *Κείμενα Εργασίας*, Εργαστήριο Ελληνικής Πολιτικής, Τμήμα ΠΕΔΔ.

Thus, we want to have an intersectionality approach to Greek gender policy, a policy that tries to follow the EU directives, while at the same time the dominant view appears to be that gender inequality issues are a thing of the past or are accepted as traditional rather than perceived as inequality. Meanwhile, views on other social problems in terms of *inequalities* are restricted to the Left, which has been in opposition since 2004. It seems evident therefore that we will not find a lot of intersectional frames at the level of policies and policy making.

Indeed, while all important policy changes that took place within gender policy in Greece during the last few years refer mainly to employment and gender violence and are included within the analysis of the respective issues, we can already note that with the exception of trafficking, intersectionality is almost non-existent. Other inequality groups are mentioned (e.g. disabled persons, foreign workers, supporters of 'other' religious beliefs, supporters of non-mainstream beliefs, young, old, and persons on the basis of their sexual orientation). However, such groups are only 'mentioned' and separately, as if one is distinct from the other, and as if one can be either disabled or a woman or old or immigrant or poor but not in combination. Exceptions to the lack of an intersectional approach to inequalities are found in the Communist Party's texts, where class and gender intersect (e.g. "within capitalism women's work force is more of an object of exploitation than men's"). As for the General Secretariat of Equality speaking at the first meeting of a new committee, insisting on "vulnerable groups of women" and in particular on "immigrant women, Roma women, women in long-term unemployment" as victims of a double discrimination, one wonders at the extent or form of intersectional approach. Perhaps in this discourse an intersectional approach concerning specific women is present in terms of being conceptualised as "women even more vulnerable than others."

It is clear from all the above introductory comments, that intersectionality is not a source of controversy and debate in gender+ equalities policies, since it is not really an issue in Greece (at least not yet, or not in the present political climate).

2b Fundamentals of gender policy after 1995

The institution of quotas in local elections in Greece took place in 2001 via law 2910/2001, which provides that at least 1/3 participation by each gender as candidates is obligatory in the Municipal and Prefecture elections. If this was one of the most noteworthy gender equality legal measures in Greece for the last decade, it was made possible by a major change at the level of the Constitution. Indeed, in the **2001 Constitutional revision** two articles concern issues of gender equality:

a) Article 116 par. 2 of the revised Constitution explicitly stipulates that the State is obliged to take **specific positive measures for the elimination of discriminations** mainly against women, aiming at the effective implementation of the gender equality.

b) The new Article 31 paragraph 1 of the Constitution stipulates that to be eligible for election to the Presidency of the Republic, a person must be of Greek descent from the father's **or mother's side**.

The revision of Article 116/2 was saluted by many as an important step towards de facto gender equality, since thereafter, any deviations from the principle of gender equality were to be eliminated and the responsibility of the State to take special positive measures for the elimination of any discrimination against women was established. In light of Article 116 paragraph 2 of the revised Constitution, and Article 1 of the United Nations CEDAW, the Greek Council of State has ruled that deviations from the principle of gender equality constitute discriminations against women. **Taking positive measures** for the elimination of discriminations mainly against women for the effective implementation of the principle of gender equality in all sectors, far from constituting discrimination, **constitutes an obligation**. In the past, the lack of constitutional legitimisation of quotas resulted in the annulment of many attempts by the Council of State.

Apart from the important constitutional revision, **The National Action Plans** of the period demonstrate the priorities in gender equality policy. In particular, the **National Action Plan for Equality 2001-2006** was implemented during the 2001-2004 period (until March 2004, when there was a change in Government sanctioning the return of the Right). The main aim of this Plan was “the modernization of social standards, targeting at full utilization of human resources regardless of sex and the elimination of any form of discrimination against women”. The principal instrument for the implementation of the principle of gender equality was stipulated to be gender mainstreaming.

The main axes of this Plan were the following:

- Gender equality in economic life.
- Equal participation and representation in the political, social and economic sectors.
- Equal access to the implementation of social rights for men and women.
- Change of the roles and stereotypes of the sexes.

In other words, the main targets of gender equality policy in Greece during this decade are, in total accordance with the EU, as follows:

- A. Combating the equality deficit in labour relations and the labour market.
- B. Preventing and combating domestic violence and human trafficking.
- C. Combating stereotyped conceptions of gender roles within the educational process.
- D. Strengthening of women's participation in decision making.

In 2004 there was a change in government in Greece and the Right returned to power. It had neither the wish nor the strength to change existing gender policy which was predefined within Greece's international obligations. *Thus, we cannot speak of any major shift in gender policy, due to the political change from Left to Right, nor about controversies that resulted in a different approach to issues of gender equality.*

There was maybe a small observable change, an expected uneasiness/awkwardness, and a period of inertia, as well as a little less grasp of the matter and less conviction in what has to be done anyway.

The main programme for gender equality for the period 2004-2008, was according to the country's 6th Report for the CEDAW, to develop "an integrated and cohesive strategic intervention, aiming to stress both the national importance and the supra-national dimension of gender equality issues. In the present situation, these two parameters render the promotion of such issues a national priority, above any political differences. The main aim of this intervention is to disengage gender equality issues from the category of marginal and special issues and to stress their political, economic, social and developmental character, through their direct connection to prevailing national priorities (development, employment, social cohesion)." In other words, it is "gender policy for development" not for equality, justice, democracy etc. It is in all probability the "modernisation argument" (which has a long tradition in Greek political culture) resurfacing once more.

As for the means for the implementation of the above targets, it is clarified in the same Report that the General Secretariat for Equality (GSE) intends to base its strategic intervention on the following:

-The promotion of gender mainstreaming in all instruments, policies and actions
-The undertaking of special actions in the following sectors, which will be put forward as priority sectors:

1. Combating the equality deficit in **labour relations** and the labour market.
2. Preventing and combating family **violence and human trafficking**, the victims of which are women.
3. Combating **stereotyped conceptions** regarding "the role of the sexes" within the educational process, especially in primary education.
4. Strengthening women's **participation in decision making**.

The mention of gender mainstreaming as a strategy is unavoidable, due to EU obligations. What must be stressed is that priorities centre on: labour market issues, gender violence, gender stereotypes and women's presence in decision making. We could say that in a sense, *three out of four of our issues for Quing (two out of the three set issues, plus the supplementary one) appear, one way or the other, within Greece's gender policy priority areas*: Non employment, as related to the labour market, and gender violence and immigration, related to the issue of trafficking.

According to the findings of the project "Implementing Gender Mainstreaming at Governmental level in the EU Member States"², "Greece has focused on gender

² "Implementing Gender Mainstreaming at Governmental level in the EU Member States". 2005, by Gunilla Sterner, Helene Biller. Ministry of Integration and Gender Equality, Sweden. A project co-funded by the EU Gender Equality Programme.

mainstreaming throughout the guidelines, policies and actions to be supported by the 4th Community Support framework (2007-2013). Gender mainstreaming as a tool to achieve gender equality is in the process of elaboration.”³ While it is further stated that “Greece does not have a plan for implementing gender mainstreaming”, it does have an **Action Plan for Gender Equality 2004-2008**, since after the change in government a new Action Plan was formulated. Its goals are practically the same, with very small differences in the phrasing, as was to be expected. The specific gender equality measures that were taken in accordance to the above provisions of the Action Plans refer to many policy areas.⁴ The ones referring to immigration, which could be of special interest in considering an intersectionality approach, are as follows:

- In 2002, the General Secretariat for Gender Equality and the Bureau of the United Nations High Commission in Greece signed a Memorandum of Co-operation, in a common effort to promote the rights of women and underage girls who have been offered asylum or have applied for asylum or have been granted humanitarian status in Greece according to the Geneva Convention of 1951 and Presidential Decree 61/1999. A result of this coordinated action has been the issuing of a circular by the Chief of the Greek Police regarding detention and the conditions of detention of people applying for asylum, wherein there is special reference to the treatment of detained women.
- From 2001 onwards, state institutions, the Bureau of the United Nations High Commission in Greece and non-governmental organizations have implemented programmes of extensive assistance to women/asylum seekers, immigrant women and women/members of vulnerable groups.
- The new Code on Greek Citizenship (law 3284/2004) abolishes any further discrimination between children of Greek or alien women.

2c Equality machinery and (the lack of) intersectional approaches

In relation to the gender machinery, in Greece the General Secretariat for Equality is responsible for promoting and implementing policy measures for gender equality in all fields (political, economical, social, and cultural). *Thus in Greece there is one*

³ See *ibid.* Annex 6, *Formal Political Support*.

⁴For a comprehensive presentation of all policies and measures necessary for this report, the Greek Reports to the CEDAW have proved extremely useful. In particular, see Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women, *Consideration of reports submitted by States parties under article 18 of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women*. Sixth periodic report of States parties Greece/ 05-40579 (E) 291105. For the initial report submitted by the Government of Greece, see CEDAW/C/5/Add.28 which was considered by the Committee at its sixth session. For the combined second and third periodic report submitted by the Government of Greece, see CEDAW/C/GRC/2-3 which was considered by the Committee at its twentieth session. For the combined fourth and fifth periodic report submitted by the Government of Greece, see CEDAW/C/GRC/4-5 which was considered by the Committee at its exceptional session.

dedicated gender unit. Originally created in 1982 as an advisory Council for Gender Equality directly responsible to the Prime Minister and operating as an independent official unit of the Ministry of the Presidency, it was upgraded three years later (Law 1558/85) into a GSE of the Ministry of Presidency. Today it is the governmental agency in charge of gender issues, supervised by the Ministry of Interior, Public Administration and Decentralisation, and has since had at its head an under-secretary of state, which is a junior cabinet member. But it may again be noted, as specified above, its title “General Secretariat for Equality” implies gender equality is a synonym to equality. Thus, the gender equality body is not integrated with machinery for other equality issues, nor is there any other single strand equality body, so the question of whether they actively engage with the issue of intersecting inequalities does not apply.

Regarding other types of machinery, there are no important changes during the recent period, in spite of the stipulated “new institutional mechanisms” that have been established, such as the Inter-ministerial Committee for Gender Equality (2000), the Permanent Parliamentary Committee for Equality and Human Rights (2002) and the Office for Gender Equality in the Ministry of National Defence (2004). All the above have mainly remained on paper, or have had minimal influence on the policy process having been primarily labels used for communication reasons. As for the *National Committee on the Equality between Men and Women* established in 2006, stipulated in Article 8 of Law 3491/2006 that has been analysed here, it has yet to prove its purpose. Its creation was often commonly questioned, given that its role seems to overlap with the purpose of the General Secretariat for Equality.

A few NGO’s engage in intersecting equality politics, especially concerning immigrant women. However there are no specialised policies or practices in relation to gender-based violence in minority or immigrant communities. The generalised anti-discriminatory stand (mainly of the left) refers to the fact that “discriminations against immigrants are legally and morally unacceptable. Greek law provides for that. We must apply this provision. Immigrants are discriminated against because they are positioned as non citizens and (implicitly) on the basis of class.”

3. The range of the meanings or frames concerning gender equality in gender+ equality policies

The texts that have been selected and analysed in the **general category of gender policy** are noted below. By their specific character/object, it becomes clear that they could be very appropriate for intersectionality analysis. However, this is not exactly the case:

-*Law 3304/2005* (which implements directives 2000/78 and 2000/43), on “Implementation of the principle of equal treatment irrespective of racial or ethnic origin, religious or other beliefs, disability, age or sexual orientation”.

-Governmental policy report: *National Policy Priorities and Axes for Action for Gender Equality* (2004 – 2008). Ministry of Interior, Public Administration and Decentralization.

- *Debate in parliament*: Protocols of the Plenary Sessions of the Greek Parliament, 11 January 2005. Extract from the Discussion of Bill on equal treatment.

-*Civil society text*: Annual Report of the Greek Ombudsman 2007 on equal treatment: “Promoting Equal Treatment. The Greek Ombudsman as National Equality Body”, 12 October 2007.

-*General gender+ equality machinery*: Accompanying explanatory report to Article 8 of Law 3491/2006 *Regulating issues of the National Centre of Public Administration and other issues relating to the Ministry of Interior, Public Administration and Decentralization*.

-*General gender+ equality machinery*: Press release on the first meeting of the National Committee of Equality between Men and Women, Ministry of Interior, Public Administration and Decentralization.

- *General gender+ equality machinery*: Parliamentary debates during discussion and voting of Law 3491/2006.

In non-employment, the sub-issues most relevant to QUING are:

- Social security
- Gender pay gap and equal treatment in employment
- Care and work
- Reconciliation of work and family life

These sub-issues form the main body of policies that have in recent years been closely connected with a commitment to promoting women’s access to the labour market and gender equality in employment.

For many years the Greek Law for **Social Security** regarded men as breadwinners and women as responsible for providing family care and there had not been major reforms as regards the pension system. In 1982, law 1287/82 extended pension rights to women working in the rural sector. Likewise, in 1988, law 1759/88 gave insurance rights to family members working in family enterprises (primarily women). Law 3029/02 includes measures in order to improve the pension system and to eliminate every form of gender discrimination as regards social security. For the first time, working mothers insured by the Social Security Institute Fund (IKA) have been given the option to a ‘notional period of time’ in order to complete the required insurance time to obtain a pension, as indirect recognition of their unpaid care work.

The 'notional period of time' is estimated as one year for the first child, one and a half for the second child and two years for the third child.

On the other hand, social exclusion indicators show that the **gender pay gap** was 9% in 2005⁵ and 10% in 2004⁶. (Other measurements estimate 15% and even 25%). It follows that there is a gap between de jure and de facto pay in Greece. Equal pay is not directly related to non-employment but inequalities of income combined with a non-family friendly labour market influence many women's decision to work. Equal pay is provided for in **article 22 of the Constitution of 1975** where for the first time in Greece gender equality was consolidated (article 4 general principal of equality). In 1984, equal pay was included in law 1414/84 aiming at adjusting employment equality measures to the E.C. directives 75/117 and 76/207. This law was replaced by law 3488/2006 on the 'principle of equal treatment' between men and women as regards their access to employment and vocational training. The law 3488/2006 transposed directive EEC73/2002 into the national legislation; article 5 abolished articles 3 and 10 of the law 1414/84, the misinterpretation and incorrect implementation of which had lead to a systematic restriction on the access of women in the labour market and the exclusion of women from professions such as the Police and the armed forces.

Care and work is an integral part of reconciliation, equal opportunities and social policy in Greece. However, policymaking in these fields is characterized by fragmentary and often contradictory regulations that obstruct the normal operation of several organisations and institutions, and this is because the state prefers to offer short-term solutions as an alternative to social policy reform. In that context, child care is limited to the following:

- Public nurseries supervised by the local government, the Ministry of Health and Social Solidarity, or by NGO's.
- Public kindergartens that belong to the public system of primary education.
- Day-long public kindergarten and day-long primary public schools in order to support dual-career families and the participation of mothers in the labour market.
- Private nurseries.
- Centres for creative activities.

The PASOK (Panhellenic Socialist Party) government in 1997 established **the day-long kindergartens and primary schools** (law 2525/1997) in an attempt to strengthen the role of the state in child-care beyond the regular operating hours of

⁵ National Statistical Service of Greece EU Statistics on Income and Living Conditions, 2005 'Social Cohesion Indicators', http://www.statistics.gr/gr_tables/S805_SFA_2_TB_AN_05_1_Y%20.pdf

⁶ National Statistical Service of Greece, EU Statistics on Income and Living Conditions, 2004 'Social Cohesion Indicators' http://www.statistics.gr/gr_tables/S805_SFA_2_DK_AN_04_1_Y.pdf

public schools. Despite efforts to expand care services, insufficient child care facilities create a barrier to women's employment because they cannot meet family needs for child care. EU-SILC 2004 shows that to a large extent child care in Greece is provided by family members, relatives or other people⁷.

Reconciliation of work and family life refers to the combination of paid and unpaid labour or balance between paid work and caring responsibilities. It is seen as a well-considered policy response to labour and care issues.

The turning point for developing coherent reconciliation policies in Greece was the transposition of the **Open Method of Coordination** (as defined in the **Treaty of Amsterdam 1997**) guidelines into national and regional policies⁸. The OMC was further officially defined and endorsed at the Lisbon Council in 2000.

The National Action Plan for Social Integration (NAP) 2003⁹ reveals that in Greece non-working women's reluctance to work results from family obligations and a variety of labour market complexities. In Greece working conditions combine the following characteristics: inflexible working hours and a limited range of options available to a potential employee; "incompatibility between working hours and the hours observed by the social infrastructure (schools, public administration, government departments, shops, etc.); the limited duration of the official school timetable, the way that many city schools operate alternating morning and afternoon shifts" (National Action Plan, 2003). All of the above comprise factors that prevent many women from participating in the labour market. Another factor influencing women's decision to work is the partial development of child and elder care services, as well as many women's attitude and preference to bring up their children alone.

In Greece, reconciliation policies aim at bridging the gap between work and caring responsibilities. Most of these policies are described in a number of Government documents on employment issues such as the National Action Plans, which epitomize the integrated employment policy of the Government, and also in law articles related to the following general categories:

1. Measures for the regulation of working hours (reduction of working hours and flexible types of employment).
2. Balancing measures promoting maternal, paternal and parental leaves (maternity and parental leaves should not be detrimental to women's access to employment, encouraging men to participate in child caring duties).

⁷National Statistical Service of Greece, 17.05.2006 Press release available at: http://www.statistics.gr/gr_tables/S805_SFA_2_DT_05_04_1_Y.pdf

⁸ OMC allows member-states to coordinate their employment policies, exchange knowledge, policies and good practices on social policy.

⁹ Ministry of Labour and Social Security, "National Action Plan for Social Integration, 2002-2005, Athens, July 2003

3. Measures referring to Collective Deliberate action at a business level (regulation of working hours, child and elder care).
4. Measures for the provision of allowances, benefits, structures and support services.
5. Measures for the social organisation of time (operating hours of public services, administrative authorities, schools and shops).

Although in the policy texts reconciliation is represented as an issue of intimacy, it appears that most policy proposals offer solutions away from the gendered organization of intimacy (see also Meier, Peterson, Tertinegg and Zentai 2007, 118). Overall reconciliation policies in Greece lay great emphasis on flexible employment.

Part-time employment is undoubtedly the most common type of flexible employment. In Greece part-time employment is 'feminized' as more women than men work part-time. Some policy texts suggest that part-time employment gives women the opportunity to reconcile work and family life and also it is a convenient option for students to get some income. Additionally, it is considered an important measure against long-term unemployment. Generally, part-time work does not have a long history in Greece since it was enacted in 1990 by the law 1892/90. Some regulations like work suspension and supplementary employment pre-existed in law 3198/55 which is still in practice as a form of part-time employment. In 1998 law 1892/90 was amended and completed by law 2639/98 "Regulation of Labour Relations, Establishment of Labour Inspectorate and other provisions" by the Ministry of Labour and Social Security. Article 1 regulates issues of informal work and work-at-home. Furthermore, law 3250/2004 'Part-time Employment in the Public Sector, Local Government and Legal Public Entities' allows the above mentioned agencies to hire staff for part-time employment from vulnerable social groups (unemployed people, people with disabilities, mothers with small children and parents with three or more children). Compared to other European member-states, part-time employment is very limited in Greece because it involves low-paid and low-status jobs. For many years the rate for part-time employment has been stable at around 4-5% below the EU average (18%)¹⁰.

In **intimate citizenship**, the policy texts analyzed are quite limited due to the lack of policy initiatives in this area in the time period covered by QUING. In Greece, heterosexual marriage and divorce are not currently under discussion, since no new legislation covering those aspects has been passed since the 1980's. Regulation of partnership outside marriage, both homosexual and heterosexual, is a very recent debate that has not yet produced any law; however in the last 2-3 years discussion has surfaced and we have therefore decided to include for analysis some texts that deal with this issue since they are indicative of the way the issue of same-sex

¹⁰ Press release 25 August 2005 available at:
[http://www.parliament.gr/sioufas/press/Deltia/2005/8_2005/\(25-08-05\)stage.doc](http://www.parliament.gr/sioufas/press/Deltia/2005/8_2005/(25-08-05)stage.doc)

partnership is currently framed. Finally, on reproductive issues, during the QUING period the debate in Greece has been on medically assisted reproduction.

In gender based violence, the sub issues most relevant to the QUING project are:

- Domestic violence and rape in marriage;
- Sexual harassment;
- Trafficking and prostitution (although not addressed as gender-based violence).

Domestic violence is recognized and reported as a social problem in Greece according to evidence given by the NGO's and the newspaper reports; however it still remains a 'common secret' well kept within Greek families. A National Plan exists since 1997 in Greece on the subject of violence against women, drafted by senior civil servants at the Ministry of the Interior. However, this plan was never implemented. Until last year, when Law 3500/2006 was passed, it was often noted that there was no specific legislation for domestic violence which would take into account the marital and the familial relationships. According to official sources the long delay to put the issue forward with specific legislative acts is attributed to 'the lack of political commitment by the various ministries involved, and the division of competencies between them that makes coordination difficult' (see Greek Helsinki Report 2002).

During the last decade there were certain attempts to embody EU directives, mainly after January 2000, when the Secretary General for Equality, who works at the Ministry of the Interior, announced the creation of an **Inter-ministerial Committee** to develop a policy on the subject of violence against women. Once again no mention was made of a specific budget which would be necessary to implement this policy. The Inter-ministerial Committee is made up of Ministerial representatives from the Ministry of Health and Social Protection, Ministries of Justice, Public Order, civil servants from the Department of the Secretary General for Equality, members of the police force and university experts.

Since 2001, Greece has started to tackle **trafficking in human beings** and sexual exploitation of women and girls in a systematic way. Since August 2004, the Greek government has been implementing an integrated National Action Plan against trade and trafficking in persons. This Plan covers the whole spectrum of actions, more specifically: screening, identification, protection and support of the victim, granting of a residence permit, a work permit and a reflection period, voluntary repatriation with financing of reintegration programmes, training of police officers, judges and public prosecutors, information and raise awareness of the society and the creation of a national database for monitoring the phenomenon. The National Action Plan is coordinated at a political level by a Special Inter-ministerial Committee of Secretary Generals in cooperation with specialised NGOs and the International Organization for Migration (IOM). An important turning-point was a Memorandum of Cooperation

between the Special Committee on the one hand, and twelve (12) NGOs and the IOM on the other. There has been an extensive television campaign aiming to raise awareness amongst public.

The 3064 Act, which covers the subject of trafficking, was adopted in October 2002 and alongside the 233/2003 Decree it governs the subject of trafficking of human beings for sexual purposes. It considers trafficking as a crime and provides a base for the assistance and protection of victims according to the measures set down in the Decree. Unfortunately, these texts do not explicitly provide for work permits which are essential if the victim is able to earn enough money to live and also for their psychological wellbeing. However, despite the gaps in the Act and the Decree and its lack of clarity, the legal framework aims to protect victims. The work done by NGOs in this area is of great significance if we consider the activities carried out, the knowledge gained and the pressure brought to bear on the competent authorities by the Movement. We should also mention here the Agreement on Collaboration for the prevention and suppression of cross-border crime (SECI), which was signed by Greece, Turkey and the Balkan States in 1999 and which came into effect in 2000. 20% of its budget is covered by the Greek State.

Since 1999 **prostitution** in Greece has been regulated by a new law which defines it a legal profession - for men and single women only - by specifying permits and health checks for sex workers, as well as tight rules on location including specification of a 200-metre distance from civic buildings such as churches or schools. However the law was not enforced until the middle of 2003, when the city council revived it for a pre- Olympic Games 'clean up', saying enforcement would cut down the 600-odd brothels operating in the city to 230. But in the meantime, the vice Mayor Hra Valsamaki put forward a proposal for an amendment to the law 2734 of 1999 requesting the issue of extra permits for hotels to provide sexual services. The justification was that during the Olympics, when demand is expected to rise sharply, it would be very difficult to exert control over illegal brothels. Also 'if the existing ones begin to comply with regulations and are licensed, then authorities will have better control over the sex trade'. The reactions to this decision were direct and came from all parts.

Until 2006, there was no specific legislation on **sexual harassment**; the general provisions were applicable in very few cases that came before the courts. They included: a) provisions in the Civil Code: article 57 entitles the victim to request the charges to be lifted and for its omission in the future; article 59 provides for the compensation of the victim; article 281 prohibits abuse of the law; article 662 obliges the employer to protect the life and health of his or her employees; article 932 provides for the compensation of the individual whose life or health has been damaged; b) provisions in the Penal Code: article 337 provides for the punishment of the assault against sexual dignity; article 343 provides for sanctions against employees who commit an offence against an individual under his or her charge;

article 361 provides for sanctions for insulting either verbally or through one's actions; c) labour laws including the 1414/1984 Act which prohibits discrimination in the workplace. The recommendation of the Inter-ministerial Committee to draft a specific law was rejected on the basis that Greece was due in the near future to ratify Directive 2002/73/CE which contains clauses concerning sexual harassment in the workplace and because of this it was deemed unnecessary to have a specific law on the subject.

In September 2006, a new law was adopted (**Law 3488/2006 Official Journal of the Hellenic Republic A' 191/11.09.2006**), which addresses sexual harassment in the workplace, at the same time incorporating the relevant EU Directive into domestic law and responding to related recommendations of this Committee.

3.1 The range of the meanings or frames of gender equality in general legislation and machinery

Concerning general gender equality legislation, the analysis of the texts showed that there is a lack of a developed diagnosis, which usually remains on a shallow **under-problematised** level. In general, the prognosis is more developed, either in length, depth or in concreteness, often resulting in imbalanced texts leaning more towards "what is to be done" and less towards "what is the problem". The communist text is quantitatively more balanced, but both diagnosis and prognosis are under-theorised, looking more like slogans. The Minister's speech on Bill 3491 is also more balanced but seems to repeat the EU jargon. On the other hand, the Greek Ombudsman's report, in its lengthy diagnosis, prepares the reader for a broader prognosis than merely the stated "we must comply with the law".

While the **problem statement** is also as a rule under-theorised, it is striking that the Minister of the Interior (where the Secretariat for Equality belongs), in presenting the main priorities for gender equality for 2004-08, insists that until now gender equality was promoted as a specific target, while from now on it will be part of the three basic poles of policy making: Development-Employment-Social cohesion. Two important points here: a) He admits that until 2004 nothing has been done in the area of gender mainstreaming, b) He presents, for the first time, gender policy as a *means* to economic development.

A variety of norms are referred to in the diagnosis, mainly "equal treatment", "equal opportunities", "economic development", "efficiency", "cooperation", "anti-discrimination", but also, "equality", society with "no exploitation", and "respect of civil rights". In the problem solution, in addition to the above norms, the "Europeanization" of the country as a value per se is found.

While the **concept of gender** is generally referred to in its social sense, the fact that no radical change in gender roles is considered implies the existence of a strong biological component. The only exception is the ombudsman text which, in trying to show that the Ministry of Mercantile Marine limit to the number of women admitted in its schools, without any legal justification, leads to excluding a large number of women who wish to be captains or marine engineers, refutes the statement that women are necessarily weaker. Indeed, the ombudsman refutes any significance of biological differences among women and men by refuting the legitimacy of the statement that the difficulties in training are very great for women (This seems to go further than the usual discourse in gender equality texts).

The above comments point also towards the fact that equality is mainly perceived as same treatment (with preferential measures for the weaker) among two given, pre-constructed categories. Nowhere but in the ombudsman text are gender stereotypes questioned. As a frame, "equality" is dominant, due to the type of texts selected, as is economic development rendering gender equality a means to an end, while indicators and statistics are nonexistent. The call for action is centred on the national level, due to the type of texts, while due to the texts referring to the National Committee and the National priorities 2004-2008, there are a lot of appeals to civil society and the social partners.

Depending on the provenance of the text we obviously note a different **main normative message**. Kouvelis' (Left) speech in Parliament (GR/Kouvelisin Parljan05) insists on the need for a society of equality comprising of all Greek territory. Discriminations must not be tolerated. While the Communist Party (GR/Parldebate3491), considering the European acquis as a weapon for the destruction of peoples and countries in view of economic interests, insists that Capitalism is the source of all evil. Only out of capitalism, in "a different society", can women's problems and issues of gender inequality be solved. But gender equality is not considered as a norm per se since what prevails is the credo "let's change the social system and gender issues will automatically be solved". In other texts, such as when the minister of the Interior (who supervises gender equality) speaks, we have the impression that the main underlying norm, apart from the expected new reference to economic development and to social cooperation (because of the main object of the speech), is that "Lisbon says so". That seems to be the main "norm" in many official Greek texts in which EU directives seem to be perceived as unavoidable natural phenomena. In such texts, we can also detect an attitude indicative of the following (see GR/natcomongenrqual): "we have achieved a lot, there are a few areas still to be confronted, so that is what we will do". As to the reason why, the implicit answer/norm could be that change in attitudes is good; and that is it. This under-theorisation of gender policy becomes a policy issue in itself when such a stance is taken by the General Secretary for Equality. For the Ombudsman of course, concerned with protecting victims of state arbitrariness, underlying norms stress that the "Law must be respected" and "Equality of opportunity must be applied", while

discriminations are seen to derive from out-dated social prejudice which is socially detrimental.

In this general context it is not astonishing that **intersectionality** is almost non-existent. While other inequalities are mentioned as axes, depending on the type of the text and particularly in texts on the labour market (e.g. Law 3304 Application of the principle of equal treatment, regardless of racial or national provenance, religious or other beliefs, disability, age or sexual orientation, in application of the need to incorporate in national law EC Directives 2000/43 and 2000/78), there are almost no intersecting inequalities in our texts. Disabled persons, foreign workers, supporters of 'other' religious beliefs, supporters of non mainstream beliefs, young, old, and persons on the basis of their sexual orientation etc are mentioned but with no intersectionality.

Exceptions to the lack of an intersectional approach to inequalities are found in the Communist Party text, in which class and gender intersect (“within capitalism women's work force is more of an object of exploitation than men's”), and the General Secretary of Equality speaking at the first meeting of the new committee insisting on “vulnerable groups of women” and in particular on “immigrant women, Roma women, and women in long-term unemployment” as victims of a double discrimination. As mentioned above however, one wonders at the extent of an intersectional approach in this case; we could maybe accept that in this discourse an intersectional approach concerning specific women is observable in being conceptualised as ‘women even more vulnerable than others.’

3.2 The range of the meanings or frames of gender equality in non employment

In non-employment the sub-issues addressed were social security, equal treatment and equal pay, care and work and reconciliation of work and family life. **The concept of gender equality** in the context of non-employment refers to equality in employment, equal treatment at the workplace, equal pay, a higher participation of women in the labour market, integration and non-discrimination.

Diagnosis and prognosis are not always equally elaborated. Laws, for example, lay greater emphasis on the prognosis and legal technicalities whereas the NAP, similar to other policy plans and civil society texts, is more analytical and both sections are consistently divided over a number of sub-themes. Generally, both sections are nearly equally developed in texts that are produced by policy making bodies. Compared to laws, civil society texts and policy plans employ a gender equality approach and draw attention to mechanisms that produce inequality and social exclusion and provide a number of solutions. Parliamentary debates focus on technical issues and do not provide real explanations and solutions. Overall

parliamentary debates are very limited in scope, sometimes also incoherent, and lay more emphasis on the diagnosis than the prognosis.

In addition, sometimes **prognosis** describes some possibilities for action but often it does not provide clear priorities regarding those actions. At times, problems and solutions are linked to different social domains or spheres and actors in diagnosis do not always match actors in prognosis. Most policy plans address the following issues as very important in achieving gender equality goals: promoting female employment, effective implementation of gender equality policies, particularly in the private sector; advancing education, vocational training and lifelong learning for women; promoting part-time employment and flexible types of work to meet the needs of women with family obligations; and changing traditional perceptions of women's role in the family.

Furthermore, the preferential treatment of women in **the social security system** that is related to their right to retire earlier than men is generally seen as recognition of women's care-giving role and unpaid work in society. Neo-liberal politicians, however, are against the early retirement of women, except perhaps for women with children, because in their view it violates the constitutional principle of gender equality.

The implementation of gender equality and the incorporation of **equal treatment and equal pay** into legislative, normative and administrative measures is the most important policy objective. Additionally, policy actions involve the following gender equality objectives: combating vocational segregation, greater participation of women in positions of responsibility, and increase in minimum pay and pay for part-time employment, all aiming to bridge the gender pay gap; to combat any loss related to job position after a period of absence due to family obligations; to support career advising structures and vocational training; and to enforce the existing law by the activation of control mechanisms that will impose penalties on those employers that violate labour laws.

Gender equality in relation to **care and work** is seen as greater participation of men in family responsibilities. There is great emphasis on the need to provide men with incentives to use parental leaves. Additionally, the elimination of gender stereotypes is considered important for gender equality and the increase in female employment as well as the presence of more women in public life. Another important issue related to gender equality and care is the emphasis most texts put on the need for the expansion of good quality child and elder care services.

Gender equality is associated with the social organisation of the provision of care and the pressing need to modernise the Greek labour market in order to facilitate the participation of more women in employment. In that context, **reconciliation** is represented as a number of labour reforms that include measures for flexible working hours, part-time and informal types of employment so as to facilitate the entry,

retention and advancement of women in employment. Although most texts favour part-time employment as a proper measure for women with caring responsibilities, civil society and policy-making bodies disagree and stress that unemployment and gender inequality are hidden by part-time and other informal types of employment.

Social categories and institutions are mentioned as actors in both sections. Active actors in diagnosis are not always clearly defined. Private companies, employers and other labour related actors (i.e. trade unions, Labour Inspectorates) are pictured as **active actors** because they violate labour laws and general collective agreements or because they fail to apply laws. In some cases the Government and the state are seen as responsible for the existing complexities in the labour market and the failure to develop mechanisms for law enforcement. Society is also seen as a responsible for the perpetuation of traditional gender stereotypes. Women are seen as active actors as well because they “prefer” part-time, illegal and temporary employment; and mostly because they do not seek any information or advice about their work rights. Hence they are depicted as irresponsible and unwilling to seek formal employment. Generally however, women are the predominant **passive actor** in all sub-issues, particularly working women and mothers. Other passive actors are the de-gendered categories of unemployed, employees, parents, the elderly, people close to pension age, disabled people and children or pupils. **Target groups** in prognosis include women and men, fathers and mothers, long-term unemployed, children, young and old people, parents, single parent families and families with many children, employees and job-seekers. There is minor reference also to pregnant women, married women and women with children. All **responsible actors** constitute de-gendered institutional categories. It is the Ministry of Employment and Social Protection and other government departments and social partners (businesses and trade unions) that are mentioned as responsible actors.

With the exception of one text (law 2525/1997), all other texts invoke gender. It is not however always possible to say whether gender is really seen as a social or biological category. Policy texts mostly see men and women as social categories, while laws, civil society texts and to some extent parliamentary debates reproduce biological categories. Most texts picture gender equality as both a means to a policy goal and an end in itself. Laws see gender equality primarily as a strategy or means to policy goals, while policy texts that are produced by policy-making bodies see gender equality also as an end in itself. The majority of texts see equality as sameness and the strategy as equal treatment.

3.3 The range of the meanings or frames of gender equality in intimate citizenship

Concerning the relative importance of sub-issues in intimate citizenship it must be noted with regard to same-sex partnership that discussion is still largely non-existent. Therefore this is rather a non-issue (for the time-period covered by QUING), despite

the triggering of some debates in the last couple of years. In contrast, artificial insemination and assisted reproduction are discussed and there has been some legislation in recent years, whilst issues such as abortion and divorce are no longer on the agenda since they have been 'resolved' (i.e. legalized) during the 1980's. At that time, they represented very important issues, particularly abortion.

It is not easy to identify frames of gender equality in the texts analyzed. Gender equality is not relevant and not used in the majority of texts, with the exception of one text by a civil society actor where gender equality is seen as an end in itself.

Regarding the reproductive rights sub-issue, one common pattern in the governmental texts is the way reproductive rights are viewed; most of the time the argument in favour of the adopted legalisation stresses the need to protect the rights of the (unborn) children conceived through artificial insemination, more than the need to protect the rights of women getting this treatment. Protection of children and family are seen as top priorities, together with the concept of 'motherhood'. Even where there is argumentation in favour of the right of single women to have access to fertility treatment (parliamentary debate by Th. Askitis), the speaker defends his position by claiming that eventually single women having children will seek a (male) partner and therefore form the desired family. It is interesting that in the text by the Greek Holy Synod, which is fiercely against the proposed legislation on assisted reproduction on the grounds that it goes against natural laws, one can detect some common patterns with a text defending the legislation (the Askitis text). Natural laws are accepted in both texts and sides, and family and motherhood are idealized.

3.4 The range of the meanings or frames of gender equality in gender based violence

The sub-issues addressed in gender based violence were domestic violence, trafficking and sexual harassment. For trafficking, and to a lesser extent for domestic violence, one common pattern that can be observed is that in many texts the ineffectiveness of various institutional actors (such as the police, or policies in general) is seen as the key problem. Legal documents have a far less developed diagnosis and mostly underline the need for harmonization of the Greek law with European and international directives (again, this is most evident in texts on trafficking). Civil society texts offer a more developed diagnosis, and a far more gendered perspective, since they mention as problems "patriarchy" and "traditional family values" (in the text by the National Observatory on Violence against women), "male authority" (in the text by the National Human Rights' Commission) or "indifference and hypocrisy in Greek society" (text by G. Touloumi). Women are only mentioned as a vulnerable category in parliamentary debates.

In **Prognosis**, objectives are not always mentioned, and in those cases where there is such reference, this is for general and abstract goals such as to stop, prevent or protect from gender violence. Also, texts in the domestic violence sub-issue have a more developed prognosis than those in the trafficking and sexual exploitation, where in many cases the prognosis is either very underdeveloped or missing.

When speaking about the problem, **active actors** are often identified, either people or institutional actors. When the active actors are people, these in some cases are gendered categories, such as men, but can also be more abstract categories, such as “perpetrators” in general. However, this is only evident in the domestic violence sub-issue; in the trafficking sub-issue, active actors are almost exclusively institutional actors, and state actors to be precise. Therefore, the problem of trafficking is seen as generating from the inefficiency of the Greek State or the Greek government (to apply laws, harmonize its legislation etc), or of the international community or the EU, which has an ineffective policy regarding criminal activities.

Passive actors are predominantly women or children in the domestic violence sub-issue, although they can be more abstract categories, such as “the weak” or “family members”. In the trafficking sub-issue, passive actors are often de-gendered categories since most of the time there is reference only to “victims of trafficking”. It is worth mentioning that in this sub-issue we find the only explicit reference to intersectionality, when “*young* migrant women” are recognized as passive actors.

Nearly all documents invoke gender; the exceptions are two Law documents on the Bill on Trafficking. In all civil society texts, gender as a social category is either the dominant or the sole framing used. In the parliamentary debates, there is no such clear pattern; in some cases gender is seen primarily as biological, in others as social, in some cases it is not possible to say, or there is a combination of dominant and marginal frames. In nearly half the documents however, gender equality is seen as relevant to the policy, in some documents as an end in itself, in others as a means to a policy goal, with a rather balanced distribution among the texts regarding whether it is seen as a vision or as a strategy. Again, civil society tend to favour more gender as a vision, with legal texts tending towards the strategy option, and parliamentary debates standing in the middle with a less clear pattern. The vision of gender transformation is either absent or marginal in all texts except the civil society ones.

As noted before, **intersectionality** is considered only in the trafficking sub-issue texts. In these texts, gender mostly intersects with race or ethnic origin, age, nationality/migrant status and, to a lesser degree, with class or marital status.

Regarding **frames**, human rights and equality are present most of the time (either as sole frames, as dominant or as significant frames), followed by the avoidance of crime and administration of penal justice, as well as prostitution and sexual and

economic exploitation. Other marginal frames include health and modernization/ Europeanization.

3.5 Summary and comparison

As we have seen there is a lack of a developed diagnosis concerning “what’s the problem with gender inequality”, thus the issue remains on a shallow **under-problematised** level. In the diagnosis, a variety of norms are referred to, such as “equal treatment”, “equal opportunities”, “economic development”, “efficiency”, “cooperation”, “anti-discrimination”, but also, “equality” society with “no exploitation”, and “respect of civil rights”. In the problem solution, in addition to the above norms, the “Europeanization” of the country as a value per se is found.

Equality is mainly perceived as same treatment among two given, pre-constructed different categories, which necessitates preferential measures for the weaker. It seems that gender stereotypes are rarely questioned. While the **concept of gender** is generally referred to in its social sense, as was mentioned above, the fact that no radical change in gender roles is considered implies the existence of a strong biological component. Only rarely we note exceptions as in the ombudsman text, where it is refuted that women are necessarily weak. Indeed, the ombudsman refutes any significance of the biological differences among women and men by refuting the legitimacy of the statement that for women the difficulties in training are very great, which seems to go further than the usual discourse in gender equality texts. Obviously, we note a different **main normative message according to the “voice”** of the text, but in the dominant approaches we have the impression that the main underlying norm, apart from the expected (new) reference to economic development and to social cooperation, is that “Lisbon says so”. That seems to be the main “norm”, in many official Greek texts, in which EU directives seem to be perceived as unavoidable natural phenomena, while at the same time the idea that change in attitudes per se is good implicitly (and strangely) prevails.

Gender equality is meant to matter primarily to women, and thus to the whole of society, while the state is perceived as the main if not sole actor in its promotion.

We noted above that it is not surprising that intersectionality is almost non-existent. Other inequalities are mentioned but there are almost no intersecting inequalities in our texts, in which it is labour market inequalities that are mainly noted. While disabled persons, foreign workers, supporters of 'other' religious beliefs, supporters of non mainstream beliefs, young, old, and people on the basis of their sexual orientation etc are mentioned, we often get the impression in Greek policy texts that one can either be woman or disabled or Muslim or old, but not simultaneously.

4. The range of intersecting inequalities

See above. As was mentioned before, this section refers marginally to the Greek case. However, we can trace a few elements of intersectionality in the issue of non-employment and within the framework of the issue of gender-based violence, mainly in trafficking. As far as the issue of non-employment is concerned this is probably because it is a multidimensional issue that by its nature is related to a number of structural inequalities which are not present in other issues as one might expect (e.g. intimate citizenship). With respect to the sub-issue of trafficking, this is mainly due to the fact that the social groups most vulnerable to trafficking are young migrant women.

Non-Employment

In non-employment, the sub-issues most relevant to this project are: social security, equal pay and equal treatment, care and work, and reconciliation of work and family life. Intersectionality is rarely present in the texts and it does not characterise any particular sub-issue. The majority of voices tend to overlook social inequalities, with gender and gender inequality usually disassociated from any other structural inequalities. Religion is not an element of intersectionality and ethnicity appears only in one policy plan (NAP). Class, marital status and, to a lesser extent, age and disability are intersectional categories in unemployment and non-employment. Intersectionality is mainly treated through a separate and de-gendered approach and only in very few cases in a gendered and hierarchical way (i.e. family status intersects with gender). Categories are either named or are described in terms of behaviour. Overall the various categories (i.e. immigrants, the elderly etc.) are mentioned as de-gendered categories (i.e. young unemployed, people above 65 years); hence, with the partial exception only of class and marital status, gender inequality does not usually intersect with other structural inequalities (i.e. minority status, ethnicity, religion, age and disability).

Class inequalities refer to exclusion from employment and the de-gendered distinction between employed and unemployed. Class inequality only becomes gendered when it intertwines with different employment statuses and preferences between women and men. This is framed as both gender-based discrimination and choice. It is suggested that compared to men, women generally work in low-paid jobs and low or medium skilled positions (gender discrimination); or women mainly prefer to work part-time or to work in informal and illegal jobs¹¹ tailored to their family needs as caregivers (choice). Multiple class inequalities also refer to the unique distinction that is often made in Greece between those working in the public (privileged sector) and private sector in terms of working hours, pay, social benefits and maternity

¹¹ Illegal in terms of unregistered employment in the social security system and revenue office.

rights. What is more, class and age inequalities are interlocking and inherently connected. However, the analysis of the texts for the issue of non-employment in Greece does not reveal any of the various dimensions of social exclusion related to both age and class inequality and public debate on these issues proved to be superficial. Texts lay more emphasis on gender and gender inequality than class inequalities whilst there is no real intersection between gender and age.

Family status refers to the support of single-parent families and families with many children or women with children and family obligations. Sexual orientation is not mentioned. Diagnosis suggests that single parent families and families with many children are at risk of poverty due to the lack of coherent state family support policies. Prognosis lays emphasis on the need to eliminate discrimination on the basis of family status; to prevent dismissal on the grounds of marriage or maternity, to prohibit the loss of employment, seniority rights or allowances; and to enable parents to participate in public life, to grant early retirement to women with children. The focus here is on employment and pension rights amongst women with children/family obligations and women without children. Problem holders are families (single parent families and families with many children), and women with children and family obligations.

Age inequalities refer to the following de-gendered social categories: the elderly, pensioners and young people or young unemployed. Diagnosis suggests the young suffer from unemployment and social exclusion whilst pensioners are low income because public pensions are usually very low in Greece. Generally age intertwines with class but the real dimensions of the intersecting inequalities are not really exposed. For example, looking at the EU-SILC data in Greece we observe that the young (16-24 years old) and the elderly are at the highest risk of poverty compared to all other age categories¹².

There is also no reference to the status of the elderly (i.e that they are pensioners or economically dependent on other family members). Prognosis puts emphasis on paid employment in order to (re)integrate pensioners into the labour market and on the decrease of unemployment among young people.

Disability refers to social exclusion and high unemployment rates among people with disabilities. There are only few references to disability and there is no particular intersection with gender.

Ethnicity/race: There is no reference to ethnic groups or groups with particular racial characteristics. There is only one reference to immigrants as a distinct social category which is beyond doubt comprised by different ethnic groups. Immigrants are

¹² For more information see www.statistics.gr / statistical data / social statistics / Income – Living Conditions / Household income and living conditions/ Common Cross-Sectional Indicators 2003-2005.

presented as unskilled workers who need training but the pressing issue of their social security rights is not discussed.

As far as **civil society organisations** are concerned, we must note that civil society organisations in Greece hardly ever take into account multiple inequalities. Class and family status are elements of inequality that are sometimes taken into account in texts. Various inequalities are usually discussed separately even though they may be very closely interconnected (i.e age and class). For example, a civil society text that focuses on family status may only briefly reflect upon class or may not even take it into account. Among the equality strands, family status and class are at the top of the 'hierarchy' and most common combinations are gender and family status and gender and class. Ethnicity, age and disability include de-gendered categories and they are very rarely mentioned.

Civil society organisations are not necessarily 'better' at doing intersectionality' than state-bodies. Civil society is generally weak on that issue. For example, the Confederation of Families with Many Children has largely influenced social policies that are predominantly directed towards parents with many children but it has not had any particular interest in promoting gender equality since it is a traditional conservative organisation. However, civil society organizations with a "progressive" profile, and which are thus by definition against all types of inequality, are definitely **potentially** far better equipped to adopt intersecting approaches to inequality than a neo-liberal state which goes through the motions of equality policy because it has to. It is not a question of whether state or civil society are the main actors in intersectional policy against inequality, but rather a question of their ideological basis.

Trafficking

In the sub-issue of trafficking intersectionality is always present in the relevant texts either explicitly or implicitly. The majority of voices stress the issue of age as a base for vulnerability. Another base for vulnerability is migrant status, especially for women from the former socialist countries of Europe. Social class and the social distribution of gender roles also make a marked appearance in the speeches. In most cases, intersectionality appears as a result of dominant social stereotypes about women in general and prostitutes in particular in Greek society. It also appears in connection to discussions referring to the inefficient legal treatment and protection of juveniles as well as the ineffective legal controls in handling the trafficking in human beings which results in their sexual and economic exploitation by organised international crime networks. In most speeches class, age and migrant status are intersecting in the discussions about gender and all receive similar attention. It is important to note however that recently there has been a tendency to avoid gender references, with discussion revolving around age and the dichotomy of juvenile and adult.

When involved in discussions on trafficking, **civil society organisations** are 'better' at including intersectionality than state-bodies.

5. What are the implications of different versions of intersectionality for the meaning and practice of gender+ equality?

This section is largely irrelevant to the Greek data. However, we will try to give a few partial answers. Obviously, on the theoretical level, the implications of intersectionality for gender+ equality are very important since, as mentioned before, gender equality policy can be really effective for women if it tackles intersectional inequalities.

Concerning the inequalities that are named/mentioned as having an impact on gender equality, or as being a part of gender+ equality, we can note:

Family status in non-employment; age, social class and legal status (immigrants vs residents) in gender-based violence, and prostitutes versus other women in the sub-issue of trafficking.

What are the most 'visible' intersections in the issue/country?

Gender and family status in non-employment and a lesser degree in intimate citizenship; gender and ethnicity, gender and age, and gender and social class in gender-based violence.

Is intersectionality central to the policy? Is it marginal? Is it merely a reference to such groups being consulted?

Marginal for all issues, except the sub-issue of trafficking where intersectionality is very relevant and prominent.

Is there a tendency for intersectionality to be present in particular types of documents?

In general, no. However, texts that are more than usual "inspired" by EU bodies, as well as Ombudsman's texts, have a greater chance of demonstrating intersectional approaches. From another point of view, texts referring to trafficking and the labour market are more probable candidates. Yet in certain civil society documents coming from feminist organisations or movements (i.e. Feminist Movement Initiatives), there is also a tendency for gender to intersect with social class and the status of women in the social stratification and hierarchy.

While there may be increased focus on some groups at intersections, is there at same time a tendency to de-gender (discursively or non discursively) (e.g. lone parents)? There is a strong tendency to de-gender intersectional categories, mainly

in the production of laws and legal documents which appear neutral from the gender point of view.

Are there intersections which you see as absent because they may carry a stigma for already marginalized people, or axis? E.g. gender-based violence in Crenshaw's analysis.

No, that is not an issue. However, in the sub-issue of trafficking there is slight evidence of intersectionality carrying a stigma in the projection of an image of prostitute women versus the image of male prostitutes.

5.1 Inequalities in general gender equality legislation and gender machinery

Is the equalities legislation consistent with the equalities machinery (e.g. separate legislation for each strand, separate equality bodies, or integrated legislation, integrated equality body)? If not, do you know whether there are any changes planned to make the legislation and machinery consistent?

It is difficult to answer this question on the basis of the above. We know that the General Secretariat for Equality is responsible for promoting and implementing policy measures for gender equality in all fields (political, economical, social, and cultural). Thus in Greece there is one dedicated gender unit. However, as was mentioned before, in this title “gender equality” is implied; “equality” is used as a synonym for gender equality. Thus, the gender equality body is not integrated with machinery for other equality issues, nor is there any other single strand equality body.

As for other “new” types of machinery such as the Inter-ministerial Committee for Gender Equality (2000), the Permanent Parliamentary Committee for Equality and Human Rights (2002) and the Office for Gender Equality in the Ministry of National Defence (2004), besides mainly remaining on paper, or having had minimal influence on the policy, nothing permits us to suspect that they will act differently.

A few NGO's engage in intersecting equality politics, especially concerning immigrant women, and form a kind of civil society “machinery” for other, mainly ethnic, inequalities. However there are absolutely no specialised policies or practices in relation to gender-based violence in minority or immigrant communities.

Does the gender / equality machinery take into account all or some (which) categories? How do they relate categories – do they use the concept intersectionality, others?

This question has been answered above.

5.2 Intersections in non employment

Is there a focus on different employment rates amongst women by minority ethnic or religious group? If so, how is this framed (e.g. choice, discrimination) and by whom (e.g. equality body, government)?

No.

Is there a focus on different employment rates amongst women and amongst men by ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation (or family status), disability (or mobility, strength, physical features), age (or social/employment status) etc.? If so, how is this framed (e.g. choice, discrimination) and by whom (e.g. equality body, government)?

There is no focus on different employment rates amongst women and amongst men by ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, age or disability, but there is occasionally focus on family status and more specifically on single parent families, families with many children and women with children. Single parent families that are mostly headed by women and families with many children are thought to be at risk of poverty, hence, family status and gender also intersect with class. Yet class is hidden behind family status and it is not discussed separately as an element of intersecting inequalities because texts lay more emphasis on family status. Family status (single parenthood) is framed in terms of social causality and an overall lack of family support by the Greek state and the government.

5.3 Intersections in intimate citizenship

Where is gender in the issue of intimate citizenship?

How is gender constructed in these debates: gay men, male homosexuality, lesbians, others? Does race, class, age, disability, class figure? Regarding which issue, and by whom?

Gender is not frequently mentioned in the intimate citizenship issue. We find frequent references to de-gendered categories, such as 'people' or 'couples' without further specifications. References to race, class, age, disability or class are absent from the picture.

Have issues been discussed in relation to immigration, i.e. the axis of race? Does "race" figure elsewhere as well?

There is no reference to immigration or race in the texts analyzed, except in the general non-discrimination text applying to Greece EU legislation.

Are marriage/partnership policies framed relating to any category? Which one? With which effects? E.g. class and divorce/separation regulations, race and immigration?

Are there discussions around the legitimacy of legal recognition of intimacy, as in “fake marriage”? Which categories are raised?

No such issues were raised in the texts analyzed.

5.4 Intersections in gender based violence)

Where does gender violence begin? What is defined as gender violence in which country, and in which policy context, and by whom?

Who is discussed as victim or perpetrator of which kind of gender-based violence? E.g. are men (when?) victims? Are women perpetrators and when?

Women are never discussed as perpetrators in the texts analyzed, only as victims, together with children. Indeed, it is very often that women *and* children are mentioned together especially as victims of domestic violence. In discussions around trafficking there seems to be an increased emphasis in the distinction between adults and minors, since the respective legislation, although gender-neutral, places special emphasis in this dichotomy. Sometimes women are projected as perpetrators of trafficking in human beings and sexual and economic exploitation of other more vulnerable women.

Are causes of violence related to specific categories, e.g. racialised?

More specifically, which inequality feature around which type of violence, like trafficking, prostitution, forced marriage, honour crimes, FGM, domestic violence, rape, sexual assault, harassment

For the sub-issue of trafficking, economic and class inequalities have a strong bearing upon trafficking.

Are services around gender based violence directed at specific groups, people related to categories? Which ones?

For the sub-issue of trafficking, gender-based violence is directed at the specific category of young migrant women, especially those coming from the former socialist countries of Europe.

Do your findings on intersectionality support or contradict Crenshaw’s analysis?

There is insufficient evidence upon which to base an assessment.

5.5 Summary and comparison

Most of the specific questions here **do not apply to the Greek case**. However, we try to respond whenever possible.

Is the focus on intersectionality largely ephemeral? Or is it becoming embedded in gender+ equality policy?

Intersectionality is largely ephemeral (rather incidental) whenever present and far from becoming embedded in gender equality policies in Greece. But one can hope that in different political conditions it can become an integral part of gender policy.

The questions below either do not apply to the Greek case or have already been answered:

To what extent does a focus on equalities other than gender produce a detriment to the development of the gender+ equality policy? n/a

Compare the definitions and practice of gender equality and the definitions and practice of intersectionality – how do they relate, do the meanings of intersectionality change the meaning of gender equality? n/a

To what extent is there commonality of a specific policy issue across several strands, or inequalities, that leads to enhanced and constructive attention to the issue? Or are differences between inequality strands a source of controversy and division? n/a

Is intersectionality a source of controversy and debate in gender+ equalities policies or not? If yes, what is the nature of this controversy and debate? n/a

If responsible for more than one country, can you compare and contrast intersections between countries?

The Cyprus case is not very different from the Greek case. If anything, Cyprus is even less accustomed to the EU approaches than Greece due to its more traditional character as a society and to the recent date of its accession.

*If there is an absence of intersectionality in the documents analysed, are there explanations for this? **YES. SEE ABOVE** .Why would such a finding be surprising or expected?*

This is not surprising for all the reasons mentioned above.

6. Identifying changes and the relevance of different forms of intersectionality

Using primarily the issue histories, but also the country contexts and document analysis, this section is to identify the changes in the extent to which different forms of intersectionality was an issue in the development of gender equality policies (including the governmental equalities machinery).

Indicative questions for all areas:

Are there significant 'turning points' (e.g. change in government; new gender / equalities machinery) that appear to influence the treatment of intersectionality in gender equality policies? If so, what are these and what is the impact (positive/negative) on the quality of policies?

ALL THE ABOVE ARE NON APPLICABLE

Although the selection of documents was limited to a particular time period, given your knowledge in gender equality policies, do you think intersectionality has become generally more present? If so, why and what consequences do you think this has had?

It will become so, if a change in government permits, due to EU tendencies and due to the necessity of doing so given the social realities (e.g. Unemployment rates for women are double than those) and more NGO pressure.

6.1 Changes in general legislation and machinery

Have there been changes in the structure of the equalities machinery to take into account multiple inequalities and intersectionality (e.g. becoming an integrated equality body)? If so, what consequences has this had for gender equality policies?

Already answered.

6.2 Changes in non employment

Has the issue of demographic change done something to the presence of gender, sexual orientation, race, or class?

In public discourse demographic change is mainly associated with family policy. Gender and family issues are discussed in relation to only one demographic indicator (the birth-rate) and we can identify two types of frames. First, declining birth rates are seen as a cultural problem resulting from an overall crisis in the value-orientations of society, the contemporary life-style and the cultural patterns

of consumerism and materialism. What is more, changing demographics - associated with low birth rates and the increase in the immigrant population- are also regarded as a national threat because in few years time it is considered that the Greeks will become a minority in their country. Women are held responsible for the declining birth rates because they choose to work and not have children or because they want to pursue a career. It is this type of mentality that justifies non-employment as maternity and the 'primary care giving' role of women is certainly not disputed.

A second frame derives from generally more liberal and progressive ideas. Demographic issues are linked to economic and social changes associated with women's status and emancipation. At the age of fertility women also happen to be at an economically productive age. Although these are seen as two different life patterns, it is suggested that women should be given the possibility to accomplish both work and family (reconciliation). This more liberal approach to changing demographics also suggests that women must feel free to decide when and how many children they will have and that the state must provide maternity support in respect of the birth rate decline.

However, it must be underlined that since the early 1990's Greece has become an immigration receiving country which is a development that has mostly affected public discussions and general perceptions of cultural identities, nationhood, criminality and security. Issues of naturalisation and citizenship rights are at the centre of the migration policy but racism, work exploitation of immigrants, work type by gender and social integration are issues concerning mainly academics, social scientists and researchers (and a few activists).

6.3 Changes in intimate citizenship

No particular changes were detected in the time period covered by QUING, especially since intersectionality was largely absent from the intimate citizenship issue; this was also an issue that, as discussed previously, did not provide many policy initiatives from the mid 90's onwards.

6.4. Changes in gender based violence

Trafficking is a relatively new issue with obvious intersecting aspects. However, the whole gender based violence approach is new in Greece with its traditional structures, so we cannot detect changes during the short period of interest to us here.

6.5 Summary and comparisons

All summary and comparisons are stated above.

7. Conclusions

In the concluding section, discuss the implications of your findings for the key STRIQ questions for QUING:

- *What are the implications of different versions and forms of intersectionality for the quality of gender+ equality policies?*
- *How are inequalities and their intersections conceptualised in terms of their structure and mechanisms?*
- *To what extent does context matter in the (re)production of inequalities across Europe? How important is institutional context, legal tradition, issue history (even beyond the period we focused on in QUING)?*
- *What attention must be paid to other structural (in)equalities, in the making and implementing of European gender equality policies?*

Also address the implications of your findings for the question that you raised at the end of the review of the literature. An example would be to assess whether your findings on intersectionality in gender-based violence support or contradict Crenshaw's analysis.

Consider using different levels of abstraction. Perhaps start with the more empirical level, asking if there is evidence to support or contradict a detailed claim made in the literature on intersectionality, then perhaps rise to a more general, abstract and theoretical level. Some of you will want to address theory more than others; this variation is quite acceptable.

As it was made apparent above, the questions noted in this section are **not relevant for Greece**. In spite of this fact, we have tried to formulate an answer wherever possible in the chapters above. What seems new here refers to the question ***whether context matters to the reproduction of inequalities in Europe***, to which the answer is emphatically YES. The problem is that context matters also to the formulation of questions, which is important since each question offers the frame for its answer. On this level, the guide was as good as it was possible, given the fact that it bears the stamp of its own context. This seems to be the reason why it was so difficult for the Greek team to fully answer to the questions, and the reason for the lacunae and holes in the Greek text. Indeed, as we mentioned at the beginning in an understated way:

“Producing a report which analyses intersectionality in gender equality policies for Greece is not an easy task. The first thing to note is that there is no systematic attack on social inequalities in Greece today, because politically the Right is in power and promotes a neo-liberal programme in its Greek version. If anything, there is an attack on social rights and attempts to pass the cost of an economic crisis to the less privileged. Gender policy follows EU obligations but lacks conviction and targets

mainly the “modernisation” of traditional gender roles.” Further more: “To choose to speak in terms of intersecting inequalities and to promote intersectionality policies in order to confront social inequalities means that we think in a specific (subversive) way about identity, equality and power. It requires that we focus on complexity, dynamic processes, and the structures that define access to rights and opportunities, rather than on defined categories or isolated issue areas.” This is not reflected in the Greek case. Not the dominant Greek case, nor the minor, revisionist of the mainstream, Greek way, in which “gender equality is mainly perceived as same treatment (with preferential measures for the weaker) among two given, pre-constructed categories.” The widespread essentialist perception of women and gender in Greek society forms a major obstacle to intersectional policies combating inequalities, even to being demanded.

Bibliography

There is no Greek bibliography on the matter, the standard references appear in the guide and thus it seemed unnecessary to reproduce them here (See S. Walby. **A REVIEW OF THEORY AND METHODOLOGY FOR THE ANALYSIS OF THE IMPLICATIONS OF INTERSECTIONALITY FOR GENDER EQUALITY POLICIES IN THE EU, D13 and D14,WP 16, STRIQ**). Also, the following was very useful for the relevant part of this report:

Meier, P., Peterson, E., Tertinegg, K. and Zentai, V. (2007), ‘The Pregnant Worker and Caring Mother: Framing Family Policies Across Europe’ in Verloo, M. (ed.), *Multiple Meanings of Gender Equality. A Critical Frame Analysis of Gender Policies in Europe*, 109-140 (Budapest-New York: Central European University Press).