QUING

Quality in Gender+ Equality Policies

European Commission Sixth Framework Programme
Integrated Project

Sophie Lauwers and Femke van der Wal

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

Institute for Human Sciences (IWM)
Vienna
2008

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

1. INTRODUCTION

This report researches (the appearance of) intersectionality in Dutch gender+ equality policies. The key question of this report is:

- What are the implications of different versions and forms of intersectionality for the quality of gender+ equality policies?

The research questions for the overall STRIQ-activity in QUING as listed in the Annex to the Contract are:

- 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?
- What attention must be paid to other structural (in)equalities in the making and implementing of European gender equality policies?

In addition, we will on the basis of a review of theoretical and policy literature and debates identify some country specific questions that relate to intersectionality. This literature review can be found in **chapter 2** and focuses on the intersection of ethnicity-gender in Dutch policy documents and academic debates on this intersection.

Throughout this report, different aspects of the four STRIQ questions and of the country specific questions will be discussed and researched. The focus in **Chapter 3** is gender equality. The chapter provides an account of the naming of gender equality, the range of definitions of gender equality policy (which topics are being related to gender equality), and the range of meanings concerning gender equality (among other things: for whom gender equality policy is meant, is gender seen as social or biological, is gender equality seen as an end in itself, is there a focus on transformation, which frames are visible within gender equality policies) in the four QUING-issues: general gender equality policies, non-employment, intimate citizenship, and gender based violence. In **chapter 4** a similar thing will be done, but this time for 'intersectionality'. This chapter gives an account of the range of (intersecting) inequalities that receive attention in the four QUING-issues and of the way in which intersectionality is named and framed in the Dutch gender equality policy context. In **chapter 5** the implications of the way intersectionality is present in Dutch gender+ equality policies and policy making for the meaning and practice of gender equality policies will be discussed. In the concluding **chapter 6** the general implications of our findings for the key STRIQ question will be discussed. Finally, some tentative answers to the questions raised in the literature review (chapter 2) are provided.

This report mainly builds upon data material that was collected earlier on in the QUING project: the Country Context Studies (deliverable 41), the Issue Timelines (deliverable 19), and the results of the frame and voice analysis of selected documents in each of the four QUING-issues. The data that stems from the document analysis is prioritised. Also, some additional sources, most importantly the Dutch multi-year emancipation policy plans, will be used. These emancipation policy plans are among the most authoritative generic policy documents in the field of gender equality.

Because the document analysis data is regularly referred to in this report it is important to describe the process of document selection and the exact topics on which documents were selected a little bit more. Each of the four issues that are studied within QUING – general gender+ equality policies, non-employment, intimate citizenship, gender based violence – consists of several sub-issues. For each country, the responsible researcher had to decide – on the basis of previously written issue timelines (deliverable 19) – on what topics within each sub-issue

documents were to be selected. Which topic had been of relevance in the country? For each sub-issue researchers then selected, if possible: a law, a policy plan, a parliamentary debate (split into several voices/speakers) and a civil society text. In table 1 the exact topics covered by the selection of the Dutch documents are shown. A list of all the selected documents with explanation of the choice can be found in Deliverable 33 and in the Country Studies (deliverable 40).

Fixed Issues	Fixed sub-issues	Topics chosen for The Netherlands
General gender+ equality policies (GGE)	Sub-issue 1: General gender+ equality legislation Sub-issue 2: General gender+ equality machinery	Sub-issue 1: mixed (amendment of general equal treatment act, multi-year emancipation plan, debate on emancipation of minority girls and women, and CEDAW shadow report) Sub-issue 2: mixed (mandate of Department for Coordination of Emancipation policy, functions of coordinating emancipation Minister, Emancipation Review Committee, Beijing +10 shadow report)
Non-employment (NE)	Sub-issue 1: Tax-benefit policies Sub-issue 2: Care work Sub-issue 3: Policies for the reconciliation of work and family life in employment Sub-issue 4: Gender pay gap and equal treatment in employment	Sub-issue 1: social security and lone parents & action plan on women and occupational disability pension Sub-issue 2: Childcare Act Sub-issue 3: Act on Labour and Care Sub-issue 4: equal treatment of ethnic minority women on labour market & equal pay
Intimate citizenship (IC)	Sub-issue 1: Divorce, marriage and separation Sub-issue 2: Sexual orientation discrimination and partnering Sub-issue 3: Reproduction including abortion, and assisted reproduction	Sub-issue 1: matrimonial property law & family reunion Sub-issue 2: same sex marriage & LGBT emancipation policy of current government Sub-issue 3: accession policy IVF and artificial insemination & abortion
Gender based violence (GBV)	Sub-issue 1: Domestic violence Sub-issue 2: Sexual assault Sub-issue 3: Forced marriage, female genital mutilation, 'honour' crimes and trafficking for sexual exploitation	Sub-issue 1: Bill on the eviction of perpetrator of domestic violence from the house & domestic violence/violence against women soft policies Sub-issue 2: Act amending the Equal Treatment in Employment Act (sexual harassment) Sub-issue 3: honour related violence & female genital mutilation

Table 1: QUING issues, sub-issues and chosen topics for the Netherlands

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Thinking about (political) intersectionality in the Netherlands, one of the most remarkable impressions stemming from the QUING research done so far - especially subjecting some 76 governmental and civil society texts to a frame and voice analysis - is the supposedly strong intersectional bias in Dutch gender (+) equality policy towards ethnicity.[1] In this literature review we therefore want to pay specific attention to this (supposed) bias. We wonder in what way intersectional attention is paid to gender and ethnicity in Dutch gender equality policies. And, most importantly, whether this attention has the potential to 'do well' (lead to more inclusiveness) or rather to 'be harmful' (lead to more exclusiveness)?[2] The idea or suspicion that the attention paid to gender/ethnicity in Dutch (gender equality) policymaking might not necessarily/always be a 'positive' thing is inspired by:

1. Dutch literature on intersectional thinking (kruispuntdenken). As it happens, this literature has mainly focussed on gender and ethnicity only (Wekker and Lutz, 2001; Lutz, 2002; Wekker, 2002; Botman, 2004). In this literature, a distinction is made between different shifts in time in the thinking about gender and ethnicity in the Netherlands. The last shift was from diversity thinking to intersectionality. While this literature underlines the promises that intersectional thinking bring as opposed to diversity thinking (the former has the potential of transcending dichotomies and uncovering power structures/hierarchies), at the same time, the account makes us doubt whether these promises will bear in current Dutch gender equality policymaking. The line between reinforcing 'we/them' and 'us/others' dichotomies (i.e. dominant 'non-ethnic' groups/ethnic minorities, men/women, middle class/lower class, heterosexual/homosexual, civilized/uncivilized and so on) or transcending such (racist, sexist, homophobic, ethnocentric) dichotomies seems quite thin. The habit of people in general and of policy makers alike to think in binary and hierarchical categories is strong and this makes it particularly difficult to practice a more inclusive way of thinking and more inclusive policymaking. Policymakers are to be very conscious of and willing to break with binary thinking or else paying attention to gender/ethnicity might have the effect of reinforcing existing (racist, sexist, homophobic, ethnocentric) dichotomies, biases and power structures. This is all the more so when we take into consideration the current Dutch policy climate concerning integration and migrant issues and the way 'gender equality' and 'migrant women' are placed herein (gender equality lately seems to have been co-opted by anti-immigration and neo-liberal policy agendas; see further point 4 below).

2. The idea that 'race' (and 'racism') in most European countries (not UK, but most probably in the Netherlands) was buried alive after World War II's holocaust experience (Goldberg, 2006). As a consequence, not only have European colonial history and legacy largely been dissipated; 'race' had to go 'underground' (Wekker, 2002) while being alive and kicking. This all covers up what race has meant to modern and contemporary Europe, and to what extent our society is in fact pervaded with racism(s). According to Goldberg, 'tolerance' expresses these denials directly, as it is expressed towards the 'tolerated' and from the tolerating agent's position of power. Here, Goldberg uses the Netherland as an example. Dutch 'tolerance' unveiled itself after shocking events such as the murder on cineaste and TV/film-maker Theo van Gogh by a Moroccan-Dutch man following the broadcasting of the film

---

[1] While in official government policy documents the terms 'ethnic minority women', 'allochthonous women' or 'migrant women' are most often used and used interchangeably, in parliamentary debates and especially in the media and public debate it becomes apparent that in fact Muslim or Islamic minorities/women (particularly Turkish and Moroccan) are the main focus of attention.

[2] Or doesn't it really matter in what way policy documents pay attention to intersectionality as long as they do propose specific measures for groups of women at intersections of multiple inequalities who face specific problems? (attention= good).

'*Submission*' that Van Gogh made together with MP Ayaan Hirsi Ali. After the murder, mosques and Islamic schools were attacked by 'native' Dutch. According to Goldberg, the fear of Muslims is not new in Europe. Inherited from the medieval contest between Christianity and Islam, it has been the figure of the Muslim that alongside that of the Jew has been the subject of modern Europe's historical anxieties about blackness. Increasingly, he sees a pattern of racialisation when it comes to Muslims in Europe. However, this 'trajectory' is quite disguised, exactly because of what he calls 'racial Europeanization'; the process that has made race/racism unmentionable and channels it under other headings such as 'culture' and 'ethnicity'.

3. While Goldberg primarily focuses on Europe's relation to and history of race, he more than once links the 'Muslim fear' to gender equality and gendered discussions; the European image of the Muslim is one of female suppression and the headscarf has come to represent the threat of a Muslim world. In other literature, the claim that gender equality obscures certain racist motives is made much more explicitly (e.g. NextGenderation, 2004; Römkens, 2002). The authors of the feminist statement *'Not in our names!'* by the *NextGenderation Network*, for example, oppose the appeal to women's emancipation by political leaders and public figures as a cover for their promotion of Europe as a white, homogeneous civilization. Themselves being *truly* concerned with women's emancipation, the authors will not allow the use of 'the emancipation of women' for anti-immigration, assimilationist, islamophobic and ethnocentric politics. Römkens focuses specifically on violence against women. She states that while violence against women is increasingly internationally recognised, and visible in international law as a gender specific violation of human rights, that same violence is increasingly being used as a vehicle in a strategic, rhetorical and political way in order to depict multiculturalism as a problem and in particular in order to depict Islam as hostile and oppressive towards women. She recognises this pattern in the Netherlands as well. While according to Römkens it is correct that practices like FGM and honour violence are regarded (debate and policies) as problematic from a human rights perspective in the Dutch political arena, the fact that this disapproval often is an occasion for paying *selective* attention to these forms of violence which subsequently are depicted as specific for *non-Dutch* culture is detrimental for the image that exists about minority cultures in the Netherlands. The creation of the image of cultural minorities as violent problem groups might lead to the adoption of more repressive policies and laws (criminal law) towards 'cultural minorities', which are legally seen superfluous. Violence against women is being 'contracted out' to other cultures, resulting in disproportionately less attention being paid to the epidemic violence against women in the so-called 'civilised' Western cultures. Passion crimes (women who are murdered by their ex-partner out of jealousy or anger) still occur much more often than 'honour crimes'. However, these passion crimes are constructed as 'normal violence' and not as cultural specific forms of violence. Römkens mentions numerous other examples where disproportionate, selective and over-simplified attention is paid to 'non-Dutch' – mostly Islamic – (fundamentalist) practices, while similar practices that occur in certain (fundamentalist/religious) 'Dutch' communities stay out of the picture. See for other examples like the analogy between the 'Islam' headscarf and the skirts that Dutch Reformed women wear also Poldervaart (Poldervaart, 2002).

4. Several articles and papers which point to a hardening of the Dutch public debate and policy climate regarding integration and migration issues have been published in recent years by Dutch authors (Prins and Saharso, 2006; Roggeband and Verloo, 2007; Roggeband and Vliegenthart, 2007; Ghorashi, 2003; Lutz, 2002). These articles show that gender/emancipation issues take a quite important role in these (hardened) discussions. Gender equality (and feminism) is increasingly regarded as incompatible with multiculturalism

(and more specifically with Islamic beliefs).[3] Some of the aforementioned authors express their 'fears' (in a more or less implicit way) that the 'emancipation of migrant/Muslim women', which is being increasingly stressed in Dutch gender equality and minority/integration policies, might be more motivated by anti-immigration, assimilationist (and islamophobic) concerns, than by real gender equality concerns (Roggeband and Verloo, 2007; Prins and Saharso, 2006). In most of these articles, reference is made to certain important national and international events and public figures that have given impetus to the transformation of the Dutch framing and discourse on migrants, multiculturalism, and integration and to the way this is being related to the emancipation of (migrant) women. Examples are: the person of Ayaan Hirsi Ali (a Dutch Member of Parliament) and the role she played in the public and political debate (making radical and provocative statements on the incompatibility of Islam and women's emancipation based on her own personal experiences as a Somali woman), the rise of populist right-wing and anti-Islam political parties like the 'List Fortuyn' named after its party leader Pim Fortuyn and more recently the Party for Freedom (Partij voor de Vrijheid) led by Geert Wilders, and 'September Eleven' and subsequent terrorist attacks that caused suspicions to rise concerning the willingness of Muslims to integrate in Western societies.

Below we will expand on parts of the literature that has been introduced above. Thereby, we will especially focus on those aspects that relate to – and therefore might be of help in answering – the question that was introduced earlier: *In what way intersectional attention is paid to gender and ethnicity in Dutch gender equality policies and does this attention, accordingly, have the potential to 'do well' (leading to policy that is more inclusive) or rather to 'be harmful' (leading to policy that is more exclusive)*?

As the focus of the QUING project is on how intersectionality is or is not dealt with in gender equality *policies,* it is '*political intersectionality'* that we are particularly interested in; How are inequalities and their intersections relevant to political strategies and policy work? Political intersectionality points to the necessity to address interdependencies between intersecting inequalities, because strategies on one axis are mostly not neutral towards other axes.[4] However, the booming literature on intersectionality does not frequently have as its specific focus *political* intersectionality. As of yet, attention is foremost paid to *structural* intersectionality, i.e. how inequalities and their intersections are directly relevant to experiences of people in society.[5] Still, the distinction between political and structural intersectionality does not quite capture the diverse foci of scholarship on intersectionality. As Davis argues in a recent article entitled 'Intersectionality as buzzword' there is considerable confusion as to what the concept of intersectionality means and how it can be used in feminist scholarship. Some think of it as a theory, while some regard it as a concept or heuristic device. Others see it as a reading strategy to be used for feminist analysis. Some conceptualise intersectionality as a crossroad, others as axes of difference. Some limit it to understanding individual experiences, while others want to use it in theorising identity. Still others regard it as a property of social structures and cultural discourses (Davis, 2008). But what does intersectionality mean and how is it used in the Dutch 'intersectionality literature'?

Prominent Dutch authors/scholars who have written on intersectionality in recent years and thereby mainly focused on gender and ethnicity (and sometimes class) are Wekker, Jouwe,

---

[3] The question whether multiculturalism and feminism/gender equality are compatible or not has given rise to considerable debate within women's movement and between feminists as well. Feminists are really divided on the issue. While some feminists, for example, find Ayaan Hirsi Ali's approach to the emancipation of Islamic women attractive, others find her approach arrogant and paternalistic.
[4] Lombardo and Verloo, 2008 (forthcoming).
[5] Lombardo and Verloo, 2008 (forthcoming).

Botman, Braidotti and Lutz. E-quality, the Dutch expertise centre for gender, family and diversity issues (until its 2007 merger with the Dutch family council it was named 'E-quality expertise centre on gender and ethnicity') has published on intersectionality as well (Mariette Hermans for E-quality, 2002). The literal translation of the Dutch term that is most often used to indicate intersectionality is '*crossroad thinking*' ('kruispuntdenken'). This term points to the idea that everyone (men or women, black or white…) finds her/himself at a crossroad, at a point where different organising principles (or 'social systems of meaning') like gender, ethnicity, class, sexual orientation and nationality come together to form a particular combination of 'positions'. The crossings or intersections in which individuals find themselves are not the same for everyone and some combinations of positions are more powerful than others. These power differences are often neglected since the more powerful positions tend to be regarded as 'normal' or 'natural', in other words: stripped off of power. The different social systems of meaning (gender, ethnicity, class and so on) are not autonomous and cannot be studied independently from each other, since they simultaneously construct each other (mutual constitutiveness). Gender is simultaneously constructed with ethnicity and class for example (Kambel, 2001; Wekker and Lutz, 2001).

The fact that this literature consistently speaks about crossroad ***thinking*** indicates that intersectionality predominantly is seen as an *activity*; a way of thinking, observing, and analysing; a way of constantly trying to be aware of the power positions that are connected to the different 'crossroad positions'. The literature stresses that dominant thinking implicitly relates gender to 'women' (read: white women) and ethnicity to 'ethnic minorities' (read: ethnic men). The categories have clearly defined and non-overlapping boundaries. In this way one is blind for power relations based on a combination/intersection of gender and ethnicity. Dominant thinking is binary and hierarchical in which the dominant sex (men) and the dominant ethnic group (white people) are represented as neutral, non-gendered and non-ethnical, which causes power relations to be normalised and hidden (Lutz, 2002; Wekker, 2002; Wekker and Lutz, 2001).

Wekker and Lutz see three shifts in time regarding the Dutch thinking about gender and ethnicity within women's studies: a) from sex to gender; b) from gender to gender and ethnicity (i.e. diversity thinking), and: c) from diversity thinking to intersectionality. *Diversity thinking* differs from intersectional thinking, because gender and ethnicity are regarded separately and differences (or 'diversities') are placed outside the power discourse. While diversity thinking regards diversity as enrichment and as such has the intention to combat processes of stereotyping and to promote that everybody is regarded equally despite their differences, it merely has an accumulative character and mainly enumerates different groups of people: you have men and women, black and white, allochthonous people and autochthonous people, homosexuals and heterosexuals and so on. The departure is difference, dichotomies are repeated, and different inequality axes are disassociated from each other and then accumulated. This means that diversity thinking is blind for complex co-constructions of for example gender and ethnicity and race. According to Lutz and Wekker the slogan that fits the ideas about diversity as promoted by governments and/or organisations seems not to be: "the more diversity, the better", but rather: "the more diversity, the better; as long as we do not have to talk about power differences". *Intersectional thinking*, on the contrary, assumes that everyone (including the white man for example) is situated on both the axes of gender and ethnicity, bound to a position of power. Inequalities simultaneously construct each other. As such it has the potential of transcending dichotomies and uncovering power structures/hierarchies (Wekker and Lutz, 2001; Lutz, 2002). While the particular focus of Lutz and Wekker is on gender and ethnicity, their reasoning indicates that the distinction between diversity thinking and intersectional thinking also applies when 'ethnicity' is replaced by another inequality axis (like class, sexual orientation and so on).

So far, the last shift from diversity thinking to intersectional thinking seems to be more of a wish expressed by the authors than an empirical reality, because the authors argue that intersectional thinking still has not really been picked up either within women's studies or within gender equality policymaking circles. Wekker and Lutz quote a statement by Rosi Braidotti and Wekker that describes what they regard as the most popular way in which the relationship between gender and ethnicity has been conceptualised: *"Although through the years black Dutch feminist thinkers have tried to put anti-racism and multiculturalism on the Women's Studies agenda, this did not mean that race, ethnicity, class and sexuality were approached as integral co-constructions of gender or sexual difference. The result is merely that lip service is paid to the importance of this insight by enumerating how women's experiences may differ while one still thinks in terms of an imaginary white, female, middle-class subject."[6]* (Wekker and Braidotti, 1996; quoted in: Wekker and Lutz, 2001, p.38). According to Wekker and Lutz, it is this way of thinking about the relation gender and ethnicity – which differs from the kind of thinking, promoted by intersectional thinkers – that has influenced the kind of diversity thinking that found acceptance in the Netherlands. This all means that the Dutch scholarly literature and debate on intersectionality are very much involved with putting ('real') intersectionality on the map within Dutch women's studies and within the world of policy making. In addition to this, the Dutch literature on intersectionality clearly involves itself in the multiculturalism debate in order to point towards the stigmatising and stereotyping effects of the debate. Lately the public debate has become quite heated and antagonistic, and there are many voices against the 'multiculturalist' position that are explicitly negative about Islamic citizens or culture. This gives certain urgency to the literature and research on intersectionality.

It is clear that the Dutch scholarship on intersectionality is (predominantly) located in the strand of feminist theory that is inspired by postmodernist theoretical perspectives. Intersectionality is regarded as a helpful analytical tool or approach to deconstruct and uncover normalising and homogenising categories and ways of thinking (Davis, 2008). This also becomes evident by the fact that great importance is attached in this literature to the way in which language is used and to what exact terms are used. Terminology is never free of power, never innocent, and always a construction. Certain groups are defined as insiders while other groups of people are defined as outsiders. Terminology often underlines differences and departs from, reinforces and normalises 'us'/'others' distinctions. One example is the Dutch terminology of 'allochthonous people' referring to people of foreign descent and 'autochthonous people' referring to people who are 'natively' Dutch. Another example is the use of the term 'ethnic minorities' without ever using the term 'ethnic majority' which indicates a lack of awareness that 'whiteness' is also an ethnic position. In fact, this means that it is not about *terminology* only, it is also about *absence*: what is mentioned when policy texts talk about inequalities and what is left unmentioned?

Seen from this theoretical perspective, policy texts can – depending on their degree of authoritativeness – through the mere terminology they use and by means of what is mentioned and left unmentioned have excluding/including effects. It is not too surprising to find that in the Dutch literature on intersectionality existing policy texts and/or government campaigns are repeatedly subjected to 'intersectional' scrutiny as to make clear what/who is included/excluded and what kind of power and stereotyping effects this has. In this sense, the Dutch literature on intersectionality 'fits' the QUING project quite well and, accordingly, can provide valuable input. The QUING project aims to reconstruct policy frames by means of subjecting policy documents to frame analysis in which series of sensitive questions are answered for each single policy document that is analysed. They concern questions such as: which problem definitions are organised into the policy? Which solutions are included in this definition and which actors are

---

[6] Braidotti and Wekker originally wrote this text in Dutch language. This translation is made by Christien Franken.

linked to problem and solution?[7] So, QUING shares with the Dutch intersectionality literature sensitivity for power mechanisms and for the excluding/including effects that policies can have. Moreover, one of the specific theoretical/methodological contributions that QUING intends to have is to include an intersectional analytical approach in the analysis and development of gender equality policies that will contribute to the *inclusiveness* of such policies. This is of great concern in the Dutch literature as well.

When we use the frame analysis methodology for analysing policy documents within the QUING project we mainly 'record' information, without interpreting it. We record under the heading of 'intersectionality' when documents pay attention to other inequalities than gender or to intersectional categories of people. Next, we record how - in the analysed document – the inequalities are seen to relate to each other (or whether this is left inarticulated). Intersectionality in scholarly work, at least in the Dutch scholarly work, is seen as a promising concept that can possibly be used for reaching more inclusive gender equality policies. Indeed, in the QUING project design intersectionality is linked with making gender equality policies more inclusive as well. However, the mere facts that policy texts refer to other inequalities than gender and/or to intersectional categories of people are not necessarily an 'exercise of inclusion'; it can just as well be an exercise of exclusion or 'intersectional discrimination' as the Dutch intersectionality literature and the other literature previously referred to have been keen to point out. Since the QUING frame analysis methodology is about recording and not about interpreting it is not very sensitive to this. All instances of "intersectional attention" within the analysed gender equality policies are recorded, while further analysis is necessary to see whether this adds to the *inclusiveness* or rather to the *exclusiveness* of the policies. The Dutch literature on intersectionality as reviewed above can maybe be of help here. On the basis of this review we wonder:
- Is the attention that is paid to gender and ethnicity in Dutch gender+ equality policies more of the 'diversity thinking'-type (gender and ethnicity are regarded separately and then enumerated/accumulated and differences are placed outside the power discourse) or more of 'intersectional thinking'-type (gender and ethnicity – and other inequalities - simultaneously construct each other and everyone is positioned on both the axes of gender and ethnicity, but these positions are not the same for everyone and some are more powerful than others)?

This is a broad question. In the framework of the literature discussed above, a relevant sub-question is: Is there attention for the majority (group) or the privileged categories as part of the problem or solution?

Yet, while the Dutch intersectionality literature generally is quite critical about how the relation between gender and ethnicity is conceptualised (in policy), it does not offer very specific helping hands for 'doing it better'. While it provides with great ease practical examples (often taken from the policy practice) that serve as 'bad' practices, it has considerably more trouble with providing practical examples that serve as 'good' practices. The authors indeed claim that *"it is difficult to learn and practice this other, more inclusive, way of thinking"* (Wekker and Lutz, 2001, p. 41). Is it possible that they themselves also have a hard time to break loose of the 'dominant ways of thinking' (which makes it harder to give examples of good practices)? If so, this only makes it all the more pressing that some kind of methodology of 'doing intersectionality well' is developed. Or might it instead be the case that the authors eschew the development of any positive intersectionality methodology, because either way it will be hard to avoid the pitfalls of binary/exclusive thinking? The only kind of instrument/method that they come up with – and pay little attention to – is to always ask 'the other question' as introduced by Mari Matsuda (Matsuda,

---

[7] The QUING frame analysis methodology is partly based on the work of Carol Bacchi (1999; 2005) who argues that policies always create a certain (standard) citizen/subject.

1991). For example: when you see something that looks racist, ask yourself 'where is the patriarchy in this?' And when you see something that looks sexist, ask yourself 'where is the heterosexism in this?' and so on. While this is a way of tracking the *hidden* interconnectedness of different forms of subordination, this has a 'negative' point of departure (what is wrong here?). It does not give a more positive account of how to do it better. In addition, to see whether something looks racist (and afterwards ask yourself 'where is the patriarchy in this?') we first have to recognise that something indeed 'looks racist', which is not always very obvious or visible either. It is quite possible that in the Dutch documents in which gendered-ethnicised intersectional groups are highly present, emancipatory concerns with regard to gender equality 'cover up' the racism in these texts. So the 'Matsuda-question' should then rather be: When we see something that looks emancipatory with regard to gender equality, where is the racism in this?

Because the focus of the Dutch (postmodernist) intersectionality literature is mainly limited to the 'form' or 'scheme' or the terminology a text uses, and the actor groups that are mentioned as opposed to the actor groups that are left unmentioned, the *actual* content of problems/solutions is hardly considered. However, paying attention to the actual problems that these groups are connected to and taking into consideration the policy context and climate in which this happens might be needed if we want to discover possible racist/harmful effects of the way in which policy documents speak about groups at the gender-ethnicity intersection. Therefore, we now turn to the articles by Dutch authors that give more clues with respect to content of diagnosis and prognosis. The 'broad message' that speaks from these articles was already introduced as point 4 above (see page 6). We choose to elaborate here on one of these articles, namely the one by Roggeband and Verloo (2007), because they specifically focus on *actual changes* in Dutch diagnosis and prognosis connected to ethnic minority women in gender equality policy and in integration/minority policy. This article might provide additional insight into whether the gender-ethnicity intersectionality is paid attention to in a good or harmful way in the Netherlands.

Roggeband and Verloo's article is primarily based on a frame analysis of 17 texts (a mix of Acts, policy plans, research reports commissioned by government, speeches by politicians, and parliamentary debates) from the issue areas of general gender equality policy and minority/integration policy. Their key conclusion is that Dutch emancipation policies have become increasingly 'ethnicised'. There is an almost exclusive focus on migrant/allochthonous women. According to them, this shift has become mostly visible from 2000 and onwards. As the problems of or the problems related to migrant women receive more attention, the problems of or the problems related to "Dutch" women dissolved and the (emancipation of) Dutch men simultaneously seemed to have disappeared from the emancipation policy agenda. According to the authors, allochthonous women were already defined as a policy problem prior to 2000; however, they were not yet an important policy subject at that time. During this period measures are proposed that primarily have a socio-economic nature and the problem is also seen as a socio-economic structural one: stimulating their labour participation by taking specific measures in the field of welfare state support with regard to education, social security and childcare. Policy frames that the authors see as dominant during this period are: a *participation frame,* with the left parties stressing problems of *access.* A *multiculturalism frame* is still visible as well; cultural diversity is not (yet) seen as major obstacle to integration and emancipation but rather as an enrichment for society. Removal of socio-economic obstacles and offering of opportunities and chances are seen as the most important (pre)conditions for successful integration and participation in society.

In the late 1990's migrant women become more politicised, because the previously dominant participation frame (with multiculturalism echo's) starts to be *extended with a cultural dimension* especially by the centre and right-wing parties. Migrant women are framed as having a

'problematic' culture. With the coming into office of the Balkenende centre right wing Cabinets (starting in 2002, only to end in 2006) this cultural dimension is more and more being stressed. The individual responsibility of migrants to emancipate is emphasised and this individual responsibility mainly comes down to migrants having to change or modernise their own culture. Unequal gender relations in (Muslim) minority groups are regarded as a core problem. There is a gap between the 'modern' emancipated Dutch culture with gender equality as one of its central values and the imported backward culture of immigrants. Policy frames that the authors see as dominant during this period are therefore: the *individual responsibility frame* and the *modernization frame,* which are backed by a *neo-liberal master frame* in which the government retreats, it no longer opts for welfare state measures to stimulate integration/participation (Roggeband and Verloo, 2007).

The implications of this frame extension are clearly visible in the ways in which migrant women are located within the diagnosis and prognosis of the analysed policy documents. The cultural dimension that has been added to the formerly socio-economic problem definition brings about a shift from defining individual causes (such as education skills) to defining cultural causes (traditional culture that privileges men and subordinates women and legitimizes violence: backwardness of the culture and women as potential victims) as the origin of problems related to migrant women. There seems to be a reversal in causal logic in the diagnosis. In earlier years, social and economic integration were thought to be a precondition for (cultural) integration, while in more recent years cultural integration is a precondition for social and economic integration. Migrants are held responsible for their integration and surprisingly migrant (implicitly Muslim) women are seen as both principle target groups and principle responsible actors (next to being regarded as victims of their misogynous culture). Migrant women are key actors for solving the problems with integration and emancipation because they are regarded as the motor for emancipation of the migrant community as a whole in their role as mothers/educators. Goals focus more on cultural obstacles (like forced marriage, FGM, honour killings, and emancipation of migrant men) instead of labour market participation and education (Roggeband and Verloo, 2007).

According to the authors the frame extension that has taken place in recent years has reinforced a dichotomy between the autochthonous 'us' and the allochthonous 'them', especially the Muslim allochthonous 'them'. Implicitly the migrant women in Dutch emancipation policies are increasingly equated with Muslim women (especially Moroccan and Turkish women). A message in the article is that the 'emancipation of migrant/Muslim women' that is more and more stressed in Dutch emancipation policies in fact seems to be deployed for anti-immigration, assimilationist (and islamophobic) politics.

Questions raised in this literature review:

- Is there a gender-ethnicity bias in Dutch gender+ equality policies? Is such bias observable in all four QUING-issues that were studied?
- How does such bias relate to the Dutch intersectionality literature?
  - Is the attention that is paid to gender and ethnicity in Dutch gender+ equality policies more of the 'diversity thinking'-type (gender and ethnicity are regarded separately and then enumerated/accumulated and differences are placed outside the power discourse) or more of 'intersectional thinking'-type (gender and ethnicity – and other inequalities - simultaneously construct each other and everyone is positioned on both the axes of gender and ethnicity, but these positions are not the same for everyone and some are more powerful than others. This type of thinking can transcend and

counteract dichotomies and can uncover and counteract power structures/hierarchies)?

- ▪ Do Dutch gender+ equality policies pay attention to the (ethnic) majority (group) or the privileged categories as part of problems or solutions where ethnic minority groups feature?
- ▪ When we see something in the Dutch gender+ equality policy documents that looks emancipatory with regard to gender equality, where is the racism?
- How does such bias relate to the article written by Roggeband and Verloo?
  - Can we observe a *participation/multicultural frame* in the analysed documents for QUING (i.e. problems of *access* are stressed. Removal of socio-economic obstacles and offering of opportunities are seen as (pre)conditions for successful integration and participation in society and cultural diversity is seen as enrichment for society)?
  - Can we observe a *culturalisation/modernisation frame* in the analysed documents for QUING (i.e. cultural causes are defined as the origin of problems related to migrant women and cultural integration is a precondition for social and economic integration, so government no longer opt for welfare state measures to stimulate integration/ participation.)
  - Do we see *shifts* from a participation/multicultural to a culturalisation/modernisation frame or vice versa?

After answering these questions, can we say something more about: in what way intersectional attention is paid to gender and ethnicity in Dutch gender equality policies and does this attention, accordingly, have the potential to 'do well' (leading to qualitatively better, more 'inclusive' policies) or rather to 'be harmful' (negatively impacting on the quality of the policies, because they become more 'exclusive')?

In the concluding chapter, some first tentative answers will be provided to the questions raised above. The answers are mainly based on the information gathered in the following chapters of the report.

3. THE RANGE OF MEANINGS CONCERNING GENDER EQUALITY IN GENDER+ EQUALITY POLICIES

A relevant and debatable question is whether intersectional attention within gender equality policies will have a positive or negative influence on the 'feminist project'. The implications of intersectional attention on the quality of gender (+) equality policies are examined in chapter 5. However, to determine the possible impact of intersectional attention on gender (+) equality policy, we first need to examine the range of meanings concerning gender equality in gender (+) equality policies. This will be done in this chapter. First, the definitions of gender equality are discussed. Next, different meanings/constructions of gender and gender equality are described; is gender equality construed as relevant to the policy discussed, is gender equality to a certain extent hidden, is gender seen as social or as biological, and does gender equality policy have transformative visions/strategies? Third, it is described which actors are involved; for whom and by whom should gender equality be achieved. In paragraph four we will see if adjacent frames (other then an equality frame) are found in Dutch gender equality policy. In chapter four the range and meaning of *intersectionality* will be analysed.

3.1 Defining gender equality

In this paragraph, the definitions of gender equality in the Dutch gender equality policy are discussed; how is gender equality named? What is regarded as part of gender equality (policy) when looking at the four issues? For this section we will predominantly use several Multi-year Emancipation Policy plans and to some extent the documents that were coded for all four issues (general gender equality, non-employment, intimate citizenship, and gender based violence).

Gender equality in the Netherlands is predominantly named 'emancipation'. The concept of 'emancipation' has a liberation connotation; it is about the empowerment of deprived groups. Sometimes the terms 'equal opportunities', 'equal possibilities' and 'diversity' are used.
In the Netherlands there barely exists a discrimination frame in the field of gender equality; the concept of discrimination is hardly used. In the Netherlands anti-discrimination policies/laws and gender equality policies/laws are quite separate. The anti-discrimination frame and gender equality frame do not collide or compete with each other.

Next, we turn to what is regarded as part of gender equality (policy) for the four separate issues.
For the issue *general gender equality*, the multi-year emancipation policy plans that have been written in the period 1976-2007 are analysed for the purpose of examining what they regard as being part of gender equality policy. These documents are the most important, authoritative and extensive in the field of (general) emancipation policy. For the three issues *non-employment, intimate citizenship and gender based violence* it is somewhat more problematic to answer this question, because a distinction can/must be made between policy documents that construe gender equality to be relevant and policy documents that do not construe gender to be relevant. If gender equality is not construed to be relevant to the policy, it is somewhat difficult to regard the topics that such policy document covers as part of what is defined as 'gender equality policy'. Still, these documents were selected for frame and voice analysis because they do in fact have an impact on (achieving) gender equality. Therefore, for these three issues, the focus will be, firstly, issue-related topics that are mentioned in the multi-year emancipation policy plans during the QUING research period 1995-2007 as being part of the gender equality policy agenda. Because they are covered by the emancipation policy plans, these topics are thus explicitly recognised as part of (the definition of) gender equality policy. Secondly, the policy-topics that are covered by the documents analysed for the three issues with the use of frame and voice analysis

can also be regarded as part of (definition of) gender equality policies, because despite the fact that some of them do not explicitly mention gender equality as being relevant, they do give an indication of what the core gendered topics in Dutch policy debates for each sub-issue are. See table 1 of the introduction on pages 4 and 5 for an issue-by-issue overview of which policy-topics are chosen for analysis for the Netherlands.[8]

Definitions of gender equality in the general gender equality policies issue
Concerning the Dutch emancipation policy several Emancipation policy plans are written in the period 1976-2008. These plans show which different issues are emphasised through time within the emancipation policy. The *1976 policy plan on emancipation*[9] generally aimed at increasing freedom of choice for women and men to shape their own lives. This aim was elaborated in three policy goals: (1) breaking role patterns that limit the behavioural repertoire of women and men; (2) making up women's arrears in public life and men's arrears in private life; (3) promoting the higher valuing of characteristics and activities that are traditionally associated with women (D19, Issue Histories chapter on general gender equality). *The 1985 Interdepartmental Policy Plan on Emancipation*[10] confirmed an earlier shift of policy focus, that began at the start of the 1980's, from the realm of changing attitudes towards resolving structural power inequalities between women and men. It presented not only a redistribution of public positions as its goal, but also a change in the social organisation of sexuality (Benschop, 1993) However, in practice, government (containing the Christian democrats and conservative liberals) gradually reduced this broader focus towards measures promoting women's participation on the labour market. (D19, Issue Histories/timelines of policy debates, chapter on general gender equality). *In a short-term policy plan that was adopted in 1992*, an effort was made to extend the scope of emancipation policies beyond the sphere of the labour market. Three priority areas were identified: women's participation in public decision-making, the redistribution of unpaid labour, and breaking with the prevailing images on femininity and masculinity. (D19, Issue Histories/timelines of policy debates, chapter on general gender equality). *In 1995 a new policy plan*[11] was presented in which issues such as sexual violence, distribution of power and influence, and poverty was dealt with. However, these topics were merely summed up without any in-depth analysis of the problem. In practice, the policies (still) reflected a liberal-conservative emphasis on labour and economic independence, despite the fact that more attention than before was paid to the combination of paid and unpaid labour. (D19, Issue Histories/timelines of policy debates, chapter on general gender equality). *The 2000 Short and Medium Term Policy Plan on Emancipation for the years 2000-2010*[12] identifies five priority issues for action. The (old) theme of labour and care is again most important, the other four issues are: daily routine (work-life balancing), power and decision making, human rights (including gender based violence issue), and women's position in the knowledge-based society. (D19, Issue Histories/timelines of policy debates, chapter on general gender equality). In the *Multi-year Emancipation Policy Plan 2006-2010*[13] the Short and Medium Term Policy Plan 2000-2010 is being evaluated and updated for the coming 5 years. This 2006-2010 Plan states that it has the same five priority issues (labour and care, daily routine, power and decision making, human rights, and women's position in the knowledge-based society). However, the central body of the text shows some shifts in the priorities for the upcoming five years. The primary objectives identified are: increasing attention to the emancipatory effects of

---

[8] In paragraph 3.2 it will be more thoroughly discussed to what extent gender equality is or is nott construed as relevant for the policy discussed.
[9] Ministry of Culture, Recreation and Welfare (1976), Policy plan emancipation. 'Emancipation: process of change and growth'. TK 1976–1977 14 496 nrs. 1-2.
[10] Ministry for Social Affairs and Employment (1985), Policy plan Emancipation. TK 1984–1985, 19 052, nrs. 1-2.
[11] 'Emancipation under Execution'. Emancipation policy plan developed by the Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment reflecting the official government policy course for the short term Emancipation policy 1996, TK 1995-1996, no. 24406-5.
[12] http://docs.szw.nl/pdf/35/2002/35_2002_3_2190.pdf
[13] http://docs.szw.nl/pdf/35/2005/35_2005_3_8464.pdf

policy (read: gender mainstreaming); a new heading of 'security' focusing on preventing and combating violence against women and girls; increasing the economic independence of women; and a new heading of 'social participation' explained as preventing social exclusion of women in vulnerable and underprivileged positions. (D19, Issue Histories/timelines of policy debates, chapter on general gender equality). In the latest *Multi-Year Emancipation policy plan 2008–2011*[14], the government wants to pay attention to five main topics: increase labour market participation of women; create more opportunities for women and girls from ethnic minorities; prevent and combat violence against women and girls; education on sexuality and relationships for girls and boys, and contribute to the worldwide elimination of discrimination against women and the promotion of the advancement of women. (D41, Country Context Study)

The issue most consist issue through time is the issue of increasing the labour participation. The 'issues' that seem to have disappeared through time from the emancipation policy plans are 1) the need to change prevailing images of femininity and masculinity and 2) resolving the structural power inequalities between men and women. Issues that appear more distinctively in the last few emancipation policy plans are those directed at specific target groups, for instance those directed at 'women in vulnerable and underprivileged positions' or 'women and girls from ethnic minorities'.

An indication about the meaning of general gender (+) equality policy is given above. Below, more specific definitions of gender equality for the issues non-employment, intimate citizenship and gender based violence are described.

Definitions of gender equality in the non-employment issue
From 1982 until 2007 the issue of emancipation has been connected to the Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment. It is therefore perhaps not surprising that in the Dutch emancipation policy plans, written during the QUING period, large parts are dedicated to issues that relate to the field of *(non-)employment*.

In the *1995 short term emancipation policy plan*, increasing women's labour participation to achieve economic independence is the most important issue, although the policy plan also pays attention to the combination of paid and unpaid labour for women and men. Other (connected) topics that are mentioned to achieve an increase in women's labour participation (and a better combination of paid and unpaid labour) are flexible working hours, equal treatment for part-time workers, and childcare. The *Multi-Year Emancipation Policy Plan 2001-2010* focuses on three areas that concern the issue of non-employment:
1) Increasing labour participation of women: including elements such as childcare, equal pay.
2) Offer possibilities for women and men to combine labour and care: including elements such as childcare, stimulating parental leave.
3) Offer possibilities for women and men to take care responsibilities: including elements such as flexible working hours, part-time work, long-term care leave, increasing care responsibilities of men.

In the *Multi-Year Emancipation Policy Plan 2006-2010* increasing women's labour participation is again the most important element concerning non-employment. Under this theme issues (again) such as men and women combining labour and care, childcare, equal opportunities on the labour market, and equal pay are mentioned. In the Multi-Year Emancipation Policy Plan 2008-20011: Again the most important issue for non-employment is increasing women's labour market participation to increase economic independence, to fulfil international obligations and because of economic welfare state concerns. Within this issue of increasing labour participation, the possibility of combining labour and care, flexible working hours, childcare and equal pay are mentioned as important issues. The emancipation policy plans for the period

---

[14] http://www.emancipatieweb.nl/uploads/FT/uq/FTuqJ_Fp58n415VOcQHZSQ/emancipatienota_def_versie.pdf

1995-2007 show that for non-employment the most important 'definition' of gender equality policy is **increasing women's labour participation**. This has even become more and more important over time. Other important 'definitions of gender equality policy' are women and men combining labour and care and women and men sharing care responsibilities. The topic of women and men sharing care responsibilities has however disappeared in the most recent emancipation plan.

Definitions of gender equality in the intimate citizenship issue
There is very little attention for topics in the field of *intimate citizenship* in the five latest emancipation policy plans. Only in the Multi-Year Emancipation Policy Plan 2008-20011 minor attention is paid to the prevention of unwanted teenage pregnancies and the need for sexual education for boys and girls. Topics related to the issue of intimate citizenship are not an important part of general Dutch emancipation policy. This will be further examined in paragraph 3.2 when it is described to what extent gender equality is seen as relevant for the policy discussed in the four issues.

Definitions of gender equality in the gender based violence issue
Concerning the issue of *gender based violence*, the 1995 short term emancipation policy plan emphasises the need to decrease sexual violence (including domestic sexual violence) of women and girls and to decrease the international trafficking of women. In the *Multi-Year Emancipation Policy Plan 2001-2010* it is described within the broader aim of human rights that violence against women should be prevented and suppressed. Attention is paid to the prevention of domestic violence, genital mutilation and trafficking in women. In the *Multi-Year Emancipation Policy Plan 2006-2010*, the prevention and suppression of violence against women and girls is made into one of the five main objectives. Again, like in the emancipation plan 2001-2010 it concerns the prevention and suppression of domestic violence, FGM and trafficking. The *Multi-Year Emancipation Policy Plan 2008-20011* has safety as one of the main objectives. It is divided in two sub-objectives, the 'prevention and suppression of violence against women and girls' and 'sexual education for girls and boys and increasing their resistance against (sexual) violence. Attention is paid to the prevention and suppression of domestic violence, honour violence, trafficking, female genital mutilation and prostitution. Overall, gender based violence has been an issue in all emancipation policy plans within the period 1995-2008. Prevention of FGM and honour violence (which are directed at allochthonous women) are issues that since 2000 are included in the definition of gender equality policy in the field of gender based violence.

3.2 Gendering and degendering; the meaning of gender equality

Besides focusing on the content of gender equality policy (as is done in the above), it is also important to describe how gender and gender equality policy is construed: is gender equality seen as relevant to the policy discussed; is gender equality hidden; is gender in gender equality policy seen as social relations, structures or as biology; and do the Dutch gender equality policies have transformative visions/strategies? The answers to these questions give an indication of the 'quality' of gender equality policy.

Relevance of gender equality
To examine how gender and gender equality is seen it is first necessary to take a look at whether the coded laws, policy plans, parliamentary debates and civil society texts see gender equality as relevant to the policy discussed. In table 2 it is shown that a significant part of the coded documents (29 of 76) do not construe gender equality as relevant to the policy discussed. In the issues intimate citizenship and gender based violence even more than half of the coded documents do not construe gender equality relevant.

	Gender equality construed as relevant for policy discussed					Gender equality not construed as relevant for policy discussed				
	GGE	N-E	IC	GBV	Total	GGE	N-E	IC	GBV	Total
Laws	2	1	1	1	5	-	2	1	1	4
Policy plans	3	4	2	1	10	-	1	2	3	6
Parliamentary debates	9	9	3	3	24	-	5	5	6	16
Civil society texts	2	3	2	1	8	-	1	1	1	3
Total	16	17	8	6	47	-	9	9	11	29

Table 2: Relevance of gender equality per type of document and per issue

It is remarkable that there is quite some attention for gender based violence in the emancipation policy plans and that the issue in these plans is connected to women and girls and thus gendered, while a majority of the coded documents for this issue do not construe gender equality as relevant for the policy discussed and/or are degendered. So for the issue of gender based violence, the definition and meaning of gender equality differ between the emancipation policy plans (more explicitly linked to gender inequality and to women and girls) on the one hand and the analysed policy documents which (mostly) are specifically dedicated to topics related to gender based violence on the other hand (link to gender equality often missing and more degendering).

Looking at the different types of documents, the civil society documents construe gender equality most often as relevant to the policy discussed, while laws construe gender equality the least often as relevant to the policy discussed.

Hidden gender (equality)
Construing gender equality as relevant for the policy discussed does however not always have to be (very) visible. Gender and gender equality can be hidden in certain documents; if documents are more or less de-gendered. The summary codes of the coded documents, the coded documents and the country report are used for this section.

Out of the sixteen documents that were analysed for the *general gender + equality policies* issue in which gender equality is seen as relevant for the policy discussed, only three documents are to a certain extent degendered. One document, an amendment of the General Equal Treatment Act, is dominantly de-gendered. In this document gender equality is largely made invisible by the use of 'neutral' terms like 'persons' (which is often the case in Dutch Acts). Two documents are marginally de-gendered; the part of the emancipation policy plan 2008-2011 that concerns the gender equality machinery and the overall emancipation policy plan 2008-2011 (excluding the part on gender equality machinery), where 'perpetrators' (de-gendered men) are mentioned in the part that discusses violence against women and girls. In general, the coded documents are predominantly gendered.

In comparison with the general gender+ equality policies issue, far more documents in the *non-employment issue* are (to a certain extent) de-gendered. Out of the 17 documents that construe gender equality to be relevant for the issue of non-employment, more than two thirds are to a certain degree de-gendered. Most of those documents are however only marginally de-

gendered. In these cases it mostly concerns lone parents. The only document that is dominantly de-gendered, while gender equality is present, is the cabinet note on the Childcare Act. Gender equality in this document is largely made invisible. Of the eight documents that construe gender equality to be relevant for the issue *intimate citizenship*, over one third is to a certain degree de-gendered. One document, on community of property, is solely de-gendered. Here, gender equality is made invisible. Persons are described in a de-gendered manner like 'persons', 'singles', 'non-earning spouse', and 'single parent'. Half of the documents (that construe gender equality to be relevant) for the issue *gender based violence* are dominantly de-gendered. Gender equality is largely made invisible. The other half is completely gendered. The de-gendered persons are mainly victims and perpetrators.

Gender equality is most visible in the general gender (+) equality issue. The other three issues are to some extent degendered, with gender equality being hidden the most in the gender based violence issue.

Gender as social/biological

Next, we will be looking at whether gender in gender equality policy is seen more as social or as biological. In more than one third of the coded documents, gender is seen as social (to a certain extent), while only in a minor part of the documents gender is seen as biological (to a certain extent).[15] In the emancipation policy plans of the last thirty years, several topics were addressed that clearly indicate that gender is seen as social structure or as structural power relations: "breaking role patterns that limit the behavioural repertoire of women and men" (1976), "promoting the higher valuing of characteristics and activities that are traditionally associated with women" (1976), "resolving structural power inequalities between women and men" (1985) and "changing the social organisation of sexuality" (1985) and "breaking with the prevailing images on femininity and masculinity" (1992). It seems that gender as social category is mentioned mainly in the earlier emancipation policy plans than in those that were written more recently. There are however no topics mentioned that clearly indicate that gender is seen as biological in the emancipation policy plans either.

Transformation

After analysing how many documents construe gender equality as relevant for the policy discussed (see table 2 on page 22), the next step is to examine if documents that DO construe gender equality as relevant, also have transformative visions or strategies. When looking specifically at the laws and policy plans in the Dutch case, some two-fifths of the analysed policy plans and laws do not construe gender equality as relevant to the policy. The policy plans and laws that do construe gender equality as relevant show that one quarter have a (partly) 'transformative' strategy and/or vision regarding gender equality. In these cases gender equality is always seen as both 'vision' and 'strategy'. Moreover, the 'strength' of this transformative vision or strategy is either 'marginal' (in these cases gender equality is also conceptualised as sameness/equal treatment and as difference/special programmes) or 'significant' (in these cases gender equality is also conceptualised as sameness/equal treatment). It is foremost in the issues of 'general gender equality' and 'non-employment' that gender equality as vision and/or strategy is given a (partly) transformative 'content'. In the issue gender based violence, transformative visions or strategies are absent. (See table 3)

When comparing civil society documents with governmental documents, the laws and policy plans clearly have less transformative aims than parliamentary debates and civil society texts. As can be expected, the parliamentary debates are least consistent by often describing a transformative strategy without any transformative vision. In the issue general gender equality,

---

[15] Only those documents are taken into consideration that construes gender equality as relevant for the policy discussed.

the parliamentary debates show either only a transformative vision or only a transformative strategy.

Using 47 of 76 doc.*	General gender equality	Non-employment	Intimate citizenship	Gender based violence	Total no. of doc. with transformation
Laws	1	1	-	-	2 (out of 5 documents)
Policy plans	1	1	-	-	2 (out of 10 documents)
Parliamentary debates	5	2	-	-	7 (out of 24 documents)
Civil society	2	1	1	-	4 (out of 8 documents
Total no. of doc. with transformation	9 (out of 16 documents)	5 (out of 17 documents)	1 (out of 8 documents)	0 (out of 6 documents)	

Table 3: Transformative visions and/or strategies according to type of document and issue.
* Only those documents that construe gender equality to be relevant to the policy discussed are taken into consideration.

In the policy plans and laws that DO construe gender equality to be relevant for the policy, gender equality is more often seen as a strategy than as a vision (never gender equality is seen as vision only). Also, gender equality is most often conceptualised as sameness (vision) and/or equal treatment (strategy). Several times 'equality as sameness' is the sole vision and several times 'equal treatment' is the sole strategy. In the other cases sameness/equal treatment is either dominant or significant. The vision 'equality as difference' is almost absent. However, the strategy 'special programmes' is present (to different extents) in one third of the laws and policy plans that construe gender equality as relevant. (See table 4)

vision and strategy	General gender + equality policies	Non-employment	Intimate Citizenship	Gender based violence	All issues
Equality= sameness	8	14	6	3	31
Equality= difference	1	3	-	-	4
Equality= transformation	4	6	1	-	11
Equal treatment	16	15	7	2	40
Special programmes	15	1	-	1	17
Transformation	8	5	1	-	14

Table 4: Visions and strategies regarding gender equality (based on summary codes, the numbers indicate the number of documents).

By taking another look at whether or not policy is overtly gendered, whether gender is seen as social, as biological, or if this is unclear and if texts are de-gendered, we might be able to say something about the transformative potential of *all* laws and policy plans, not only those that construe gender equality as relevant. Our assumptions are that:

A) if a policy is completely gender blind[16], whereas it is generally felt (by gender experts, by feminists) that the subject of the policy is in fact highly relevant as regards gender equality (and therefore it was included in our selection of texts to be analysed), then this can be regarded as an indicator of 'low' transformative potential. A gender blind text does not show any awareness of the fact that the policy at hand has gendered effects and should in fact pay attention to this in order to counter gender inequalities from continuing or getting worse. Contrary to gender blind texts, in de-gendered texts such awareness can in fact be included, but then it is more hidden

B) if gender is explicitly seen as 'social' then in principle there seems to be more room for transformation than is the case when the policy is gender blind or when gender is seen as 'biological' (but see remark below on 'biological'). If the government makes explicit in policy documents that it regards gender as socially constructed then this brings along the 'promise' that inequalities between the genders cannot be regarded as a naturally given fact and that they can also be transformed.

C) If reference is made to gender as a biological category it is not possible to attach conclusions as regards the 'transformative potential' of policies to it in any straightforward way. That gender is seen as biological in policy documents can namely have quite diverse meanings. If a document relates to, for example, maternity leave, IVF or abortion, gender will (at least partly) be seen as biological difference/categories, but in such case this will not necessarily be an indicator of 'low transformative potential'. If a document claims, however, that women and not men should take care of their children, because this is their naturally/biologically given role, then the implications as regards the transformative potential of such policy are of course different.

D) If for the analysed policy it is not possible to say whether gender is seen as biological or as social, then we can conclude that at the very least the policy is not gender blind, but that it does not make explicit in what way gender is regarded. This makes it more difficult to attach any conclusions regarding the 'transformative potential' of such policies.

Based on these assumptions, what can we say about the transformative potential of the Dutch policies? In the Dutch case, there are only three (out of 25) policy plans and laws that are not (overtly) gendered. However, the three are not gender blind but de-gendered and all three are law-texts (one on domestic violence, the other two in non-employment issue).

Looking at whether gender is seen as social, it shows that only three texts regard gender (partly) as social. These texts are policy plans and gender is never solely seen as 'social'; it is combined with other ways of gendering the policies (de-gendered and/or it is unclear whether statements refer to biological or social categories). One policy plan is the multi-year emancipation policy plan 2008-2011, the other one is a Cabinet policy note on combining labour and care, and the last one is a policy plan on equal pay. These are also documents that construe gender equality to be relevant and that already have a transformative vision and strategy.

In six of the policy plans and laws, reference is made to gender as a biological category. It occurs most often in the issue of intimate citizenship when policies/laws are about reproductive

---

[16] This is the case when the answer to summary question 5 is 'no', and question 6 is left unanswered. A text that is completely de-gendered would give 'no' for summary question 5 and 'solely de-gendered' for summary question 6.

matters (IVF and abortion) and about same sex marriage. It also occurs concerning the topic of combining labour and care, stemming from the fact that gender is thought of in biological way when pregnancy/maternity leave arrangements are discussed. Gender seen as biological also is present in the policy plan on female genital mutilation. All in all, while references to gender as biological categories are found more often than references to gender as social categories, this seems not to be used in a "conservative" way.

It most often occurs that for the analysed laws and policy plans it is (at least partly) not possible to assess whether reference is made to gender as social or as biological categories. And often this is combined with the policies being partly de-gendered. In those documents that leave unclear whether gender is regarded as social or biological it means that no explicit statements are made that clarify this matter. Although we have recorded this lack of clarity without letting our own interpretation interfere, we still feel that in quite some of these instances the inclination of the documents will be to the 'gender as social' side. The reason for this being that the more or less 'normalised' and 'official' standpoint that the government (tries to) propagate(s) regarding emancipation policy is one in which gender refers to social categories.

Conclusion

A significant part of the coded documents does not construe gender equality as relevant to the policy discussed. This can be found the most in the issues gender based violence and intimate citizenship. Gender equality is most visible in the general gender+ equality issue. The other three issues are to some extent degendered, with gender equality being hidden the most in the gender based violence issue. Gender is in the Netherlands more seen as social than as biological. Transformative aims and strategies can almost solely be found in the issues general gender+ equality policies and non-employment.

3.3 The actors involved

To get a better understanding of the range of meanings of gender equality policy this section will describe more closely for whom and by whom gender equality should be achieved.[17] When examining for whom gender equality should be achieved, only those persons are taken into consideration that are *related to objectives that have 'equality' as underlying norm,* to make sure that the goal is indeed related to achieving (gender) equality. This will be described for the four issues - general gender equality, non-employment, intimate citizenship and gender based violence - separately by using the coded documents, the summary codes of the coded documents, the LARG country report, deliverable 40 and the explanation of the general aim of the emancipation policy. Besides a comparison between the four issues, governmental documents and civil society documents will be compared to determine if there is a difference in the diversity of persons for whom gender equality should be achieved.

General gender + equality policy issue

The official aim of the general emancipation policy as found on the website of the Directorate Emancipation[18] is to "promote a society in which individuals regardless of sex (and in interaction with other societal order principles like ethnicity, age, civil status, and sexual orientation), can achieve an independent existence and in which women and men have equal rights, opportunities,

---

[17] Although institutional actors overall make up a significant part of the target groups, these actors are left out when determining for whom gender equality should be achieved, because it is not probable that gender equality is to be achieved for institutions.
[18] www.emancipatieweb.nl

liberties and responsibilities."[19] The website subsequently provides further explanation of this aim. Although the aim mentions both women and men, the further explanation of the aim focuses foremost on women (in general), whereby it is stated that specific attention must be given to ethnic minority women (allochtonous women), women of old age, low-educated women and women that re-enter the labour market[20].

When looking at the persons that are mentioned in the Dutch Emancipation policy plans it is clear that the persons most often mentioned are women. In the following topics women are mentioned as the main target group: increasing labour participation (most important issue), increasing women's participation in public decision-making, human rights, women's position in the knowledge-based society, preventing and combating violence against women and girls, increasing social participation, create more opportunities for women and girls from ethnic minorities, prevent and combat violence against women and girls, contribute to the worldwide elimination of discrimination against women and the promotion of the advancement of women. A significant part of the topics covered by the Emancipation policy plans mention women and men together: increasing the freedom of choice for women and men, redistribution of unpaid labour, breaking with the prevailing images on femininity and masculinity, combining paid and unpaid labour/daily routing (work-life balance), attention to emancipatory effects of policy (read: gender mainstreaming) and establish education on sexuality and relationships for girls and boys. No topics specifically targeted at men can be found.

When examining the coded documents, the persons that are most often mentioned as target group for whom gender equality should be achieved in the issue 'general gender equality' are ethnic minority women/girls. The second largest group concerns women in general. After that, girls, allochthonous persons and allochthonous men/boys (mentioned separately from women) are mentioned most frequently, but still far less often than women and allochthonous women/girls. Other groups that are marginally mentioned are for instance (single) mothers, refugees, victims, fathers, perpetrators, children, parents and teachers.

Based on the summary codes of the coded documents, the actor most often mentioned as responsible for implementing, monitoring or evaluating gender equality policy for the issue general gender+ equality policies is the state. In half of the documents, semi-state or semi-civil society institutions are mentioned as responsible for gender equality policy. Civil society is least often mentioned (one third of the documents) as responsible for gender equality policy.
    According to the coded documents, the majority of the actors that are responsible for gender equality policy are institutional, while a minority (roughly a quarter) are persons. The institutional responsible actors are predominantly state institutions, such as government, cabinet or minister. A small part of responsible actors are civil society actors, while another small part is 'hybrid' actors in between civil society and state. Almost half of the civil society actors are market actors. The responsible actors that are people are predominantly persons working for the state. The (very few) remaining responsible actors that are people, consist of some gendered actors (ethnic minority women, women having top positions), a de-gendered actor (persons claiming to have been discriminated against) and market actors (employers, representatives from Dutch business, prominent managers from business). Overall, for both categories – institutional and people – it stands out that the majority of responsible actors consists of state institutions respectively persons working for the state.

---

[19] Objective of emancipation policy as can be found on the official government website on emancipation: http://www.emancipatieweb.nl/emancipatie_algemeen#1932 accessed on 19 June 2008
[20] In the Dutch policies the term 'ethnic minority' is used interchangeably with 'allochthonous'. In this report the terms will likewise be used interchangeably.

In the explanations on the aim of emancipation policy it is not indicated specifically to what extent government is responsible for achieving gender equality. It is however stated that the emancipation process must take place in an autonomous manner, where individuals take their own responsibilities. The Cabinet only stimulates this process by offering the right economic, cultural and social conditions. Furthermore, the comment is made that social (women's) organisations, and specifically the social partners are co-responsible for the emancipation process.

In the general gender + equality policies issue the state seems to be the most important actor for realising gender equality (policy), although civil society and semi civil society/state actors are also mentioned as being responsible for a significant part. Gender equality is mainly to be achieved for *ethnic minority* women in specific and for women in general.

Next, we will describe/analyse by and for what actor or group of actors gender equality is to be achieved in the four issues, non-employment, intimate citizenship and gender based violence. [21]

Non-employment issue
Almost half of the persons mentioned as target groups for whom gender equality should be achieved in the *non-employment* issue are women. Within this group, it is mainly women in general that are mentioned. Other persons mentioned are female part-timers, allochthonous women, and lone parents. A minor part of the persons mentioned for whom gender equality should be achieved is men, but they are almost always mentioned together with women. Other persons that are mentioned a few times are 'everyone' or parents. The state is in all coded documents on non-employment seen as (partly) responsible for the implementation, monitoring or evaluation of gender equality policy. In half of the documents civil society organizations (including market actors) are also mentioned as responsible for gender equality policies. There are hardly any semi-state/civil society organisations mentioned.

Intimate citizenship issue
In Intimate citizenship, it is rather difficult to determine for whom gender equality should be achieved. First of all, not many target groups are mentioned in the coded objectives that have 'equality' as underlying norm. Second, equality in this issue can mean gender equality, but just as well equality for homosexuals. Half of the persons for whom (gender) equality must be achieved are women (including women in general, lone women, lesbians and allochthonous women). Men and gay men are only mentioned once, together with (lesbian) women. Other target groups mentioned are couples of the same sex, transgender, transsexuals and bisexuals. In most of the documents no actors are mentioned that should be responsible for the implementation, monitoring or evaluation of gender equality policies. Only in the policy vision on gay-, lesbian, bisexual and transgender policy written by a civil society organisation, are the state, civil society and semi-state/civil society actors mentioned as being responsible for gender equality policies.

Gender based violence
Based on the coded documents for the issue *gender based violence* there are no specific actors mentioned for whom gender equality should be achieved; only a very few objectives have equality as underlying norm and none of these objectives mention a target group. In all coded documents the state is mentioned as responsible for the implementation, monitoring or evaluation of gender equality policies. In half of the documents civil society is also responsible for gender equality policy. No semi-state/civil society actors are mentioned.

---

[21] It must be stated that only those target groups that are mentioned *in relation to objectives that have 'equality' as underlying norm* are taken into consideration (this is to make sure that the goal is indeed related to achieving (gender) equality).

Civil society versus government

Besides focusing on the specific issues, it can also be examined if differences between civil society and government exist in their respective description for whom and by who gender equality should be achieved.[22] Governmental documents regard gender equality to be established foremost for women ('women in general' is the largest group, ethnic minority women, ethnic minority girls and girls in general are also mentioned). Men are a minor part of the target groups and always mentioned together with women. Civil society texts show more diversity in target groups than do governmental documents. There is not one group that has occurred clearly most often. One third of the persons are women (including for instance allochthonous women, female part-timers, lesbian women, and lone parents). Men are mentioned only once. Then there is a group that is not gendered, with for instance; allochthonous persons, bisexuals, children, parents, refugees, and transgender people.

Conclusion

Gender equality in the Netherlands is to be achieved primarily for women. Ethnic minority women are the specific group of women that are mentioned most often. Men are mentioned only for a minor part as target group, mostly together with women. Only in the general gender + equality issue allochthonous men and boys are mentioned separately from women. There is no clear difference between issues on who is responsible for achieving gender equality. The state is most responsible for implementing, monitoring or evaluation gender equality policies. In the issues general gender + equality policies, non-employment and gender based violence also civil society is for a significant part held responsible for gender equality policy.

3.4 Adjacent frames and gender equality as means or end

Even when gender equality is described in a document as an end in itself or as a means to another policy goal, the document can always include other frames than a gender equality frame as well. It can also be that policy which has an impact on (achieving) gender equality is not construed as such -which means an absence of a gender equality frame- and is therefore completely construed in adjacent frames. This section will, based on the summary codes, take a closer look at these adjacent frames.

All of the documents that were coded for the issue *general gender + equality policies* see gender equality to a certain degree as an end in itself. One third of all the documents see gender equality solely as an end in itself, half of the documents see gender equality for a major part as an end in itself and for a minor part as a means to another policy goal. A minor part of the documents balances gender equality as a means to another policy goal and as an end in itself.

'Equality' is clearly the most important frame in the general gender+ equality issue. The most important *adjacent* frame, which occurs in almost half of the documents, is "quality of government and administration". This frame is solely found for the documents on gender equality machinery. It is dominant in almost half of the documents on machinery. Frames that can be found in a quarter of the documents are 'human rights', 'economic development' and 'capabilities/well-being'. The frames 'crime and justice' and 'health' are marginally used. The issue general gender + equality issue shows a rather diverse use of framing. (See table 5)

As can be seen in table 2, one third of the documents that were coded for the issue *non-employment* do not construe gender equality as relevant to the policy. Of the documents that do

---

[22] When looking at government, only laws and policy plans are analysed.

construe gender equality as relevant to the policy discussed, all see gender equality, to a certain degree, as an end in itself. Half of the documents see gender equality solely as an end in itself. A small part of the documents sees gender equality for a major part as an end in itself and for a minor part as a means to a policy goal. Another small part of the documents shows a balance between gender equality as means and as an end in itself. The three most frequently occurring frames in the non-employment issue are 'equality', 'economic development' and 'capabilities/well-being'. Other frames that occur only marginally are 'human rights', 'health', 'crime and justice' and 'social regulation', 'degendered motherhood ideology' and 'social integration'.

As table 2 shows, more than half of the documents in the issue *intimate citizenship* do not construe gender equality as relevant to the policy discussed. Of the documents that do consider gender equality as relevant, most construe gender equality as an end in itself.
'Equality' is the most important frame for this issue, although it should be noted that it concerns often equality for homosexuals instead of gender equality. Frames that occur in a quarter part of the documents are the 'human rights' frame, 'capabilities/well-being' frame and a (social) integration frame. Other frames that occur a few times are 'fairness', 'societal efficiency', 'economic development', 'crime and justice' and 'health'.

The majority of documents in the issue g*ender based violence* do not construe gender equality as relevant for the policies discussed. Of the documents that do see gender equality as relevant, some see gender equality as a means to another policy goal, while most of the documents see gender equality as an end in itself.
For the issue gender based violence, 'crime and justice' is by far the most important frame. It can be found in almost all documents and is often of great importance. Frames that occur in a minor part of the documents are equality, human rights and health. The issue gender based violence is in the EU framed as a health frame, not as an equality frame. Although the human rights frame is not the most important frame *within* the gender based violence issue, the health frame can be found the most for the Netherlands in the gender based violence frame *in comparison with the other issues.* Other frames that are mentioned once are 'economic development', 'emancipation of non-western minorities', 'culturalisation of problem' and 'anti-ethnic stigmatization'.

	No. of documents for General gender equality	No. of documents for Non-employment	No. of documents for Intimate citizenship	No. of documents for Gender based violence	Total no. of docs.
Equality	16	18	12	5	51
Human rights	4	2	4	4	14
Economic development	5	18	2	1	26
Capabilities/ well being	4	19	5	-	28
Crime and justice	2	1	2	15	20
Health	1	2	2	5	10
Other	7 (quality of government and administration)	4 (divers)	9 (social integration, social efficiency, traditional family values)	4 (culturalisation of problem, anti ethnic stigmatisation)	24

Total no. of documents coded	16	26	17	17	

Table 5: Use of frames per issue

Gender equality is throughout all issues seen as an end in itself rather than as a means to another policy goal. In half of the documents where gender equality is construed as relevant, gender equality is solely an end in itself. Gender equality is hardly seen as a sole or major means to another policy goal. Of all the issues, the issue gender based violence sees gender equality most often as a means to another policy goal. This issue is also the one in which most documents do not construe gender equality as relevant for the policy discussed.

There exists a clear difference between civil society and government on all four issues, whereby civil society (documents) construe gender equality more often relevant than do government (documents). Also gender equality is more often seen as an end in itself by civil society then by government.

Although gender equality is mainly seen as an end in itself, it does not mean that other frames are not important in the coded documents. Documents that do not construe gender equality as relevant for the policy discussed obviously use other frames than the equality frame. When looking at the framing of documents; 'economic development' and 'capabilities/well being' are found most often in the issue non-employment. 'Crime and justice' is most often found in the issue of gender based violence. Sometimes there is a clear difference in the importance of adjacent frames between issues, but these adjacent frames are closely connected to the specific issues (economic development within non-employment and crime and justice within gender based violence). Equality is the most important frame only for the issues general gender+ equality policies and intimate citizenship. It is only of minor importance for the issue of gender based violence, where the frame crime and justice is most visible.

3.5 Summary and comparison

To determine the meaning of gender equality in gender+ equality policy, this chapter examined the definition of gender equality, the different meanings/constructions of gender and gender equality, for whom and by whom gender equality should be achieved and which other frames can be found in Dutch gender equality policy.

Gender equality in the Netherlands is named emancipation, which has a liberation connotation. There hardly exists a discrimination frame in the field of gender equality. In the gender emancipation plans that where written during the period 1995-2008, the issue that can be found most consistently through time is the issue of increasing women's labour participation. The 'issue' that seems to have disappeared over time from the emancipation policy plans is the need to change attitudes towards resolving structural power inequalities between men and women. Issues that appear more distinctively in the last few emancipation policy plans are those directed at specific target groups, for instance directed at 'women in vulnerable and underprivileged positions' or 'women and girls from ethnic minorities' (often these groups are synonymous with each other). Although less important than labour participation, gender based violence stays an issue in the emancipation policy plans. Only topics that relate to the issue of intimate citizenship can hardly be found in the Emancipation plans.

In a significant part of the coded documents gender equality is not construed as relevant to the policy discussed, although these documents are in fact relevant for achieving gender equality. In the issues intimate citizenship and gender based violence more than half of the coded documents do not construe gender equality as relevant for the policy discussed. Gender equality

is most visible in the general gender+ equality issue. The other three issues are to some extent degendered, with gender equality being hidden the most in the gender based violence issue. In general, gender is seen more as social than as biological. This can be an indication for the transformative potential of policy. Looking at the transformative aims and strategies of laws and policy plans, these can only be found in the issues general gender equality and non-employment. Policy plans and laws see gender equality more as a strategy than as a vision and gender equality is most often conceptualised as sameness (vision) and/or equal treatment (strategy). The vision 'equality as difference' is almost absent.

In the Netherlands, gender equality is mainly to be achieved for women. 'Ethnic minority women' is the specific group of women that is mentioned most often. Men are mentioned only for a minor part as target group, and then primarily mentioned together with women. Only in the general gender + equality issue allochthonous men and boys are mentioned separately from women. The state is most responsible for implementing, monitoring or evaluation gender equality policies. In the issues general gender + equality, non-employment and gender based violence civil society is also for a significant part held responsible for gender equality policy.

Gender equality throughout all issues is more seen as an end in itself than as a means to another policy goal. However, only in half of the documents that see gender equality as relevant to the policy, gender equality is *solely* an end in itself. Of all the issues, the issue gender based violence sees gender equality most often as a means to another policy goal. This issue is also the one in which relatively least documents regard gender equality as relevant for the policy discussed. There exists a clear difference between civil society and government, whereby civil society construes gender equality more often relevant than does government. Also gender equality is more often seen as an end in itself by civil society then by government.

When looking at the framing of documents; 'economic development' and 'capabilities/well being' are found most often in the issue non-employment. 'Crime and justice' is most often found in the issue gender based violence. There sometimes exists a clear difference in the importance of adjacent frames between issues, but these adjacent frames are closely connected to the specific issues (for example 'economic development' within non-employment and 'crime and justice' within gender based violence). Equality is the most important frame only for the issues general gender + equality policies and intimate citizenship. It is only of minor importance for the issue gender based violence.

4 THE RANGE OF INTERSECTING INEQUALITIES AND THE NAMING, FRAMING AND PRACTICE OF INTERSECTIONALITY

In the previous chapter of the STRIQ report the meanings and definitions of 'gender equality' in the Dutch gender+ equality policies have been discussed and analysed. In this chapter a similar thing will be done, but now for 'intersectionality'.

A distinction is commonly made between structural intersectionality and political intersectionality. Structural intersectionality has to do with how inequalities and their intersections are experienced or 'lived' by people in society, whereas political intersectionality denotes how inequalities and their intersections are relevant in a political way: civil society's and social movements' intersectional organisation/activities/(power) struggles; the way intersecting inequalities appear and are (strategically) addressed in the political arena, and whether intersecting inequalities are included/excluded in the political arena (Crenshaw 1991). Structural intersectionality on the level of society is not QUING's research focus. Some attention has been paid to it in the Country Context Studies (deliverable 41). The main focus of this part of the report will therefore be on political intersectionality. Most data that we have gathered within QUING stem from the policy documents and civil society texts that we have analysed by using frame and voice analysis. Once more, this underlines that the main focus in this part of the report is on the range and the naming, framing and practice of intersectionality *in policy (documents) and by civil society actors*. In the Country Context Study (deliverable 41), in the Issue Histories/issue timelines (deliverable 19), and in the State of the Art Reports (deliverable 8) all necessary contextual information was gathered on machinery, issue histories, political system of the country, gender regimes, equality laws, mapping the civil society landscape and so on. When needed or relevant we will look beyond the document analysis and reports that have been written so far within QUING. This is the case when we analyse how intersectionality appears in the Dutch multi-year emancipation policy plans. Only the most recent plan was included in the document analysis. But in order to possibly sketch a process through time and because these documents are among the most authoritative documents in the field of gender equality policies (as they set the framework for the development of gender equality policies for multiple years to come), we also have a closer look at some of the older multi-year policy plans.

This chapter is structured as follows: *first*, the range of (intersecting) inequalities that receive attention in Dutch gender equality policy, machinery and civil society is discussed in section 4.1. However, knowing something about which inequalities and intersections appear most often in gender equality policies, doesn't yet tell us much about *the way intersectionality is done.* Hence, we *secondly* look in section 4.2 at how intersectionality is named (which terms are used to indicate intersectionality or intersecting axis), how it is framed and practiced (what is the meaning of intersectionality, i.e. which version/approaches towards it are discernible in the analysed documents), and what is the importance of intersectionality to Dutch gender+ equality policies and policy making. Section 4.3 pays specific attention to the practice and meaning of intersectionality in civil society. In the next chapter of the report (chapter 5) intersectionality (chapter 4) will be connected to gender equality (chapter 3): How do the definitions and practice of gender equality and the definitions and practice of intersectionality relate? Do the meanings of intersectionality change the meaning of gender equality? The implication of the way intersectionality is present in Dutch gender+ equality policies and policy making for the meaning and practice of gender equality policies will be discussed and analysed.

4.1 Range of (intersecting) inequalities

The range of (intersecting) inequalities will first be discussed issue-wise. Data from the document analysis will primarily be used here, but for the issue of 'general gender equality policies' we will also look at the equality legislation and machinery (taken from the Country Context Study) and the multi-year emancipation policy plans. Next, it is analysed whether there is a tendency for intersectionality to be present in particular types of documents. Finally, the range of (intersecting) inequalities that can be found in Dutch civil society is discussed (on the basis of Country Context Study).

In order to grasp the range of inequalities and intersections that are present in the analysed documents for each issue, we started to make a table with the help of the QUING software that visualizes prominence, absence and presence. In table 6 below, information is gathered on intersections of gender with other inequalities (see 2nd column), on the prominence of inequalities and whether they intersect or not (see 3rd column) and on intersectional actor categories (see 4th column). Each column is based on another source of data/information:

The second column is based on summary question 12 which asks for each of the analysed documents if and to what extent gender is seen to be intersecting with other inequalities/strands. References to gendered or de-gendered intersectional categories were also taken in consideration when answering this question. The visibility of intersections was decided upon by 'integrating' how many times the intersection occurred in the issue (how many document) with the strength/relevance that was connected to these occurrences (major or minor). Summary question 12 does not provide information on the intersection of multiple inequalities where gender is not one of the inequality strands. Also, this summary question does not enable us to see whether gender intersects with only one or with more than one inequality axis. Besides, summary question 12 does not give any insight in how many times gender is referred to as single inequality axis as compared to the number of times that gender intersects with another inequality axis.

The 'dimensions of gender and intersectionality' can fill these 'gaps' and we used these dimensions to construct the third column of the table. For each document it has been coded when it mentions actor groups that are related to one or more inequality axes or when the objectives or problems in the text are linked to one or more inequality axes. Which inequality axis/axes is/are mentioned and whether they intersect or not have been coded. By using the 'search for codes' application in the QUING software we can first of all gain insight into what is the range of inequalities that are mentioned per issue and what their relative relevance/prominence, based on occurrence, is. This is called 'prominence of different inequalities' in table 6. Furthermore, by analysing the 'dimensions of gender and intersectionality' (intersectionality: yes or no) in the software, we can see how often documents refer to intersecting inequality axes as compared to how often documents refer either to a single inequality axis or to multiple but not intersecting inequality axes. Finally, we can also see how often gender is one of the intersecting axes.

The fourth column maps information about intersectional actors. In the country study report (deliverable 40) a short note was written for each issue and for each separate actor group (in diagnosis: active actors, passive actors. In prognosis: target group, responsible actor). With the use of the software (search for codes) it was then calculated how much of the actors that are people are intersectionalised, how this varies between the sort of actor (active, passive, responsible or target group), and which intersectional categories are exactly mentioned and is gender always one of the strands?

Table 6: Summarizing table on intersectionality in QUING frame analysis data Netherlands

Issue	intersections with gender (summary question 12)	Range of inequalities and presence of intersectionality in the supertexts		Intersectionalised actors	
		DIAGNOSIS	PROGNOSIS	DIAGNOSIS	PROGNOSIS
All	*Most visible*:* G ¤ E-R G ¤ FS G ¤ A *Middle:* G ¤ C G ¤ CS *Least visible:* G ¤ SO G ¤ D G ¤ R-B *Absent:* none	*Prominence of the different inequalities**:* G E-R A, C, FS CS, SO R-B, D (negl) *Intersecting or not***?* Two thirds intersecting (gender one of axes: 90% #)	*Prominence of the different inequalities:* G E-R A, FS CS, C SO R-B, D (negl) *Intersecting or not?* Half intersecting (gender one of axes: 90%)		
GGE	*Most visible:* G ¤ E-R G ¤ A G ¤ C *Middle:* G ¤ FS *Least visible:* G ¤ R-B G ¤ CS *Absent:* G ¤ SO G ¤ D	*Prominence of the different inequalities:* G E-R A C, FS SO, CS, R-B (negl) D, R (abs) *Intersecting or not?* Two thirds intersecting (gender one of axes: 90%)	*Prominence of the different inequalities:* G E-R A C, FS SO, CS, R-B (negl) D and R (abs) *Intersecting or not?* Two thirds intersecting (gender one of axes: 90%)	*Active Actors##:* > half (of people actors) 1) G ¤ E-R 2) G ¤ E-R ¤ A or G ¤ A *Passive Actors:* Half (of people actors) 1) G ¤ E-R 2) G ¤ A, or G ¤ E-R ¤ CS, or G ¤ FS, or G ¤ E-R ¤ A	*Resp. actors:* Hardly any (of people actors) *Target groups:* < half (of people actors) 1) G ¤ E-R 2) G ¤ A, or G ¤ A ¤ E-R
NE	*Most visible:* G ¤ FS G ¤ C *Middle:* G ¤ E-R G ¤ A *Least visible:* G ¤ D G ¤ CS *Absent:* G ¤ R-B G ¤ SO	*Prominence of the different inequalities:* G C E-R, FS A, CS, D SO, R-B, R (abs) *Intersecting or not?* Almost two thirds intersecting (gender one of axes: 85%)	*Prominence of the different inequalities:* G FS E-R, C A CS, D SO, R-B, R (abs) *Intersecting or not?* Less than half intersecting (gender one of axes: 90%)	*Active Actors:* One third 1) G ¤ E-R, or G ¤ FS 2) G ¤ E-R ¤ CS, or G ¤ C, or G ¤ C ¤ FS, or G ¤ A *Passive Actors:* One third 1) G ¤ E-R, or G ¤ FS 2) G ¤ FS ¤ C	*Resp. actors:* None *Target groups:* One quarter 1) G ¤ FS, or G ¤ E-R 2) G ¤ FS ¤ C
IC	*Most visible:* G ¤ FS *Middle:* G ¤ SO G ¤ E-R G ¤ A *Least visible:*	*Prominence of the different inequalities:* G E-R SO FS , CS, A C, R-B, D (negl)	*Prominence of the different inequalities:* G FS, SO E-R, A CS C, D (negl)	*Active Actors:* Two third 1) E-R ¤ one /two other axes, or G ¤ one or two other axes	*Resp. actors:* Hardly any

	G ¤ C G ¤ CS G ¤ R-B G ¤ D	R (abs) *Intersecting or not?* Four fifth intersecting (gender one of axes: 85%)	R (abs) *Intersecting or not?* Two thirds intersecting (gender one of axes: 70%)	*Passive Actors:* Majority 1) G ¤ SO	*Target groups:* < half 1) G ¤ SO 2) E-R ¤ CS, or G ¤ FS, or G ¤ SO ¤ E-R
GBV	*Most visible:* G ¤ E-R G ¤ A *Middle:* G ¤ CS G ¤ FS *Least visible:* G ¤ R-B G ¤ SO *Absent:* G ¤ C G ¤ D	*Prominence of the different inequalities:* G E-R, A CS R-B D, FS, C, R, SO (abs) *Intersecting or not?* Half is intersecting (gender one of axes: 100%)	*Prominence of the different inequalities:* G E-R A CS FS SO, R-B (negl) D, C, R (abs) *Intersecting or not?* One third intersecting (gender one of axes: 100%)	*Active Actors:* Persons not intersectional, collectivities all ethnicised *Passive Actors:* Half 1) G ¤ A 2) G ¤ E-R, or G ¤ E-R ¤ A, or G ¤ CS, or G ¤ A ¤ CS	*Resp. actors:* None *Target groups:* Minority 1) G ¤ A, or G ¤ CS, or G ¤ E-R, or G ¤ E- R ¤ A

G = gender, E-R = ethnicity/race, A = age, C = class, D = disability, SO = sexual orientation, CS = citizenship/migrant status, FS= family/marital status, R-B = Religion/belief, R = regional
¤ = 'intersects with'
negl= negligible, abs = absent

* Visibility of intersections as compared to the other intersections. Within each category (most visible, middle, or least visible) the intersection first mentioned is more visible than the intersection that follows. That a particular intersection is categorised as 'most visible' does not necessarily imply that this intersection was a relevant aspect in *all* or *most* of the analysed documents for the issue. To give an example, the 'most visible' intersection G ¤ R-E (all issues) was a relevant aspect in 29 out of the total of 76 coded texts (see table 8). The weight of the intersections has been 'decided' upon by taking into consideration: a) in how many documents an intersection plays a role and b) the relevance of this intersection in each of the document in which it appears (major or minor?). This was coded in the supertexts.
** Ordered from most occurrences to least occurrences (in diagdimensions and in progdimensions)
*** Which part of the coded diagdimensions/progdimensions refers to *intersecting* inequality axes (instead of to a single strand or to multiple but separate strands)?
\# Which part of the coded diagdimensions/progdimensions that refer to intersecting inequalities involve gender as one of the inequality axes?
\#\# This should be read as: some more than half of the active actors (that are people) are constructed in an intersectionalised way, with gender intersecting with ethnicity/race being most prominent and gender/ethnicity/age or gender/age being less prominent. Intersections that only appear exceptionally are not included in this table.

Throughout this section some additional tables are included that single out aspects that are not covered in table 6. For example: in how many document certain intersections occur; are they spread out or are they centred in only a few documents?

4.1.1 General gender equality policies and machinery

Document coding
Table 6 shows that in the selected and coded documents gender and ethnicity/race, gender and age, and gender and class are the most visible intersections. The inequality axes that are most prominent in this issue are gender and after that ethnicity/race and after that age. Since the issue

of general gender equality also covers aspects that can be located in the other three issues, it might well be that class and family status (and maybe age as well) are 'brought forward' by non-employment, intimate citizenship and gender based violence kind of topics. If we look at the intersecting actors in table 6, it becomes clear that responsible actors are hardly ever intersectional actors, but that around half of the active and the passive actors and target groups are intersectional. These intersectional actors most often show a gender with ethnicity/race intersection. Gender intersecting with age and gender intersecting with age and ethnicity/race occur less often. Other intersections only occur exceptionally.[23] Overall, ethnicity/race and age stand out the most as inequality strands (after gender) and as intersecting with gender in the document analysis for the general gender equality issue. In reference to the literature review, the data for this issue seems thus to underline our idea of the existence of a gender-ethnicity 'bias' in Dutch gender+ equality policies. Age and class are also visible, but much less so. The other inequalities hardly appear and gender never intersects with sexual orientation or disability.

While the picture sketched above provides a rough first impression, it is at the same time quite dry and abstract and totally stripped of any 'issue narrative'. It is not sensitive to a number of aspects, for example: while on the basis of table 6 it is concluded that next to gender ethnicity is the most prominent inequality strand, we may well wonder in how many documents this strand actually appears and in how many it is absent. For instance, one of the selected documents for this issue deals specifically with the integration and emancipation of ethnic minority girls and women. If all references to gender-ethnicity intersection are located in this one document, this will affect our impression about the prominence of the ethnicity/race strand in Dutch general gender equality policy. Albeit the fact that this topic is debated in parliament as a separate issue and that a policy plan on the topic was issued– which was not selected for document analysis – already means something in itself. Still, when it also turns out that this topic pops up in other debates as well, this is an extra underlining of the prominence of the gender-ethnicity intersection.

Table 7 below shows how often intersectionality occurs per issue and across how many documents these occurrences are spread (data from diagdimensions and progdimensions were brought together). This table does not show which inequalities intersect. For the issue of general gender equality it appears that all occurrences of intersectionality are spread over half of the total number of analysed documents. When we, with use of the software, look at the two sub-issues it becomes clear that the occurrences are all (except a very few) located in the sub-issue 'general gender equality legislation/policy'. Intersectionality is hardly present in the documents on machinery. This can be explained by the fact that the documents on machinery are of some more technical nature and also (or because of that) by the fact that the emphasis in these documents is on institutions and not on people categories.

	Occurrences / No. of docs		Occurrences / No. of docs **in diagnosis**		Occurrences / No. of docs **in prognosis**		Total no. of analysed documents
GGE	107	8	41	6	66	8	16
NE	116	17	61	14	55	15	26
IC	82	15	41	11	41	14	17
GBV	55	11	22	7	33	11	17
All issues	356	51	162	38	194	48	76

---

[23] More information about actors, such as how often are women and men mentioned alone/together without being intersectionalised, can be found in the Dutch Country Study (deliverable 40).

Table 7: Presence of intersectionality in coded policy documents and debates in the Netherlands, by issue (occurrences/no. of documents taken from 'Dimension of gender and intersectionality sections' of the super texts, with use of the software)

In contrast to table 7, table 8 below IS sensitive for the kind of intersectionality. It appears that in the issue of 'general gender equality policies' gender is found to intersect with ethnicity in all 8 of the documents in which intersectionality occurs. This means that this is not limited only to the most obvious documents (parliamentary debate on emancipation of ethnic minority women and girls), but that it is rather limited to the first sub-issue.

Intersection	GGE No. of docs	NE No. of docs	IC No. of docs	GBV No. of docs	All issues No. of docs
Gender-Ethnicity	8	7	6	8	29
Gender-Religion	1	-	1	1	3
Gender-Class	5	9	3	-	17
Gender-Sexual orientation	-	-	6	1	7
Gender-Age	7	6	4	7	24
Gender-Disability	-	3	1	-	4
Gender-Marital/family status	3	12	11	3	29
Gender-Migrant/citizenship status	1	3	2	5	11
Gender-other inequalities	-	-	-	1	1
Total No. of documents analysed	**16**	**26**	**17**	**17**	**76**

Table 8: The number of documents in which gender intersects with one of the other inequality axes, by issue on the basis of summary question 12
Note: the relevance – minor or major – is not taken along in this table. The relevance was taken along in the column on summary question 12 of table 6.

Table 9 differs from table 7 and 8 because it maps the occurrence and spread across documents of the inequality strands (whether they appear 'alone' or in intersection with another inequality strand). Looking at the issue of general gender equality it appears that next to gender it is ethnicity that is the most 'spread out' inequality, as it appears in 9 out of the 16 documents analysed for this issue. Looking at the occurrences in this table it is clear that ethnicity and gender are the clear 'leaders'. Age appears quite often but far less than either gender or ethnicity. All the other inequalities only occur occasionally. This cannot be read from table 6.

Inequality	GGE Occurrences/ No. of docs		NE Occurrences/ No. of docs		IC Occurrences/ No. of docs		GBV Occurrences/ No. of docs		All issues Occurrences/ No. of docs	
Age	33	**7**	18	**12**	25	**8**	43	**8**	119	**36**
Citizenship status	3	**1**	8	**5**	20	**5**	15	**5**	46	**16**
Class	12	**3**	67	**10**	12	**7**	-	**-**	78	**15**
Disability	-	**-**	11	**4**	2	**1**	-	**-**	13	**5**

Ethnicity/ race	94	**9**	54	**13**	38	**6**	51	**8**	237	**36**
Gender	144	**11**	170	**22**	71	**15**	114	**17**	499	**65**
Marital/family status	8	**4**	68	**14**	34	**13**	6	**3**	116	**34**
Regional	-	**-**	-	**-**	-	**-**	-	**-**	-	**-**
Religion or belief	4	**2**	-	**-**	2	**1**	4	**2**	10	**5**
Sexual orientation	2	**1**	-	**-**	40	**8**	1	**1**	39	**10**
Total no. of documents analysed	**16**		**26**		**17**		**17**		**76**	

Table 9: Inequality strands mentioned in the analysed policy documents, by issue (total number of occurrences/ No. of documents)

Some more nuances can be added when looking at the coded texts in some greater detail. The data on intersectionality that is deduced from summary question 12 does not tell us for example whether gender intersects with more than one other inequality and which ones these are. Are particular combinations of more than 2 axes more common than others? And in which context are particular intersections raised?

Although class is of relevance, it does not have a very marked visibility throughout the GGE issue either (see tables above). This is a bit surprising given the fact that since the mid eighties and all throughout the nineties up until now, labour market and employment topics have taken in a central place in the multi-year emancipation plans. Expectedly, class might then emerge as an important inequality strand that intersects with gender. The most recent of these multi-year plans (the 2007 one that covers the years 2008-2011) has been coded for sub-issue 1 and (expectedly) an important part of this 80-page document is devoted to women's labour market participation, equal pay, women at top position, gendered segregation of labour market, and economic independence of women. The other main topics of the plan are women and girls from ethnic minority groups, and safety/violence against women and girls. When the document pays attention to labour/employment related issues women usually are mentioned as one homogenous group without a distinction being made between groups of women on the basis of class aspects. The plan even mentions that now that women have caught up with men regarding education, this should also be reflected on the labour market. Thus, rather than departing from class differences between the genders – such as different levels of education – that impact on status/activity on labour market, the document claims that while (certain) class differences between the genders are equalized now, the labour participation and position of women on the labour market keeps behind. It is remarkable that totally different statements are made concerning ethnic minority women. The document stresses that they have lower education, no starters' qualifications and so on. This all means that if class appears it usually intersects with gender AND ethnicity. Most of the time, it is ethnicity that seems to be bringing in class, and not gender that brings in class. Class is mentioned once in the chapter on violence, when it is stated that the social-economic dependence of women from men is a cause of the unequal power between the genders and violence against women is a consequence of this power difference. The word 'class' in never used in Dutch policy documents.

With which inequalities does age intersect? In diagnosis, only age appears in the multi-year emancipation plan and is absent in the other 15 documents. In prognosis, age appears in half of the coded documents. Age either intersects with gender only, and when it does, it is mainly in

connection to topics of safety of/violence against women and girls, or it is linked to ethnicity or to ethnicity and gender.

From these analyses of class and age it might seem like ethnicity/race is often linked to gender AND another inequality. Is it also brought up as single inequality axis or as intersecting only with gender? Far more often than being linked to multiple inequalities, ethnicity is only intersecting with gender. If it intersects with gender and another inequality, it is indeed with class or age and sometimes with citizenship status. Ethnicity/race hardly ever occurs in isolation from other inequalities.

With which inequalities does family status intersect and in which context is it brought forward? As class, family/marital status is not very visible (but not absent either). It appears with gender and age when the documents talk about young (studying) mothers and the difficulties they meet, it appears together with gender when self-employed mothers are mentioned, and it appears with ethnicity/race (and sometimes age as well) when ethnic minority women/girls that leave school or the labour market because of marriage are discussed.

The inequality axes religion (and race), disability, sexual orientation, and citizenship status are absent or almost absent. Is the absent to be expected, and what are the possible explanations for the absence? The absence of religion and race is remarkable. While the documents consistently speak about '(women of) ethnic minorities' or 'allochthonous people/women' (the term race is never mentioned). References to Islamic religion and 'Muslims' (as a racial category) are avoided. This is quite striking, because in the media and public debate this happens all too often (in everyday use 'allochthonous' or 'ethnic minorities' are often interpreted in a more narrow sense, namely as referring to Muslims). It might be that the authors of the analysed policy texts do not want to stigmatise Islam/Muslims even more than already is the case in broader society. The documents do, however, sometimes refer to the different 'culture' of ethnic minority groups and link ethnic minority groups to certain 'cultural' practices (like honour violence, female genital mutilation) that are generally seen as related to the Islamic and Muslim culture/religion. If specific countries of origin are mentioned (usually in the form of social categories like 'Turkish women), it concerns usually Morocco and Turkey and hardly ever people from, for example, the Dutch colonies (Antilles, Aruba). This means that religion (and/or race?) sometimes is present, but only hidden or latently. It is remarkable that traditional/fundamentalist practices that take place in certain 'Dutch' religious communities stay totally out of the picture. While there seems to be some (although implicit) attention for Muslim communities and practices, there is no attention to certain Dutch religious communities and practices.

Sexual orientation only pops up in the general equal treatment amendment act that has been analysed, but is totally absent in for example the emancipation policy plan. This might have to do with the fact that 'homo emancipation' policy is a policy dossier that is kept separate from 'gender emancipation' in the Netherlands. In the past sexual orientation and gender fell under the responsibility of different Ministries (gender with the Ministry for Social Affairs and Employment, sexual orientation with the Ministry for Health, Welfare and Sport). However, since a new government was installed in 2007 the two 'dossiers' both were relocated to the same Ministry: The Ministry for Education, Culture and Science. The most recent (gender) emancipation plan stems from this new government. However, although the policy dossiers are now located in the same Ministry, so far we see no integration whatsoever. It seems that sexual orientation and gender are not regarded as intersecting inequalities.

Disability has always been the responsibility of another Ministry than the Ministry that is responsible for gender policy and this might be the primary reason for why disability does not feature in the Dutch general gender equality policies. It is remarkable that disability was not included as a discrimination ground in the General Equal Treatment Act (from 1994). Only in 2003 a separate Act prohibiting discrimination based on disability or chronic illness was adopted, and it transposes certain provisions of directive 2000/78/EC (Employment Equality Directive) into

Dutch law. So it seems that in terms of being a discrimination ground, disability has only recently (driven by the EU?) been 'acknowledged'. This might be one of the possible reasons that thinking about how disability might intersect with gender, has not 'ended up' in the analysed general gender equality policies. However, in the framework of the multi-year emancipation plans the individual ministries are always required to formulate how they will embed gender equality in their policies in the upcoming years (gender mainstreaming). In earlier emancipation plans these proposals per Ministry were usually included/integrated in the multi-year policy plan, but in the most recent gender equality plan 2008-2011 that was analysed this was not the case. The contribution of the individual Ministries were published separately. It is possible that in the contribution by the Ministry for Health, Welfare and Sport (the Ministry that is responsible for disability policies) gender intersects with disability.

Citizenship status is only mentioned in the CEDAW shadow report (civil society text) where it intersects with gender. We are not sure for what reason this intersection is absent from the other documents. It is seen as problematic in this text that non-EU migrants are excluded from legally working in the sex sector. While migrant or ethnic minority women are mentioned multiple times in other documents coded for this issue, the women indicated are legally residing here and it are not aspects related to their citizenship status that are problematised. It is mainly in the documents analysed for the topic of family reunion in the intimate citizenship issue and in documents analysed for the topics domestic violence/FGM/honour violence in the gender based violence issue that citizenship status appears (how can women without independent residence permit be protected?). A few times, citizenship status also emerges in other issues/topics, when aspects related to integration policy are mentioned or when refugee women are mentioned.

Equal treatment law and equality machinery
Dutch Equal Treatment Law consists of several Acts that cover discrimination on different grounds. According to these Acts unequal treatment is unlawful in specific fields – ranging from employment only to employment and goods and services and social security (this can differ per Act and per inequality ground, see Country Context Study for details). Gender is covered by two of these Acts. The *Equal Treatment in Employment (Men and Women) Act* covers gender as inequality ground; the *General Equal Treatment Act* covers the grounds of religion, belief, political conviction, race, sex, nationality, heterosexual or homosexual orientation and civil/marital status. These multiple grounds are treated as separate (not 'and/or' but 'or'), so they do not intersect. The *Equal Treatment (working hours) Act* covers discrimination on the basis of working hours (part-time or full-time work). The *Equal Treatment Temporary and Permanent Employees Act* covers discrimination based on the ground of nature of contract (fixed or flexible/temporary). The *Equal Treatment (Disability or Chronic Illness) Act* covers the inequality ground 'disability', and the *Equal Treatment in Employment (Age Discrimination) Act* covers 'age'. To summarise, the range of inequalities that Dutch equal treatment law covers is: sex/gender, race, nationality, religion/belief, political conviction, sexual orientation, civil status/marital status, working hours, nature of contract, disability or chronic illness, and age. These inequality grounds do not intersect. It is important to note that 'class' or any inequality that is linked to class is not covered by Dutch equal treatment law.

The (autonomous) Equal Treatment Commission (ETC) promotes Dutch equal treatment law and investigates whether the equal treatment law has been violated on any of the grounds that are covered by the above mentioned equal treatment Acts. When the *Equal Treatment in Employment (Men and Women) Act* was introduced in 1980 an Equal Treatment Commission had already been set up, although only covering the ground of gender (in employment). The work area of the Commission has basically extended each time the body of equal treatment law has been extended. When the remits of the Equal Treatment Commission was extended beyond gender in 1994 women's groups initially feared that gender would be overlooked in the new structure. However, more than ten years later it can be concluded that gender has not moved to

the background. Around 50% of the cases investigated by the Commission concern sex discrimination. Among other things, the gender expertise that is present among the staff of ETC has contributed to this.Women find their way well to the ETC.[24]

So, the Netherlands has a monitoring equality body outside the government bureaucracy that is 'integrated' in the sense that it covers multiple grounds next to gender. The ETC investigates cases in which a single discrimination ground features, as well as cases that relate to complaints lodges about multiple discrimination (i.e. discrimination on more than one ground at the same time). However, this does not necessarily mean that the Commission also considers the possible *intersection* of different types of discrimination. In a 2001 article Kambel claims that while people can lodge a complaint based on multiple discrimination grounds, the applicant has to provide evidence for each separate discrimination ground and the ETC will subsequently treat these grounds as separate in her research. As a consequence, the specific dynamic that can be the effect of the co-occurrence of discrimination of different grounds can become invisible.[25] Kambel subsequently investigates some judgements of the ETC related to complaints about discrimination both on the ground of gender and the ground of race. She feels that because of the separate treatment of the grounds, the specific experience of the requestor as black women disappeared from view. Further/new research is however needed to find out whether the ETC's method of working is still the same in the year 2008.[26]

The equality machinery within the government bureaucracy is the Directorate for Emancipation Policy (DE).[27] This civil servant policy unit is responsible for general gender equality policies and gender therefore is its key focus. The DE is also sensitive to (certain) other inequalities that impact upon gender as is shown by the multi-years emancipation policy plans that the DE prepares (so in fact, their focus is on gender+). Since the instalment of the new government in 2007 when homosexual emancipation policy and gender emancipation policy were both moved to the same Ministry (Ministry for Education, Culture and Science), the DE has also become responsible for sexual orientation policy, called 'homo emancipation policy'. However, and as argued before, there yet is no sign of an integration of these two policy dossiers. They are really separate. Contrary to other countries like Belgium, there exists no such thing as a 'diversity policy unit' within the government that covers the multiple grounds together in one diversity policy (plan). While sexual orientation and gender+ fall under the DE, it is not very clear where exactly within the government bureaucracy lays the responsibility for emancipation on other grounds of inequality. This must be scattered across different Ministries. During the last two decades before 2007 the DE has always been located in the Ministry for Social Affairs and Employment and its Minister (or state secretary) has been responsible for gender equality policy. Labour and employment issues (women's labour participation, women's economic independence and lately the balance between labour and care) have always had an important place in Dutch gender equality policies. Breaking with the 'traditions', the latest multi-year emancipation plan thus has been written under auspices of the Minister for Education, Culture and Science. Still, the officials of the DE moved from the one Ministry to the other, so in that sense this means continuity. This seems to show in the multi-year plan, where the labour and employment chapter is still the most extensive chapter. Only time will tell whether the change of institutional location will – in the longer run – also change the contents of gender equality policy.

---

[24] Outshoorn, Joyce and Jantine Oldersma, 'Dutch Decay: the Dismantling of the Women's Policy Network in the Netherlands', in Outshoorn, Joyce and Johanna Kantola. 2007. *Changing State Feminism*. Houndmills/Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

[25] Kambel, Ellen-Rose. 2001. Op het kruispunt van sekse en etniciteit, ZMV-vrouwen in het Nederlandse werkverkeer. [On the intersection of gender and ethnicity. Black, migrant and refugee women on the Dutch labour market]. Nemesis 17: 103-106.

[26] Saskia Martens (who researches Belgium and Luxembourg within QUING) and Sophie Lauwers are planning to write a journal article on, among other things, this matter. We will compare the working methods of the Belgian and Dutch equal treatment bodies while proceeding from an 'intersectional approach'.

[27] It was only a short time ago that the Directorate's name was changed from 'Directorate for the Coordination of Emancipation Policy (DCE)' into its current name: 'Directorate for Emancipation Policy (DE)'.

Multi-year emancipation plans

The general aim of emancipation policy as is found in the multi-year emancipation policy plans (gender emancipation is the main focus of the plans) since 1985 and/or on the website of the DE has in essence stayed the same until today. The aim of emancipation policy as it is currently cited on the official government website on emancipation reads as follows: *"create the necessary conditions needed to reach a pluriform society in which individuals regardless of sex, and in interaction with other societal order principles (like ethnicity, age, marital/family status, and sexual orientation), can achieve an independent existence and in which women and men can realise equal rights, opportunities, liberties and (social) responsibilities."*[28] The addition "and in interaction with […] sexual orientation)" has not always been included in the aim in this way. For example, in the second emancipation plan of 1985 (first one was in 1976) the aim goes like: "promote a pluriform society in which individuals regardless of sex or marital status can achieve an independent existence and in which women and men can realise equal rights, opportunities, liberties and (social) responsibilities."[29] So over time more inequality strands have been added and the *interaction* of gender with other inequality strands is stressed. Still, this does not necessarily mean that awareness within the 'gender equality policy-making circles' regarding the fact that gender interacts with other societal organising principles has indeed increased in more recent years or that all inequalities mentioned in the current aim are indeed seen as impacting on gender equality in the multi-year policy plans. Examining the most recent emancipation plans – the ones that were published during the QUING research period – on their treatment (or non-treatment) of intersectionality, might give us some insight into which inequalities, out of all the possible societal inequalities that the general aim of the Dutch emancipation policy intends to cover, are indeed regarded as having an impact on gender equality.

In the <u>emancipation multi-year policy plan of 1995</u>[30] inequalities that are considered to have an impact on gender equality are predominantly class (feminisation of poverty and women with lack/low educational qualifications and lone parents receiving social assistance) and following class, ethnicity (sometimes in combination with class). Age and family status (lone parents) are mentioned as having an impact, but less explicit and less often. <u>In the emancipation multi-year policy plan of 2001-2010</u>[31] the inequalities that are most often mentioned as having an impact on gender equality again are class and ethnicity. Age, family status and disability are mentioned as having an impact as well, but less often. <u>An evaluation and update document was published for the years 2006-2010</u>.[32] The government sticks with the objectives that were included in the 2001-2010 report but adds the social participation objective: preventing social exclusion of women in vulnerable and underprivileged positions. Therefore the impact of class on gender is somewhat more stressed in this plan than was the case in the previous one. Moreover, the impact of ethnicity on gender equality pops up in most of the objectives and sub-objectives of the plan (and some sub-objectives are specifically about women from ethnic minorities). Presence of ethnicity is stronger in this report than in previous ones. The new objective on social participation for an important part focuses on ethnic minority women. Next to class and ethnicity, age and family status are sometimes mentioned. Disability and sexual orientation are mentioned, but are almost

---

[28] Objective of emancipation policy as can be found on the official government website on emancipation: http://www.emancipatieweb.nl/emancipatie_algemeen#1932 accessed on 19 June 2008.
[29] Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment. Parliamentary year 1984-1985. Emancipation Policy plan. Document 19052, no 1-2, 89 pages.
[30] Ministry for Social Affairs and Employment. Parliamentary year 1995-1996. Emancipation Policy memorandum. Document 24406, no. 5, 23 pages.
[31] Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment. November 2000. Multi-year policy plan Emancipation. The emancipation policy for the short and middle term. 119 pages.
[32] Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment. 2006. Dutch Multi-Year Emancipation Policy Plan 2006-2010 Emancipation: Self-evident but not yet self-supporting!. 92 pages. http://www.emancipatieweb.nl/uploads/-p/SD/-pSDwNmB9nlCidsdxsKJuA/evaluatie_meerjaren_emancipatie_engels.pdf

absent. <u>The emancipation multi-year policy plan of 2007 (intends to cover period 2008-2011)</u>[33] was selected for document analysis. Ethnicity and age are considered to have an impact on gender equality (with strongest accent on ethnicity). Class and family/marital status is mentioned as having impact as well, but less prominently (stronger accent on class, class mostly in combination with ethnicity).

All in all, we can on the basis of this comparison of Dutch emancipation policy plans, conclude that almost a similar range of inequalities appears in every emancipation plan (although the strength of each inequality can vary a bit from plan to plan). Ethnicity and class are the main inequalities mentioned as having an impact on gender equality. In later years, the attention paid to ethnicity seems to 'overrule' class a bit. Class also appears often in combination with ethnicity. Some inequalities that are less important, but always named are age and family status. Other inequalities are only named as an exception.

4.1.2 Non-employment

Document coding
Table 6 (see table in section 4.1.1) shows that gender with family status and gender with class are the most visible intersections in the analysed documents. Gender intersecting with ethnicity and gender intersecting with age are some less visible. Gender intersecting with disability and gender intersecting with citizenship status are the least visible intersections. Other intersections with gender are absent. The most prominent inequalities are gender, followed by class, family status and ethnicity. A look at the intersecting actors in table 6, reveals that none of the responsible actors (that are people) are intersectionalised actors. In comparison with the issue of 'general gender equality' intersectionalised active and passive actors and target groups are less common in non-employment. For all three types of actors, it holds that – if intersectionalised – gender intersects most often with ethnicity or with family/marital status.[34] <u>Overall, class, ethnicity and family status stand out the most as inequality strands (after gender) and as intersecting with gender in the document analysis for the non-employment issue.</u> What table 6, however, does not show is in how many of the analysed documents (out of the total number of analysed documents) these inequality strands actually appear. Are they spread or are they centred in only a few documents? Our assumption namely is that the importance/prominence of an inequality strand or intersection of gender with another inequality strand increases when it appears in a larger proportion of the analysed documents.

Table 7 (see table in section 4.1.1) shows how often intersectionality occurs per issue and across how many documents these occurrences are spread (data from diagdimensions and progdimensions were brought together to create this table). The table does not show which inequalities intersect. For the issue of non-employment the table shows that intersectionality is present in 17 out of the total number of 26 analysed documents. This number was lower in the general gender equality issue (see 4.1.1). On a sub-issue level, *absence* of intersectionality from documents is highest in sub-issue 2 'care-work' and lowest in sub-issue 1 'tax-benefit policies'. This might well be related to the topics on which texts were selected (childcare for care-work and social security for lone parents & action plan on women and occupational disability pension for tax-benefit policies). The topic of 'equal pay' hardly mentions gender as intersecting with other

---

[33] Multi-year emancipation policy plan 2008-2011. September 2007. More opportunities for women: emancipation policy 2008-2011 [Meer kansen voor vrouwen: emancipatiebeleid 2008-2011]. Document no. 30420 – 50. 83 pages
http://www.minocw.nl/documenten/emancipatienota_def_versie.pdf
[34] More information about actors, such as how often are women and men mentioned alone/together without being intersectionalised, can be found in the Dutch country study (deliverable 40).

inequality axes either. The sub-issue of 'reconciliation policies' and the topic of 'ethnic minority women on the labour market' take in a middle position.

In contrast to table 7, table 8 (see table in section 4.1.1) is sensitive for the kind of intersectionality; it shows the number of documents in which gender intersects with each of the other inequalities (based on summary code 12). It appears that in the issue of non-employment the intersection of gender with marital status is the most spread even though this intersection does (only) appear in less than half of the analysed documents. A gender-class intersection is found in one third of the documents and a gender-ethnicity intersection in a quarter of the documents (which is clearly lower than was the case for GGE where this intersection was found in half of the documents).

Table 9 (see table in section 4.1.1) differs from table 7 and 8 because it maps the occurrence and spread across the analysed documents of the 'individual' inequality strands (whether they appear 'alone' or in intersection with another inequality strand). It shows that in the issue of non-employment gender appears in almost all of the analysed documents. Marital status, ethnicity, age and class are spread across half (ethnicity) or in just over half (marital status) or just under half (age and class) of the analysed documents.

Referring back to the literature review: do the document analysis data for this issue support our impression of the existence of a gender-ethnicity 'intersectional bias' in Dutch gender equality policies? The prominence of ethnicity and intersections of gender with ethnicity are not as strong as in the issue of 'general gender equality'. Family status is more prominent, so is class (but only slightly). Still, ethnicity is one of the more prominent inequality strands in the documents that were analysed for non-employment.

It is remarkable that for the issue of non-employment exactly the same inequality axes – namely religion, disability, sexual orientation, and citizenship status – are absent or almost absent as in the issues of 'general gender equality policies'. These absences have already been shortly discussed in section 4.1.1 and the possible explanations provided there seem to apply for the non-employment issue as well.

Intersectionality and employment rates (statistics)
Below, three types of 'monitoring' reports – Yearbook Emancipation, Emancipation Monitor and Social Atlas on Women from Ethnic Minorities – which have been published in the Netherlands throughout the QUING research period, which focus on the status of certain groups of women and/or developments in the Dutch emancipation process, and which include statistics on this are briefly discussed. Is there a focus on different employment rates between men and women and is there a focus on different employment rates among women and men by ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, family status, age and so on? If so, how are these differences framed?

So-called 'Yearbooks on Emancipation' were published in 1997, 1998 and 1999. These reports preceded the 'Emancipation Monitor' reports, written every two years from 2000 onwards. The yearbooks on emancipation were written by the Department for the Coordination of Emancipation Policy (DCE) and Statistics Netherlands (an organisation that collects and processes data to be used by policymakers and for scientific research) and focus on giving an overview of emancipation processes in Dutch society. A lot of gender segregated statistics are present in the yearbooks. Regarding employment rates there is a main focus on gender, on gender and ethnicity, and on ethnicity and class. Also mentioned are: gender- age, gender-family/marital status, gender-class, and gender-class-family status. There is no explanation given why

employment rates differ for the different categories of people mentioned, therefore it is not clear how this is framed.

The Emancipation Monitors are written by the Netherlands Institute for Social Research and Statistics Netherlands [CBS] and by the Social and Cultural Planning Office [SCP]. The Monitors are meant to provide an overview of emancipation processes in Dutch society. A wealth of gender segregated statistics is present in the Monitors. In the Emancipation Monitors several inequalities are mentioned together with gender regarding employment rates; gender-age-ethnicity, gender-age, gender-class (educational level), gender-family/marital status, and gender-class-family/marital status. When speaking about women with children and their employment rate, it is about their choice to work or not (framed as choice and not as discrimination). No further explanation is given when the document speaks about the employment rates of other intersectional groups.

In 2006, a so-called 'Social Atlas on women from ethnic minorities'[35] was written by the Social and Cultural Planning Office [SCP]. The Atlas aims to provide a broad and in-depth overview of the societal position and participation of ethnic minority women in the Netherlands. The social atlas was commissioned by the Minister for Social Affairs and Employment (at that time also responsible for gender equality policy). There is a focus on employment rates amongst women (and men) by minority ethnic group. Nine different ethnic minority groups (the most important are Turkish, Moroccan, Surinam, and Antillean women) are mentioned and compared with autochthonous women ('native' Dutch women). Within the group of allochthonous and autochthonous women there is also made a division by age, family status, citizenship status (first and second generation migrants and marriage migrants), and class (educational level). In the document it is described that the government wants to increase the labour opportunities of minority women. Good 'equipment' (education) and good 'accessibility' to the labour market are of special interest. The lack of equipment is being used as one explanation for the lower employment rate of ethnic minority women. Other explanations for the lower employment rates are discrimination and the existing ideas on family roles (which leaves migrant women with the care for the children).

The above mentioned documents show that in the Netherlands a focus on the employment rates of quite a range of intersectional categories of women can be found. In the monitoring reports that were described above, gender and ethnicity are always amongst the intersectional categories mentioned. Therefore, this combination can be seen as receiving the most attention. Other inequalities that are mentioned are gender combined with age, class, citizenship status and family/marital status. Furthermore, gender combined with not one but multiple other inequality axes can be found. The difference in employment rate is framed foremost as a choice frame (based on ideas on combining labour and care) and to a lesser extent as a discrimination frame.

The documents referred to above specifically focus on women or on emancipation processes. Are 'general' (employment rate) statistics also segregated by gender and do they focus on specific groups of women? In for instance a general document of the SCP (Social and Cultural Planning Office) on the social condition of the Netherlands[36], there is no focus on specific gendered groups. Women, ethnic minorities, elderly people, young people and low educated people are all mentioned separately from each other. The other Dutch organszation that collects and publishes statistics, the CBS (Statistics Netherlands)[37], however, does offer the possibility to generate

---

[35] http://www.scp.nl/publicaties/boeken/9037702694/Sociale_atlas_van_vrouwen_uit_etnische_minderheden.pdf
[36] http://www.scp.nl/publicaties/boeken/9789037703214/De_sociale_staat_van_Nederland_2007.pdf
[37] http://www.cbs.nl/nl-NL/default.htm

statistics on groups of different categories, whereby numbers are available on every combination of the categories gender, age, ethnicity and educational level.

4.1.3 Intimate citizenship
Gender and family status is the most visible intersection (Table 6, section 4.1.1). Second, gender intersecting with sexual orientation, and then with ethnicity, and then with age is most relevant. Other intersections with gender are absent (class) or nearly absent (citizenship status, religion, and disability). The inequality axes that are most prominent (see the third column of table 6) vary a bit between diagnosis and prognosis and also show some different accents when compared to the aforementioned intersections with gender. Gender is the most prominent axis in both diagnosis and prognosis. In diagnosis ethnicity is more prominent than family status. Sexual orientation is less prominent than ethnicity, but more relevant than family status. Age and family status are equally present. In prognosis, family status and sexual orientation follow gender and are equally relevant. Here, ethnicity/race and age are less prominent. Recapitulating, while the same inequalities pop up as the 'more relevant' ones that also popped up when looking at the gender intersections, their order is different with ethnicity being somewhat more important and family status somewhat less. This is most probably a consequence of the fact that in the intimate citizenship issue gender is somewhat more hidden and inequality axes more often appear 'alone' or in intersection with other inequalities than gender.

The last column of table 6 on intersecting actors makes clear that – as was the case for the issue of GGE and NE as well – hardly any of the responsible actors are intersectionalised. On the contrary, a majority of the active and (especially) passive actors that are people are intersectionalised. Half of the target groups that are people are intersectionalised. Compared to the other three issues, this is the issue in which – relatively seen – most actors are constructed in an intersectional way. At the same time, it is the only issue in which the specific intersectional actors categories that occur most often do not always include gender. In the active actors and in the target groups some categories have ethnicity as 'key' inequality instead of gender.[38] Overall, family status, sexual orientation, and ethnicity stand out most as inequality strands (after gender) and as intersecting with gender in the document analysis for the intimate citizenship issue. What table 6, however, does not show is in how many of the analysed documents (out of the total number of analysed documents) these inequality strands actually appear? Are they spread or are they centred in only a few documents? Our assumption is that the importance/prominence of an inequality strand or intersection of gender with another inequality strand increases when it appears in a larger proportion of the analysed documents.

Table 7 (see section 4.1.1) shows how often intersectionality occurs per issue and across how many documents these occurrences are spread (data from diagdimensions and progdimensions were brought together). This table does not show which inequalities intersect. For the issue of intimate citizenship it shows that intersectionality (not necessarily with gender) is present in 15 out of the 17 analysed documents, which means in almost all documents (although occurrences can greatly differ per document). On a sub-issue level, there is not one sub-issue that can be appointed as the most intersectional sub-issue. There is no apparent clear pattern..

In contrast to table 7, table 8 (see table in section 4.1.1) is sensitive to the kind of intersectionality; it shows the number of documents in which gender intersects with each of the other inequalities (based on summary code 12). It appears that in the issue of intimate citizenship the intersection of gender with family status is the most spread intersection of all, being present in

---

[38] More information about actors, such as how often are women and men mentioned alone/together without being intersectionalised, can be found in the Dutch country study (deliverable 40).

two thirds of the analysed documents. Gender intersecting with sexual orientation or with ethnicity comes next, being present in one third of all documents. The gender-family status intersections occurs in all three sub-issues, while the gender-ethnicity intersection only occurs in the sub-issue 'marriage, divorce and separation' and the gender-sexual orientation intersection only occurs in the remaining two sub-issues. This is not very surprising, given the topics and texts that were analysed. It might however be interesting to know whether ethnicity does intersect with sexual orientation. It is only in the text from the main LGTB civil society organisation (COC) that was selected for sub-issue 2 (sexual orientation discrimination and partnering) that sexual orientation and ethnicity are linked to each other, mainly by stating that ethnic minority individuals/communities have a more negative and intolerant stance towards homosexuality, which causes problems for GLTB individuals from ethnic minorities.

Table 9 (see table in section 4.1.1) differs from table 7 and 8 because it maps the occurrence and spread of the inequality strands across documents (whether they appear 'alone' or in intersection with another inequality strand). It shows that in the issue of intimate citizenship gender and marital status appear in almost all analysed documents. Sexual orientation and age and class are present in almost half of the analysed documents. Ethnicity and citizenship status are spread across roughly (some more and some less) one third of the coded documents.

Referring back to the literature review: do the document analysis data for this issue underline our impression of the existence of a gender-ethnicity 'intersectional bias' in Dutch gender equality policies? The prominence of ethnicity and intersections of gender with ethnicity is surely not as strong (in this particular selection of documents) as was the case for the issue of 'general gender equality policies'. Family status clearly is more prominent and age and sexual orientation seem equally important as ethnicity. Still, ethnicity comes to the fore as one of the more prominent inequality strands in the documents that were analysed for intimate citizenship.

When we focus on <u>absence</u>, it is clear that there is more diversity of inequalities and intersections in intimate citizenship than was the case for the issues of GGE and NE. In case of both GGE and NE four inequality strands were (nearly) absent (disability, religion, sexual orientation and citizenship status), while in case of intimate citizenship there are two (nearly) absent ones, namely <u>disability and religion</u>. Class and citizenship status do have quite a low visibility, especially when looking at intersections with gender (table 8). Generally (as single equality strand or as intersecting with inequalities other then gender) their visibility is however clearly higher than either disability or religion. Could explanations be given for this absence and is this absence to be expected? Disability and religion are only mentioned once in the civil society text by the main LGBT organisation (COC). The absence of disability and religion was discussed in section 4.1.1 and the possible explanations provided there also seem to apply for the intimate citizenship issue. Class is mentioned once by the same COC civil society text and it is mentioned in texts about marital property regime and family income. But in all cases these references to class are quite indirect (low education or non-earning spouse). It is quite expectable that class would not be a central issue in most of the texts that were selected for this issue, but for the texts on marital property regime and family reunion. Citizenship status is only found in the texts on family reunion, which is not surprising either.

4.1.4 Gender based violence
Table 6 (see table in section 4.1.1) shows that in the analysed documents ethnicity and age most visibly intersect with gender. Less visible are gender intersecting with citizenship status or with family status. Other intersections with gender are absent (class and disability) or not very visible (religion and sexual orientation). The inequality axes that are most prominent (see the third

column of table 8) seem quite coherent with the gender intersections mentioned above, except that family status is more prominent when intersections with gender are concerned, but less so when inequality axes or intersectional actors are concerned: gender is the most important axis, ethnicity second and then age and citizenship status. Absent or negligible are class, disability, sexual orientation and religion.

The last column of table 6 on intersecting actors shows that – as was the case for the other three issues – hardly any of the responsible actors that are people are constructed in an intersectional way. In contrast to the other issues, (people) active actors are hardly intersectionalised (perpetrator is most common). Although ethnic minority communities or groups (like allochthonous youth) are sometimes mentioned as active actors, the texts do not get more specific than that and they do not indicate whether gender is involved. They are vague about whether ethnic minority *men* are the active actors. Half of the passive actors (that are people) and a minority of the target groups (that are people) are intersectionalised. They mostly concern aged gendered/de-gendered groups (young women/girls or young victims/persons). Intersectionalised actors most often concern 'gender' (intersecting with 'age' in case of girls) intersecting with 'ethnicity/race' OR 'gender' (intersecting with 'age' in case of girls) intersecting with 'citizenship status' OR 'gender' intersecting only with 'age' ('girls'). The intersection of gender with ethnicity/race or citizenship status does not appear in the sub-issue of sexual harassment at all, it is marginally present in the sub-issue of domestic violence (only in policy report), and clearly present in the FGM and honour violence sub-issue. Gender intersecting with age is also absent in the sub-issue of sexual harassment, while it is present in all texts on honour violence and FGM (except for one) and in the government report on domestic violence. Gender intersecting with marital status/family status is absent in the sub-issues on FGM and honour violence and present in the sub-issues of sexual harassment and domestic violence (but not very prominently). Overall, ethnicity and age stand out the most as inequality strands (after gender) and as intersecting with gender in the document analysis for the gender based violence issue. The same recapitulating statement was made earlier for the issue of general gender equality policies.

What table 6, however, does not show is in how many of the analysed documents (out of the total number of analysed documents) these inequality strands actually appear? Are they spread out in all documents or are they centred in only a few documents? Our assumption is that the importance/prominence of an inequality strand or intersection of gender with another inequality strand increases when it appears in a larger proportion of the analysed documents.

Table 7 (see table in section 4.1.1) shows how often intersectionality occurs per issue and across how many documents these occurrences are spread (data from diagdimensions and progdimensions were brought together). This table does not indicate which inequalities intersect. For the issue of gender based violence it shows that intersectionality (not necessarily with gender) is present in 11 out of 17 analysed documents. On a sub-issue level it can be concluded that the third sub-issue 'Forced marriage, female genital mutilation, 'honour' crimes and trafficking for sexual exploitation' is the most intersectionalised sub-issue. Most references (occurrences) to intersectionality are located in this sub-issue and they are spread across all the texts that were analysed for this sub-issue. This is however not very surprising given the topic. The sub-issue of sexual assault is the least intersectional while domestic violence takes in a middle position.

In contrast to table 7, table 8 (see table in section 4.1.1) is sensitive to the kind of intersectionality; it shows the number of documents in which gender intersect with each of the other inequalities. The table indicates that the two main intersections (gender with ethnicity and gender with age) are at the same time also the most spread out ones. These intersections are present in roughly half of the documents. Gender intersecting with marital status or with family status is spread across a bit less than one third of the documents. Other intersections only appear in one document or in none.

Table 9 differs from table 7 and 8 because it maps the occurrence and the spread across documents of the inequality strands (whether they appear 'alone' or in intersection with another inequality strand). It shows almost the same picture as table 8; after gender, ethnicity and age show the most spread.

Referring back to the literature review: do the document analysis data for this issue support our impression of the existence of a gender-ethnicity 'intersectional bias' in Dutch gender equality policies? Yes, the data does confirm this. While the bias was some less apparent in the issues of NE and IC, it seems almost as strongly present in the issue of gender based violence as was the case for the first issue of general gender equality. One difference is that while ethnicity was 'alone at the top' in the issue of GGE, in the gender based violence issue age is equally 'strong'.

<u>Inequality axes that are absent or nearly absent are class, disability, sexual orientation and religion.</u> So, in comparison to the issues of GGE and NE, citizenship status and class have swapped places. Could explanations be given for this absence and is this absence expected? The absence of disability, religion and sexual orientation was discussed in section 4.1.1 and the possible explanations provided there also seem to apply for the issue of gender based violence. That class is absent in the issue of GBV might be related to the de-gendering (especially of the domestic violence and sexual harassment sub-issues) and along with that, the unlinking of the gender based violence documents from the notion of structural gender inequality in broader society (all sub-issues). The strange thing is that in the most recent multi-year emancipation plan class is mentioned in the chapter on violence against women, when it is stated that the social-economic dependence of women on men is a cause of the unequal power between the genders and that violence against women in turn is a consequence of this power difference. So in this generic gender equality plan the issue is gendered AND linked to structural (power) inequalities between men and women in society, while in documents that are specifically dedicated to violence issues, this is not the case.

4.1.5 The different types of documents and presence of intersectionality

It might be that there is a tendency for intersectionality to be more prominently present in particular types of documents (law, or policy plan, or parliamentary debate, or civil society text). Table 10 below indicates the presence of intersectionality by type of document. It provides a very rough first impression only, as it is not issue specific and it includes every document in which intersectionality occurs at least once.

	Intersectionality in no. of docs	Intersectionality in no. of docs **in diagnosis**	Intersectionality in no. of docs **in prognosis**	Total no. of analysed documents
Laws	5	1	5	9
Policy plans	14	10	12	16
Parliamentary debates	25	21	24	40
Civil society texts	7	6	7	11
All texts	51	38	48	76

Table 10: Presence of intersectionality in Dutch coded documents, by type of text

We have refined this by generating an excel sheet that lists all the analysed documents and the answers to the summary question 12 which maps intersectionality of gender with other inequalities on a document level. Subsequently, we ordered this list on 'type of document' and searched for remarkable patterns. We have searched per issue and for all issues together (and within that tried to be sensitive to the specific intersections that receive attention).

For *all issues taken together* it can be observed that gender intersecting with other axes of inequality seems least present in parliamentary debate voices and especially in laws. Intersections are most present in policy plans and in civil society texts (almost equally). It is striking that for both these types of texts - policy plans and civil society texts - the intersections that are (almost) absent are gender with religion, gender with sexual orientation, and gender with disability. Intersections that are visible (but to a varying extent) are gender with ethnicity, gender with class, gender with age, gender with family status, and gender with citizenship status. Gender intersecting with ethnicity and gender intersecting with family status are the most visible intersections in both types of texts. Class is less prominent but equally present in both types of texts. The types differ a bit when it concerns the remaining intersections. Gender intersecting with age is more present in policy plans than in civil society texts, while gender intersecting with citizenship status is more present in civil society texts than in policy plans.

In the issue of *General gender equality* policies gender intersecting with ethnicity is present in all voices of the parliamentary debates, except for the ones that were coded for the machinery sub-issue (this is not very amazing actually, since the Netherlands does not have an integrated government equality body) and in two out of the three government reports that were analysed for this issue. This intersection is however absent in law documents, while it is present in one out of the two civil society texts. It is in a civil society text (CEDAW shadow report) that the highest diversity of intersections addressed is found (only gender intersecting with sexual orientation and gender intersecting with disability is absent). This diversity is also quite high in the multi-year emancipation plan 2008-2011 from government. The diversity is lower for other documents (in any case for laws and parliamentary debates).

In the issue of *non-employment* intersections of gender with other inequalities axes appear more often in government reports and civil society texts than in parliamentary debates or laws. For the issue of *intimate citizenship* no clear general patterns can be observed. Citizenship status as an inequality axis only occurs in laws and civil society texts. Overall, there is no great difference in the diversity of different inequality axes (intersecting with gender) between the different types of documents.

Finally, in the issue of *gender based violence* intersectionality of gender with other axes of inequality is absent altogether in the law texts. Furthermore, intersectionality of gender with age is absent in civil society texts but present in some of the parliamentary debates and in most of the governmental policy reports. Class and disability are absent in each of the different document types.

In general (all issues together), a wider range of intersections is present in governmental policy reports as compared to civil society texts and parliamentary debates, but in law texts intersectionality is completely absent.

4.1.6 Summary and comparison
The tables included in this section, which contain data segregated by issue as well as merged data covering all issues, provide a nice comparison between issues and an overview across all issues. Based on these tables and on the issue specific descriptions above, the following can be concluded: Gender is the most prominent inequality for all four issues. This is not too surprising

knowing that we have analysed a representative selection of texts for each of the four issues that all somehow might be labelled 'gender (+) equality policies'. Following gender it is ethnicity/race that – *overall* – is the most prominent inequality axis, with family status and age also being prominent, and class being some less prominent. At any rate, this is the picture for the issues of GGE and GBV. In NE class and family status/marital status are some more relevant than ethnicity. In IC family status/marital status and sexual orientation are more prominent. But even in the two latter mentioned issues (NE and IC) the ethnicity strand is definitely among the more visible ones. Quite a similar pattern emerges regarding the *intersections* of gender with other inequalities and when looking at the *intersectionalised actors*.

The general picture that thus emerges is: the inequality strands that stand out the most (after gender) and that intersect most often with gender are ethnicity, family status, age, and class. Their relevance varies, however, across the different issues: while ethnicity is particularly visible in all four issues, age is particularly visible in GGE and GBV, family status is particularly visible in NE and IC. Class is particularly visible in NE and takes a middle position in the general picture (see table 6 'all issues'). It is remarkable that class is never mentioned as such in Dutch policy documents. Class is usually expressed by referring to things like low educational qualifications, economic dependence, people receiving social assistance and lack of social/economic inclusion. The word 'poverty' is hardly used.

The gender-ethnicity intersection and the gender-marital status intersection are – overall – the most 'spread out' intersections, appearing in almost half of the analysed documents (see table 8). The spread of the gender-ethnicity intersection, however, seems more equally across the issues (only non-employment relatively lower presence), while the gender-family status intersection is highly present in IC and NE and much less spread in the issues of GBV and GGE. That the gender-ethnicity intersection pops up in quite a number of analysed documents for each of the four issues can be regarded as an additional underlining of its prominence in Dutch gender+ equality policies.

Inequality axes that are practically absent in all issues are religion and disability. It seems that explicit reference to (Islam) religion is avoided while latently it is actually present. At the very least, it is a 'charged' issue. The lack of attention for disability is most probably due to institutional separation combined with the fact that 'disability' as a discrimination ground was only recently included in the Dutch body of equal treatment law. In general, sexual orientation (especially) and citizenship status (some less) are not very visible either. There are variations per issue though. Sexual orientation is nearly absent in all issues, except for IC. Class is nearly absent in GBV. Citizenship status is never absent, but in most issues – except for GBV – it is not very prominent either.

On the basis of a comparison of the Dutch multi-year emancipation policy plans that were published during the QUING research period (1995-2008), it can be concluded that an almost similar range of inequalities appears in every consecutive emancipation plan (although the strength of each inequality can vary a bit from plan to plan). This roughly seems to be in line with what has just been concluded on the basis of the document analysis for all four issues as well. Ethnicity and class are the main inequalities mentioned as having an impact on gender equality in the emancipation plans. Some less important, but always relevant, are age and family status. While attention to ethnicity was always there, especially in later years this attention seems to 'overrule' class.

The range of inequalities that Dutch equal treatment law covers is sex/gender, race, nationality, religion/belief, political conviction, sexual orientation, civil status/marital status, working hours, nature of contract, disability or chronic illness, and age. These inequality grounds do not intersect; they are treated as 'separate' in this law. It is important to note that 'class' or any inequality that is linked to class is not covered by Dutch equal treatment law. The Dutch monitoring equality body (Equal Treatment Commission ETC) outside the government bureaucracy is 'integrated' in the sense that it covers all the grounds that are covered in the equal

treatment law. There are signs that ETC – just like the laws – treats these grounds as separate from each other not being sensitive for intersectional discrimination. The equality machinery within the government bureaucracy is the Directorate for Emancipation Policy (DE). This civil servants policy unit has traditionally always been responsible for general gender equality policies and gender+ therefore is its key focus. But since very recently (2007) sexual orientation (homo emancipation policy) is also located within the DE. The two policy dossiers so far are treated separately.

Gender intersecting with other inequality strands seems the least present in the voices of parliamentary debate and especially in laws. Intersections are most present in policy plans and in civil society texts (almost equally).

Can something be concluded as to the extent to which Dutch gender+ equality policies show sensitivity to a large diversity of inequalities/intersections? It is quite difficult to say something about this when there is no 'standard' to compare with. Since we are also responsible for the Malta QUING reports, we can at least compare Malta with the Netherlands. In the Netherlands we can observe that while in each issue there are always a few inequality axes – next to gender – that are hardly present or that hardly intersect with gender, at least half or more of the inequality axes that have been researched within QUING are clearly visible. In Malta this picture is really different: Most of the inequalities are absent or hardly visible. So, the diversity of the inequalities that receive attention in Dutch gender+ equality policies is clearly higher than is the case for Malta.

4.2 The naming, framing and practice of intersectionality

Section 4.1 provides us with the necessary information about the inequalities and intersections that appear (most prominently) in Dutch gender+ equality policies, machinery and civil society. However, it does not clarify much about *the way intersectionality is done.* Are the intersections referred to in section 4.1 mere references to intersectional actor categories or do documents also articulate how the inequality axes interact or relate to each other*?* The aim of this section is to get to know more about this. In section 4.2.1 it is analysed which terms are used to indicate intersectionality or intersecting axes. In section 4.2.2 we try to analyse how intersectionality is framed, i.e. which versions/approaches towards it are discernible in the analysed documents? Following on from this, in section 4.2.3 we try to answer whether intersectionality is important to Dutch gender+ equality policies and policy making or not. This section is not structured issue-wise. The reason for this is that the main patterns described below concerning the naming and framing of intersectionality seem to apply, though roughly, to all issues (although with some slight differences). When no reference is made to specific issues this means that there are no marked differences between the issues. A clearer difference is made between the different types of text and especially between governmental documents on the one hand (laws, policy plans and parliamentary debates) and civil society documents on the other hand, since we are interested whether or not there are large differences between these two 'spheres'.

4.2.1 Naming of intersectionality

In <u>law texts</u> intersectionality appears the least and if it does, it merely takes the form of mentioning groups at the point of intersection. This is not so surprising, since (Dutch) law texts usually hardly contain any reasoning and most of the time they are formulated as 'neutral' as possible (even trying to avoid mentioning actor groups at all). As the analysed <u>parliamentary debates and especially the analysed policy plans, and the multi-year emancipation policy plans</u> allow for more elaborate reasoning – the average policy plan in the Netherlands covers quite a

number of pages[39] – it is expected that intersectionality potentially might manifest itself differently (qua naming and qua framing) in these document types. However, a quick analysis of the naming of intersectionality in these documents reveals once more that the range of terms that suggest the presence of intersectionality is rather limited. Again, intersectionality is predominantly indicated by referring to intersectional actor categories. More explicit terms like 'multiple disadvantage' or 'additive disadvantage' or 'mutually constitutive' or 'intersecting inequalities' or 'multiple discrimination' or 'intersectional discrimination' are practically absent. Some exceptions are found though, like the use of 'double prejudice' (ethnic minority women are faced with double prejudice on labour market') in a parliamentary debate.

The term 'intersectionality' itself or its Dutch counterpart 'crossroad thinking' (kruispuntdenken) that is frequently used in scholarly texts (see literature review) and sometimes in civil society texts (especially by E-quality)[40] as well, is never used either in the multi-year emancipation policy plans or in the government related texts (be it laws, policy plans or parliamentary debates) that were analysed within QUING.

A term that at times is used, especially in the multi-year emancipation policy plans, and that might also suggest intersectionality is 'diversity'. In every multi-year emancipation policy plan that was published during the QUING research period – except for the 1995 one – the term 'diversity' can be found several times. The term is used in different ways though. One way in which it is used is to argue that other inequalities like ethnicity, age and class impact on the opportunities that certain groups of women have (most notably in emancipation policy plan 2001-2010). Another way is to use the term to denote 'gender diversity', i.e. that a more equal representation of the genders on the labour market and/or in decision making positions should be reached. No other inequalities are referred to when the term is used in this way (emancipation plans 2001-2010, 2006-2010, and 2008-2011[41]). In the next paragraph on the framing of intersectionality some more attention is paid to the use of the term 'diversity' in the emancipation policy plans.

When we look at the policy plans that were included in the QUING document analysis, diversity is mentioned in a minority of the policy plans. It is mentioned in the multi-year emancipation plan 2008-2011 (as indicated above) that was analysed for the issue 'general gender equality policies' and in two policy plans that were analysed for the non-employment issue. One of these plans is on equal pay and the term diversity is used when it is stated that gender pay differences and women's labour market participation differs between ethnic minority groups. The other plan is on the labour participation of ethnic minorities. Diversity is also used when it is indicated that 'ethnic minority women' are not to be regarded as one homogeneous group.

The most explicit way of naming intersectionality by the government (though this explicitness does not necessarily imply a higher degree of awareness or understanding of intersectional processes!) is probably included in the official aim of the Dutch emancipation policy. The aim, stated on the official government's website on emancipation and quoted in the emancipation policy plan 2001-2010, is: "*To create the necessary conditions needed to reach a pluriform society in which individuals regardless of sex, and in interaction with other societal order principles like ethnicity, age, marital/family status, and sexual orientation, can achieve an independent existence and in which women and men can realise equal rights, opportunities, liberties and (social) responsibilities.*"[42]. Here, intersectionality is indicated by the phrase 'and in interaction with other societal order principles'. Certain phrases from this general aim are subsequently singled out and explained, such as the phrase 'pluriform society'. This phrase is

---

[39] The multi-year emancipation policy plans that were published during the QUING research period range from 23 to 119 pages (with 23 being an exception). The policy plans that were analysed by using frame analysis on average are 30 pages long.

[40] Mostly after 2000, hardly ever before 2000.

[41] This was the only multi-year policy plan that was selected for the frame and voice analysis

[42] Objective of emancipation policy as can be found on the official government website on emancipation: http://www.emancipatieweb.nl/emancipatie_algemeen#1932 accessed on 19 June 2008.

then linked to 'diversity'. The phrase *"and in interaction with other societal order principles"* is not explained any further.

Finally, looking at the civil society documents that were analysed by using frame analysis, we can conclude that terms like 'intersectionality' or 'intersecting inequalities/discriminations' or the more common (in the Netherlands at least) 'crossroad thinking' (kruispuntdenken) are explicitly mentioned only as an exception. Generally, the term 'diversity' is only invoked sometimes. There are two texts, however, which use this term frequently (the civil society text analysed for sub-issue 'sexual orientation discrimination' and the civil society text analysed for 'reconciliation of work and family life'). Still, intersectionality in the analysed civil society texts mainly takes the form of referring to groups at the point of intersections. All in all, the terminology used by civil society only slightly differs from the terminology used in government texts.

For all document types it goes that intersectionality is indicated predominantly through the mentioning of intersectional actor categories. More explicit terms like 'multiple disadvantage' or 'additive disadvantage' or 'mutually constitutive' or 'intersecting inequalities' or 'multiple discrimination' or 'intersectional discrimination' are practically absent. The terms 'intersectionality' itself or its Dutch counterpart 'crossroad thinking' are hardly used. The term 'diversity' is sometimes used.

4.2.2 Meaning, framing and versions of intersectionality

In 1982 an *"analysis of the 'women's issue"*[43] was commissioned by the State Secretary for emancipation Hedy d'Ancona. It was written by three external expert scholars and two civil servants from the Directorate for the Coordination of Emancipation Policy and it served as input for the upcoming second emancipation policy plan (the 1985 one). In this document intersectionality is paid specific attention to, although the term intersectionality itself is not used. It is underlined that differences in class position, in ethnicity, and in age shape the specific problems that specific groups of women will be confronted with in our society. So, in order to achieve change and find good solutions, emancipation policy-makers have to each time again analyse the different forms that women's oppression can take. Good emancipation policy is to diversify between different groups of women who all have different positions depending on 'class', 'ethnicity', and 'age'.

One can differentiate between ways in which attention is paid to 'intersecting inequalities' in policy documents. Such attention can take a more explicit, articulate, conscious, theoretical, reflective, and in-depth form, like the 1982 document above where specific attention is paid to what intersectionality is (although the term itself is not used) and why it is important to be aware of intersectionality when making gender equality policies. Or it can take a more implicit, less articulate, less reflective form. In this case it is still possible to deduce from the policy proposals that attention is in fact paid to intersecting inequalities (for example because intersectional actor categories are mentioned) but the conceptualisation of how the inequalities relate to each other is missing or at least less articulate.

To get to grips with such different framings of intersectionality, we (QUING Radboud University Team) have developed a table (see table 11 below) that visualises a range of different versions by which policies/documents might pay attention to gender and (its relation to) other inequalities. Some of them can be labelled a form of 'true' intersectionality, while some of them do not involve intersectionality or it is ambiguous whether or not this is the case. We will use this categorisation as a 'helping device', which enables us to make sharper observations about the

---

[43] Ministerie van Sociale Zaken en Werkgelegenheid [Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment]. May 1982. Een analyse van het "vrouwenvraagstuk" [an analysis of the "women's issue"]. Directorate for the Coordination of Emancipation Policy (DCE): Working Group on theoretical Framework (Marjan van der A, Tieneke Dijkstra, Saskia Grotenhuis, Joan Meyer, and Joke Swiebel).

different manifestations of intersectionality in Dutch gender+ equality policies. The table has been developed based on what we thought, while working on the STRIQ report, would be the different 'appearances' that (non-)intersectionality can take.

Version	description	Form of intersectionality yes/no?
Single minded	Attention to one strand. Can be gender, can be another inequality. If other: shift?	NO
Multiple, but separate strands	Attention to multiple strands, but treated separately from each other	NO
Additive inequalities	On top of one discrimination/disadvantage groups or persons are seen to suffer from an 'extra' discrimination/disadvantage originating in (an)other inequality/inequalities	In principle: no (because no *interaction*), but often seems to originate in lack of expertise/knowledge about how interaction looks like/works. Therefore: SETTING THE STAGE for intersectionality
Interacting inequalities	Attention to the *interaction* of multiple inequalities	YES
Genderedness of structural mechanisms	Attention to the genderedness of structural mechanisms like racism, ethnocentrism, heteronormativity and/or for structural power differences that originate in intersecting inequalities	YES
Inarticulate intersectional categories/ inarticulate mentioning of multiple inequality strands	Intersectional categories or multiple inequality strands are mentioned, but unaccompanied by any articulate vision or conceptualisation of how the inequalities relate to each other (separate? additive? Interacting?)	AMBIGUOUS Difficult to categorize in one of the 'versions' included in this table because of 'inarticulateness'. Once intersectional categories are accompanied with vision/conceptualisation, then it is possible to categorise them.

Table 11: Range of different versions by which policies pay attention to gender and (its relation to) other inequalities

General picture

By looking at the third column of table 6 on page 31 (which maps the range of inequalities and the presence of intersectionality in the super texts) a rough idea can be obtained about how often Dutch analysed documents refer to intersecting inequality axes as compared to how often they refer either to a single inequality axis (single minded) or to 'multiple but separate inequality strands'. For all issues taken together, it appears that documents more often refer to intersecting inequalities than to single or multiple but separate strands. While table 6 does not show what exact forms these 'intersectionalities' take (is it 'additive inequalities', or 'interacting inequalities', or reference to the 'genderedness of structural mechanisms' or a less articulate form of referring to intersectionality?) it clearly points out that intersectionality anyhow is very present in Dutch gender equality policy documents. What table 6 also shows is that when texts refer to intersecting inequalities, gender is one of the axes in 90% of the cases. Looking at the separate issues, we see some slight deviations from this general picture. The issues of GGE and IC seem to be some more 'intersectional' and the issue of GBV some less. However, when inequality strands intersect in IC, gender is less often one of the axes involved, while in GBV gender is always one of the axes involved (but at the same time: gender in GBV issue is mainly de-gendered.)

Shifting the attention to the way intersectionality is framed – is it 'additive inequalities', or 'interacting inequalities', or reference to the 'genderedness of structural mechanisms' or maybe a less articulate form of referring to intersectionality? – <u>a first conclusion</u> is that the Dutch analysed documents and multi-year emancipation policy plans ***in general*** contain many intersectional actor categories, but at the same time often lack an explicit articulation or conceptualisation of how the inequalities that lie at the basis of these intersectional categories are seen to relate to each other. While intersectional actor categories beforehand exclude the 'single minded' and 'multiple but separate' versions (see table 11), the nature of the intersectionality does not often become clear from the texts in any decisive way.. Are the inequalities 'accumulated' and therefore still somehow seen as dissociated (additive inequalities) or is there attention/awareness about the co-construction of the inequality axes (interacting inequalities or genderedness of structural mechanisms)? Overall, there is a *tendency* to inarticulateness with regard to intersectionality/intersectional actors. Nevertheless, when texts DO contain some articulateness with regard to intersectionality this usually points to an 'additive inequalities' framing. Much less often it points to 'interacting inequalities' or to 'genderedness of structural mechanisms'.

<u>A second conclusion</u> concerning the analysed documents and the multi-year emancipation policy plans is that it ***generally*** is an exceptional thing to find a text part in these documents – even if only small – that is specifically dedicated to a discussion or reflection concerning which inequalities are seen to impact on each other, how they are seen to impact and what this might mean for the policy field and for the specific policy proposals that are being introduced in the document. This means that a 'broader' vision or conceptualisation concerning intersectionality that would explain or embed the emergence of intersectional categories throughout the rest of the policy is usually lacking.[44] The documents never pay explicit attention to why intersectionality is important for (reaching) gender equality. Instead, intersectional groups usually enter the picture in a more casual, a less embedded or even in a seemingly arbitrary way. Intersectional categories might just 'pop up' in certain parts of the text. The document might hint at the fact that a certain problem seemingly is regarded to be especially pressing for this intersectionalised group, or (statistical) facts are invoked from which it can be inferred that a certain 'problem' is more often found with this intersectionalised group. Still, lacking any broader vision on intersectionality, it is not always clear whether these problems are *only* found in relation to this group, or whether they

---

[44] There are some exceptions like the 2001-2010 multi-year emancipation policy plan where a text part is dedicated to explaining the idea of 'diversity' and what this means for emancipation policy.

are faced with double/extra problems or whether problems stem from interaction of multiple inequalities. And if 'hints' are present in the text it might tell us something more about the nature of the intersectionality, they are mainly to be found in just one or at the most two sentence(s) that surround the intersectional actor groups that is mentioned. Again, this makes it hard to pinpoint the type of intersectionality. Below we will take a closer look at how intersectionality appears in different types of documents.

Framing of intersectionality in the different types of documents
If Intersectionality is present in **laws** it mainly takes the form of just a denotation of a specific group of persons (that happens to be intersectional) without this being accompanied with any further reflection or articulation that reveals how the inequalities that lie at the basis of this 'intersectional' category relate to each other (inarticulate intersectional categories, see table 11). This is not so surprising, since (Dutch) law texts usually hardly contain any reasoning. From the 9 law-type documents that were analysed half do not contain any form of intersectionality. The remaining ones denote intersectional groups without reasoning. There is one exception and that is the Decision on family reunion, which includes some reasoning surrounding the intersectional groups that are mentioned. It is for example mentioned that Turkish and Moroccan female (marriage) migrants have a low(er) education level, have a bad (starting) position in Dutch society, and are more often unemployed than the 'autochtonous' Dutch women.. A norm group is not always mentioned, and if a norm group is mentioned, ethnic minority women are either compared with the 'native' or 'autochthonous' Dutch citizens in general or with 'autochthonous' *women*. When autochthonous women are the norm group the framing of intersectionality seems of the 'additive inequalities' type, but in the other cases it is not always clear how the inequality axis relate (inarticulate intersectional categories, see table 11).

In **policy plans, parliamentary debates and multi-year emancipation policy plans** reference, again, is usually made to groups at the point of intersection, by merely naming the specific group (for example 'lone unemployed parents', or 'ethnic minority women with low qualifications') without any further reasoning that illuminates the way intersectionality is framed (inarticulate intersectional categories, see table 11). Still, the articulateness seems some higher in these types of documents than in law texts. More often than in law texts it is for example mentioned that the group at the point of intersection has a 'worse' or a 'more difficult' or a 'more vulnerable' position (than a certain norm group) or reference is made to 'specific problems/obstacles' that this group faces. Quite often it concerns ethnic minority women/girls combined with another inequality axis (like class) who are then compared with 'native' Dutch women or men or just 'native' citizens in general. If intersectional women are explicitly compared with the norm group 'women in general', the framing of intersectionality seems to points towards the 'additive inequalities' type (see table 11); women in general face certain difficulties/obstacles/problems, and this specific intersectional group of women is faced with these difficulties/obstacles/problems even more so because of some 'added' inequality.

In the previous sub section on the 'naming of intersectionality' it was stated that the term 'diversity' – a term which might indicate intersectionality – was found in all **multi-year emancipation policy plans** that were published in the period 1995-2008, except for the 1995 plan. But what form of intersectionality is actually denoted by the term 'diversity' in these plans? In the emancipation multi-year policy plan 2001-2010 there is one paragraph that is specifically dedicated to intersecting inequalities, although this happens under the labels of 'a pluriform society' and 'diversity'. Diversity in the basis is seen as something positive and enriching for society. People make diverse individual choices and have diverse lifestyles and cultural backgrounds. This diversity is regarded as desirable and important for the emancipation process. Diversity here is connected to 'freedom of choice'. However, the document underlines that it should be born in mind that there are groups of women who have less opportunities as a consequence of societal order principles such as ethnicity, age and educational qualifications

(class). It is stated that this does not mean that separate policies have to be made for each different group of (vulnerable) women. It means that in the regular policy express attention has to be paid to the potential different effects that policy can have for different groups of women. At times, it can be useful and desirable to make some extra effort for groups that insufficiently profit from regular policy. Intersectionalised groups of women which are confronted with specific obstacles and therefore might need some extra measures are low educated women, allochthonous/ethnic minority women and women returners to work. In comparison to the analysed laws, policy plans and parliamentary debates, this policy plan includes a more in-depth reasoning and vision concerning intersectionality. The framing of intersectionality consists of a mix of 'additive inequalities' and 'interacting inequalities'; hints of both types of framing can be found (see table 11). The text seems to claim that general emancipation policy is needed for all women, because they suffer from disadvantages on the basis of being women, but some women suffer from extra disadvantages that originate in other inequalities like class, age and ethnicity, This indicates an 'additive inequalities-type of framing. At the same time, the text seems to point out that certain groups of women that lie at the crossroads of different inequalities have problems of 'their own' which might not be faced by 'non-intersectionalised' women. This indicates an 'interacting inequalities'-type of framing. The term 'diversity' is also used in another way in this plan. It surfaces in the chapter on power and decision-making when it is mentioned that less women have top positions on the labour market and in politics than men do. Diversity has a quite limited – in fact non-intersectional, single strand – meaning here; namely that there should be more *gender* diversity in top positions.

   In the emancipation plan for the years 2006-2010 the term diversity is used again. But now it is used in a slightly different way. At first, it is again being linked to 'freedom of choice', a tension between the increasing diverse backgrounds of people and the government wanting its citizens to experience real freedom of choice can be traced. This can be read from statements such as the following: *"The diversity of Dutch society is increasing. It is more than just the fact that many people in the Netherlands come from another country and another culture; lifestyles and societal positions of women and men, the old and the young, are changing remarkably. Individual freedom of choice is ever more important in the Netherlands […]The cabinet wishes to protect every resident of the Netherlands from violence as best it can and create the conditions for participation so that everyone can experience real freedom of choice. The large number of refugees and labour/marital migrants in the Netherlands makes this an imposing social and economic task for the coming years."* Next to this use, diversity is also used in the more limited – non-intersectional, single strand – sense of 'gender diversity'; i.e. more women should participate in top positions at labour market or in politics. In the emancipation multi-year policy plan for the years 2008-2011 attention for intersectionality is interwoven with the policy proposals; no separate attention or somewhat more in-depth analysis is present regarding intersectionality like the paragraph on diversity in the 2001-2010 policy plan. Intersectionality mostly takes the form of mentioning intersectionalised categories, sometimes being accompanied with the claim that the intersectionalised group is particularly vulnerable (indicating an 'additive inequalities' type of intersectionality, see table 11). The term 'diversity' appears a number of times in the 2008-2011 plan, but is only used in the sense of 'gender diversity'; i.e. in connection to a better representation of women in top position in government and in business, more girls in technical education/occupations, and a better gender balance in general on the labour market. In this plan diversity (contrary to the 2001-2010 plan) only seems to refer to gender and not to other axes of inequality (single minded, see table 11).

In the **civil society texts** that were analysed, intersectionality often takes the form of referring to groups at the point of intersections as well. Sometimes this is not accompanied by any articulated conceptualisation of how the inequality axes relate to each other and in such cases the framing of intersectionality is one of 'unarticulated intersectionalised categories' (see table 11), sometimes it

is claimed that the group is particularly vulnerable (additive inequalities, see table 11), and sometimes there also is a sensitivity to power structures/differences and gendered structural mechanisms (see examples below). So, the framing of intersectionality in the civil society documents seems somewhat more diverse than is the case for the other types of texts. Still, there are also some analysed civil society texts where intersectionality is almost absent and/or pretty unarticulated. Furthermore, the civil society texts that were analysed hardly go into a more in-depth or theoretical discussion about what is intersectionality and why intersectional thinking in gender equality policy-making would be needed. This matches with the observations made concerning the other types of documents. Part of the analysed civil society texts are quite critical when it comes to how intersectional concerns end up in government policies. Government policy reports seem to be scrutinised with some sort of intersectional 'awareness' in mind. Sometimes it is demanded from government that attention is paid to certain intersecting inequalities or groups at intersections when this attention is lacking in government policy. At other times, criticism is expressed about the way in which the government pays attention to certain groups at intersections. In general, these critical civil society texts show a greater awareness of how inequalities intersect at the level of Dutch society than can be said for government policy texts.

Some examples might illustrate the 'general' picture just sketched concerning intersectionality in civil society texts. The most recent CEDAW shadow report was analysed for the general gender equality policies issue. It represents the voice of a large coalition of Dutch and as such is one of the most 'authoritative' civil society texts that was analysed. It stresses that governments' gender equality policies has shrunk to the integration of migrant, refugee and minority women and that attention is paid in a wrong kind of way to these groups of women, namely by denying structural power differences and pretending that all citizens (and all women) have equal voices. The government tends to reinforce instead of acting against the discrimination and the stereotyping that migrant (particularly Muslim) women are confronted with. These women suffer not only from discrimination as women, but also on basis of ethnicity and religion. According to this report, the government should incorporate in its policies an exploration of the implications of the intersection of various forms of discrimination and recognize intersectionality as a critical component. The CEDAW shadow report is one of the few civil society documents in which the terms 'intersecting discriminations' and 'intersectionality' are mentioned explicitly. The framing of intersectionality is a mix of 'additive inequalities' and 'genderedness of structural mechanisms' (see table 11).

The authors of the Beijing +10 shadow report (general gender equality policies issue) demand that the government takes a gender-inclusive approach towards poverty and social exclusion. Lone parents, lone older women and ethnic minority women are specifically mentioned in this context. The authors disapprove of ethnic minority women as a group being denoted in its entirety as a problem group on the labour market. This does not do any justice to the heterogeneity that exists within this group of women. This text, although showing a certain 'intersectionality awareness', is framing intersectionality in a mainly unarticulated way.

The Women's Alliance (non-employment issue) argues that the government should have much more regard for and should counteract the feminization of poverty in its policies. Especially lone parents, older women and ethnic minority women are highly represented amongst the least well off people. The stressing that poverty is a gendered something might indicate attention for a more structural framing of intersectionality (genderedness of structural mechanisms). But the text does not say anything more than what is quoted here, so the framing stays quite unarticulated, because there is no further explanation found in the text.

E-quality, the expertise centre on gender and ethnicity wrote an advice about the future Labour and Care Act (non-employment issue). E-quality argues that it is important to take into account differences between people regarding gender, ethnicity, class, age, and sexual orientation and argues that the government does not sufficiently do this in its policy. However, diversity is predominantly an enumeration of differences where inequalities are regarded as

separate. Mentioning is however made of groups at the point of intersections (for example low educated Turkish and Moroccan women) but this is not accompanied by any reasoning. The overall framing of intersectionality therefore is 'multiple but separate strands' (see table 11).

Marijke Ekelschot (intimate citizenship issue) writing an article for the "Fable of the Illegal?", a radical left civil society organisation argues that the government labels female immigrants as retarded, that the government subjects female immigrants to patriarchal restrictions and that the government takes efforts to make import brides good mothers instead of independent paid employees. The fact that Ekelschot does single out 'female immigrants' and never compares them with for example 'male immigrants' or with 'native/Dutch females', makes it more difficult to pinpoint what type of intersectionality framing is present in this text (inarticulate). Her attention for the role of the government is one line of argument including attention for structures.

Tiye International, in its recommendation regarding honour crimes, (gender based violence issue) argues that honour violence is undeservedly and one-sidedly related to ethnic minority groups, while such violence has already been occurring for a long time in Dutch culture itself. Honour killings occur in all subcultures in which patriarchal relations continue. The main causes of honour violence are the unequal power relations between men and women and patriarchal traditions. The text points towards racist/stigmatising processes that surround the dealing with honour violence/killings by government. This violence is gendered. So, the text contains hints of a 'genderedness of structural mechanisms'-type of framing intersectionality, but interestingly, against a 'biased' attention of the government, there are calls for focusing on 'gender' only in these cases.

The position of intersectional (gender-ethnicity) actors in the analysed documents and terminology used

Now that we have established that intersectionalised actor groups often are not accompanied by any articulate view on intersectionality in Dutch gender equality policy documents, another line of approach that might reveal some more about the framing of intersectionality is to analyse what is the role/position a certain intersectionalised group gets within the analysed documents. Such analysis also helps with answering questions that were put forward in the literature review; questions that were somehow all related to whether the intersectional attention paid to gendered-ethnicised actors in Dutch gender equality policies has positive or negative effects. Leading questions for such an intersectional actor analysis are: is this particular intersectional group rather seen as problem causer or a problem sufferer (it is assumed that if this intersectional group is an already stigmatised/stereotyped group in broader society, being seen as merely problem causer will in any case not 'counteract' such stigmatisation)? If this intersectionalised group is seen as an active actor in a certain problem statement, who is seen as the passive actor for this problem and vice versa (this might tell us whether the problem is solely connected to the intersectionalised group or whether policy documents take a broader perspective on 'who else is affected by the problems that this group is confronted with?', 'who else would benefit from this solution' or 'who else is causing the problem'? This might tell us something about whether there is attention for the majority group or 'privileged categories' as part of the problem). And within prognosis: is the intersectionalised group seen as bearing individual responsibility for solving the problem or is it seen more often as a target group?

Because our interest in the literature review specifically lies with the gender-ethnicity intersection, it is particularly interesting to answer the questions above for gender-ethnicity intersectional actors. So far, we have done this 'gender-ethnicity intersectional actor'-analysis only for the general gender equality issue and not yet for the other three issues. In a later stage of the QUING project and when time allows us, we can do such analysis for the other issues and for other intersectional groups as well. An analysis of the role/position that gender-ethnicity intersectional actors (including those actors groups where except for gender and ethnicity also other inequality axes are involved) occupy in the analysed texts for the issue of general gender

equality policies, leads to the following observations: While active actors that are intersectionalised along the gender and ethnicity axes are most prominent within the whole group of intersectionalised active actors and while the same goes for passive actors, the ratio between passive and active actors that are intersectionalised along gender and ethnicity axes is as follows: for each gender-ethnicity intersectional active actor that is mentioned in the diagnosis of the issue general gender equality, two gender-ethnicity intersectional passive actors are mentioned. We may thus conclude that gender-ethnicity actors are more often regarded as sufferers from problems than as problem causers. The assumption stated above was that if this intersectionalised group is an already stigmatised/stereotyped group in broader society (which we think is the case for 'ethnic minority' groups - and especially the Muslim groups among them – in the Netherlands), being seen as merely problem causer will not 'counteract' such stigmatisation. If an already stigmatised group is solely regarded as causing problems, we must seriously doubt whether such attention in fact adds to the 'inclusiveness' of the policy. However, as we have just established, this is not the case for the issue of general gender equality issue, since gender-ethnicity intersectional actors are not only framed as problem causers. They are more often framed as problem sufferers.

A closer look at how gender-ethnicity intersectionalised active/passive actors are combined with other actors in problem statements shows that gender-ethnicity intersectionalised active actors are always combined with passive actors (in case there is a passive actor[45]) that are also gender-ethnicity intersectionalised actors or that are at least ethnicised (for example ethnic minority children). Another pattern that can be identified is that when the active actors are 'ethnicised' *women* the corresponding passive actor either is exactly the same actor (ethnicised women) or is the same actor plus another actor (for example the same ethnicised women category plus their children). But when the active actors are 'ethnicised' *men* the corresponding passive actors are always 'ethnicised' women. Ethnicised women are more often active actors than ethnicised men. Gender-ethnicity intersectionalised passive actors are always combined with active actors (in case there is an active actor[46]) that are either gender-ethnicity intersectionalised actors or 'government' or (few times) 'employers'. How are we to interpret these identified patterns? What we see is quite a narrow perspective on the social categories that are involved in problems that are connected to gender-ethnicity actors, since no other groups of people – like for example the majority group/privileged group – are seen as being part of these problems. They only appear as the 'norm group' sometimes (mostly named 'authochthonous' women or people). It is only the state and employers that are mentioned sometimes as active actors. We may conclude that ethnicised-gendered actors form an actor category in diagnosis is more or less isolated from other actor groups in society. The 'majority' group or 'privileged' group – is never seen as part of the problem. Ethnicised-gendered actors are a separate group that causes or is suffering from separate/own problems. When ethnic minority women are regarded as causer of a certain problem, they are usually seen as sufferers of that problem as well. This is not the case with men. Seen from the Dutch intersectional theorists' perspective (see literature review, chapter 2), these patterns can be understood as reinforcing dichotomies (us/others, i.e. autochthonous people/allochthonous people) instead of transcending them and as being blind for power differences between the minority groups and majority groups in society. If we look at prognosis, we see that gender-ethnicity intersectionalised actors are hardly ever seen as the responsible actors to act. Looking at the target groups shows another picture. Half of the target groups that are people are intersectionalised people, and within the group of intersectionalised people gender-ethnicity actors are most often present. This means that gender-ethnicity intersectionalised actors are scarcely seen as bearing individual responsibility for solving the problem. More often they are the target group of the policies.

---

[45] The passive actor is 'empty' only a few times.
[46] In roughly a quarter of the cases in which the passive actor is intersectionalised along gender and ethnicity axes, the active actor is empty.

Next to such an 'intersectional actor-analysis' we might also take a closer look at the terminology that is used in the analysed documents to denote gender-ethnicity intersectional actors. Dutch intersectionality literature (see literature review in chapter 2) underlines that terminology is never free of power, never innocent, and always a construction. Certain groups are defined as insiders while other groups of people are defined as outsiders. Terminology often underlines differences and departs from, reinforces and normalises 'us'/'others' distinctions. If we look at the terminology used in the analysed Dutch documents, there is a clear distinction between 'us/we' and 'them/others'.. The terms that are most often used to denote gender-ethnicity actors are 'allochthonous women' (referring to women who are 'native' Dutch and usually inferred as the norm group) as opposed to 'autochthonous women' (referring to women of foreign descent, usually inferred as the group that deviates from the norm) and 'ethnic minority women'. It is typical that the analysed documents never speak about 'ethnic majority women'. That only one side of this pair of terms is used at least indicates a lack of awareness that 'whiteness' is also an ethnic position. Other terms used – but less often – are 'migrant women' and 'black-migrant-refugee-women'. These terms do not go together with any counterpart term (as is the case with allochthonous versus autochthonous).

4.2.3 Conclusion: Importance of intersectionality to Dutch gender+ equality policy

Concluding; how is the importance of intersectionality in Dutch gender+ equality policies to be assessed? Is the focus on intersectionality central or marginal to these policies? Is this focus ephemeral or embedded? And has this changed over time?

To begin with, the Dutch focus on intersectionality is not merely ephemeral or marginal in the Netherlands. In case we regard the *'focus on intersectionality'* to cover all possible sorts of attention that can be paid to intersectionality, we have to conclude that such a focus is in fact quite central in Dutch gender + equality policies. The analysed documents refer more often to intersecting inequalities than to single or to multiple but separate inequality strands. This mostly takes the form of referring to groups at intersections which in the context of the policy proposal itself (as active actor, as passive actor, as responsible actor or as target group). However, to give a right estimate of the level of '*embeddedness*' of intersectionality we cannot neglect *the way in which intersectionality is paid attention to*. Does this attention takes a more explicit, articulate, conscious, theoretical, reflective, or in-depth form or does it instead take a more implicit, less articulate, less reflective form? And: in what way is it framed – single minded, multiple but separate, additive inequalities, interacting inequalities or genderedness of structural mechanisms or inarticulate (see table 11)?

While the Dutch analysed documents and multi-year emancipation policy plans contain many intersectional actor categories, at the same time these documents often lack an explicit articulation of how the inequalities that lie at the basis of these intersectional categories are seen to relate to each other. Thus, there is a tendency to inarticulateness with regard to the way intersectionality is framed. In case documents do contain a more articulate vision on intersectionality, this usually concerns an 'additive inequalities'-framing. Much less often intersectionality is framed as 'interacting inequalities' or as 'genderedness of structural mechanisms' (see table 11). Law texts are the least articulate when it comes to intersectionality (and intersectionality is also least present in these documents). Civil society texts generally are somewhat more articulate in this respect and the diversity in framing is also somewhat higher than policy plans and parliamentary debates. Moreover, there hardly is analytical/theoretical attention for the meaning, usefulness and necessity of intersectionality in the analysed documents and in the emancipation policy plans (for example: What is intersectionality? Why intersectionality is important for (reaching) gender equality? And; which inequalities are seen to impact how on each other and what does this mean for the specific policy proposals that are being introduced in the document?). Furthermore, sensitivity for (intersectional) structural power

differences is almost absent (except for some civil society texts). So, a 'broader' vision concerning intersectionality that would better explain or embed the emergence of intersectional categories throughout the rest of the document is usually lacking. Instead, intersectional groups usually enter the picture in a more casual, less embedded or even in a seemingly arbitrary way. An exception is a text part on the idea of 'diversity' in the emancipation policy plan 2001-2010.

In conclusion, it would be a bit of an exaggeration to say that intersectionality is central to or even *embedded* in Dutch emancipation policy, but intersectionality certainly is not ephemeral or marginal to Dutch gender+ equality policies either. The centrality of intersectional actor groups underlines that there definitely is a kind of 'intersectional awareness' present in Dutch gender equality policy. Nevertheless, the tendency to inarticulateness (negatively) affects the extent in which intersectionality can be regarded as really '*embedded*' in gender+ equality policies. To nuance this general conclusion, it is important to note the following: while intersections are found equally often in policy plans than in civil society texts (see paragraph 4.1.5[47]), part of the civil society documents that were analysed show a certain intersectional 'awareness' that seems somewhat more 'embedded' (i.e. more conscious, articulate, structural attention) than is the case for government documents. These critical civil society texts show a greater awareness of how inequalities intersect at the level of Dutch society than can be said for government policy texts.

Lastly, has the importance of intersectionality changed over time? The coded documents cannot reveal much about this, because the main part of the selected document stems from more recent years. Judging from our broader knowledge, we can at least conclude that a certain amount of attention has always been paid to intersectional categories of women in Dutch gender equality policies – at least in the general gender equality policies – so this is not something that has emerged only in the more recent years.

4.3 Civil society and the naming and meaning of intersectionality

The Country context study (deliverable 41) roughly maps the Dutch civil society landscape for each of the inequality strands that are researched within QUING. What does the country context study tells us about the range of inequalities that are 'covered' and around which intersections do we witness civil society organisation? Are they organised by strand or do they take into account multiple inequalities? Do certain combinations of inequalities appear more often? For more detailed information about the Dutch civil society landscape, we would like to refer to the Country context study (deliverable 41).

In the Netherlands there is civil society organisation around each of the inequality strands that QUING highlights, that is: gender, class (mainly trade unions), ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, age, disability, family status/marital status, and citizenship status. The bulk of these organisations have one single strand as their key focus and within this context they do at times (to a varying extent, depending on the organisation in case) pay attention to other strands that impact upon this 'key' strand. Sometimes rather ad-hoc alliances are formed between organisations that have different single inequalities as their organising base. Organisations that have an intersection or multiple inequality strands as their organising base, are much less numerous then 'single strand organisations'. It is remarkable that when gender is one of the inequality axes involved in organisations that take into account multiple inequalities, it mainly concerns organisations for/of black, migrant and refugee women (for example BLinN, Tiye International, Comensha, Support Group for Women without a Residence Permit, KEZBAN, Pafemme. Further: see country context study). Other organisations that are organised around multiple inequalities (not always intersecting) and which cover gender as well are '*Article 1*' which

---

[47] In this paragraph it was, furthermore, observed that intersectionality is less present in laws and in parliamentary debates

is the national association dedicated to prevent and combat discrimination on all grounds mentioned in the anti-discrimination article of the Dutch Constitution and '*E-quality'*.

'E-quality' is the Dutch information centre for gender, family and diversity issues. Until its 2007 merger with the Dutch Family Council it was named 'E-quality expertise centre on gender and ethnicity'. 'E-quality' is one of the only organisations that still receive structural emancipation subsidies from the state and in recent years, it has moved closer and closer to the government. In a sense it almost has become a semi-public or hybrid organisation, since it has been made responsible for some explicit policy-related tasks like coordinating and supporting Ministries regarding their gender equality policies (and gender mainstreaming). Before 2004, this coordinating/supporting task had always been part of the formal mandate of the governmental gender equality machinery – the Directorate for the Coordination of Emancipation policy (DCE). 'E-quality' also serves politicians and policy-makers who are active in national, provincial and local governments, and the EU. In addition, social and employment organisations can consult them for advice and information, and they are a general source of information for people and agencies who wish to contribute to the public debate on gender, the family and diversity. Although 'E-quality' is located outside government and still has tasks that extend beyond executing coordinating and supporting tasks for government, it seems like it is becoming a sort of 'extended' part of the government equality machinery. In the long run, this development might in fact have an impact on the way in which government will deal with intersectionality. For now, it is a bit too early to be able to make any statement about this.

While the organisations that focus on black, migrant and refugee women can truly be labelled 'intersectional' as they defend/promote the interests of this specific group of women on the basis of the specific experiences and problems that this group comes across, this is not necessarily the case for organisations like '*Article 1*' and *'E-quality'*. At times these organisations focus on only one inequality or on multiple equalities that are regarded separate, while at other times they pay attention to 'crossing' inequality strands.

Is intersectionality raised only or largely by NGOs? If we understand 'raise' to mean 'who has put intersectional concerns first on the political agenda', then the answer should possibly be 'yes', although this may also depend on the specific intersection that is considered. The intersection gender-ethnicity has in any case been raised first by the black, migrant and refugee women's movement. If we understand 'raise' to alternatively mean 'do raise intersectionality more often than government' then the answer would probably be 'no'. Intersectionality is not markedly more present in civil society texts than in government documents (except when compared to laws, where intersectionality is clearly less present). However – as we have seen in section 4.2 of this chapter – the *kind* of attention paid to intersectionality differs a bit between the analysed civil society and government documents. It is this difference that let us conclude that civil society seems *'a bit'* better at doing intersectionality than state bodies. While there are much similarities between the analysed civil society and government texts as to how intersectionality is approached (see section 4.2 of this chapter) civil society texts generally are some more critical and articulate when it comes to intersectionality. The reason for this might be that they are better aware of how inequalities intersect at the level of society and reality. This brings along that civil society texts generally are also some more sensitive for structural power differences in society. However, we only speak of a small difference here and if the selection of civil society and government text would have been differently, this conclusion could have been different as well.

We can conclude that in the Netherlands there is civil society organisation around each of the inequality strands that QUING highlights. The bulk of these organisations have one single strand as their key focus. Organisations which have an intersection or multiple inequality strands as their organising base, are much less numerous then 'single strand organisations'. It is remarkable that when gender is one of the inequality axes involved it mainly concerns organisations for/of black, migrant and refugee women. Certain intersections of gender with other inequalities have first

been raised or put on the policy agenda by (particular parts of) women's movement, but if we interpret 'raising intersectionality' as the extent to which intersectionality is present in the analysed civil society texts as compared to the analysed government texts, there is not a very marked difference (only in laws intersectionality is obviously less present). Still, civil society can be regarded as doing a bit better at intersectionality, because generally the analysed civil society texts show some more awareness of how inequalities intersect at the level of society and (subsequently) these texts generally are also some more sensitive for (intersectional) structural power differences in society.

4.4 Summary and comparison

The inequality strands that stand out most (after gender) and that intersect most often with gender in the coded documents are (in order of importance) ethnicity, family status, age, and class. Their relevance varies, however, across the different issues: while ethnicity is particularly visible in all four issues, age is particularly visible in GGE and GBV, and family status is particularly visible in NE and IC. Class is particularly visible in NE. It is remarkable that class is never mentioned as such in Dutch policy documents. Usually it is denoted by referring to things like low educational qualifications, economic dependence, people receiving social assistance and lack of social/economic inclusion. The gender-ethnicity intersection and the gender-marital status intersection are – overall – the most 'spread out' intersections, since they appear in almost half of the analysed documents. The spread of the gender-ethnicity intersection, however, seems more equal across the issues. That the gender-ethnicity intersection pops up in quite a large number of analysed documents for each of the four issues underlines the prominence of this particular intersection in Dutch gender+ equality policies. The inequality axes religion and disability are practically absent in all four issues are. It seems that explicit reference to (Islam) religion is avoided while latently it is in fact present. At the very least, it is a 'charged' issue. The lack of attention paid to disability is most probably due to institutional separation combined with the fact that 'disability', as a discrimination ground, was only recently included in the Dutch body of equal treatment law. Generally taken, sexual orientation and citizenship status are not very visible either. There are variations per issue though. Gender intersecting with other inequality strands seems the least present in the voices of parliamentary debates, and especially in laws. Intersections are most present in policy plans and in civil society texts (almost equally present).

Special attention was also paid to the range of inequalities covered in the Dutch emancipation policy plans and by the Dutch body of equal treatment law and the equality machinery. A comparison of the Dutch multi-year emancipation policy plans published during the QUING research period (1995-2008), shows that an almost similar range of inequalities appears in every consecutive emancipation plan and that this roughly seems to be in line with the conclusion drawn from the analysis of the coded documents. Ethnicity and class are the main inequalities mentioned as having an impact on gender equality. Some less important, but always relevant, inequalities are age and family status. Dutch equal treatment law covers all inequalities researched within QUING – except for class – as well as several 'extra' inequalities. The inequality grounds do not intersect in equal treatment law; they are treated as 'separate'. The Dutch monitoring equality body (Equal Treatment Commission ETC) outside the government bureaucracy is 'integrated' in the sense that it covers all the grounds that are covered by the equal treatment acts. There are signs that the ETC – just like the laws – treats these grounds as separate from each other and is not sensitive to intersectional discrimination. The equality machinery within the government bureaucracy is the Directorate for Emancipation Policy (DE). The De has traditionally been responsible for general gender equality policies; gender has therefore been its key focus. However, since very recently (2007) responsibility for sexual

orientation (homo emancipation policy) is also located within the DE. The two policy dossiers are, so far, treated separately.

The naming of intersectionality predominantly occurs (this applies to all four issues as well as to the different types of texts) by the mentioning of intersectional actor categories. More explicit terms like 'multiple disadvantage' or 'additive disadvantage' or 'mutually constitutive' or 'intersecting inequalities' or 'multiple discrimination' or 'intersectional discrimination' are practically absent (some exceptions in the civil society texts). The term 'intersectionality' is hardly ever used; neither is its Dutch counterpart 'crossroad thinking'. The term 'diversity' is used sometimes.

The analysed documents refer more often to intersecting inequalities than to single or to multiple but separate inequality strands. This mostly takes the form of referring to groups at the point of intersections. So, intersectional actor groups take a quite central place in Dutch gender equality policy documents. At the same time, the documents often lack an explicit articulation of how the inequalities that lie at the basis of these intersectional categories relate to each other. Thus, there is a tendency to inarticulateness with regard to the way intersectionality is framed. In case documents contain a more articulate vision on intersectionality, it usually concerns an 'additive inequalities'-framing. Intersectionality is less often framed as 'interacting inequalities' or as 'genderedness of structural mechanisms' (see table 11). Moreover, hardly any analytical/theoretical attention is paid to the meaning, usefulness and necessity of intersectionality in the analysed documents and in the emancipation policy plans. This all means that a 'broader' vision concerning intersectionality – which would (better) explain or 'embed' the emergence of intersectional categories throughout the rest of the document – is usually lacking. Instead, intersectional groups usually enter the picture in a more casual, less embedded or even in a seemingly arbitrary way. Having said that,, it would be a bit of an exaggeration to claim that intersectionality is central to, or even embedded in, Dutch emancipation policy, but intersectionality certainly is not ephemeral or marginal to Dutch gender+ equality policies either. The centrality of intersectional actor groups underlines that there definitely is a kind of 'intersectional awareness' in Dutch gender equality policy. Nevertheless, the tendency to inarticulateness (negatively) affects the extent to which intersectionality can be regarded as really 'embedded' in gender+ equality policies.

In the Netherlands, there is civil society organisation around each of the inequality strands that QUING highlights. The bulk of these organisations have one single strand as their key focus. Organisations, which have an intersection or multiple inequality strands as their organising base, are much less numerous than 'single strand organisations'. It is remarkable that when gender is one of the inequality axes involved, it mainly concerns organisations for/of black, migrant and refugee women. Civil society can be regarded as 'doing intersectionality' a bit better. While there are many similarities between the analysed civil society and government texts as to how intersectionality is approached, a part of the analysed civil society texts shows more awareness of how inequalities interact at the level of society and (subsequently) are also somewhat more sensitive to (intersectional) structural power differences in society.

5 IMPLICATIONS OF THE NAMING AND FRAMING OF INTERSECTIONALITY FOR THE MEANING AND PRACTICE OF GENDER + EQUALITY POLICIES

In this chapter it is tentatively discussed whether – and if so in what way – the naming and practice of intersectionality in the Netherlands impacts on the meaning and practice of gender equality policies.

In chapter four we described the range of inequalities and intersections that receive attention in Dutch gender equality policies and we described the way in which intersectionality is named and framed. A wide range of inequalities and intersections is found in Dutch gender equality policies, but chapter four, as well as chapter three, show that the attention for other inequalities shows a typical and biased pattern where the gender-ethnicity intersection is the relatively most central intersection. Chapter three concluded that gender equality is mainly to be achieved for 'women in general' and ethnic minority women in particular. Other intersectionalised groups also receive attention, but overall they are less visible (variation exists across issues though, see chapter 4). The naming of intersectionality is quite indirect/implicit (except for the term 'diversity', intersectionality is hardly explicitly named, but rather takes the form of mentioning intersectionalised actor groups) and the framing often is inarticulate. How can we evaluate this description of the way in which intersectionality appears in Dutch gender equality policies?

A legitimate and very relevant question is whether this particular appearance of intersectionality is mainly a good thing for the quality of gender equality policies or whether there actually is something 'wrong' or 'harmful' about it. A tension might exist between the *theoretical* idea that the concept of intersectionality holds the promise of contributing to (the quality of) gender equality (policies) on the one hand and the way in which intersectionality is 'deployed' in the *day-to-day reality* of gender+ equality policies on the other. The promise of intersectionality stems from the idea that in order to reach real gender equality one must be aware of the fact that other inequalities have an impact on gender equality and that, accordingly, it is impossible to achieve gender equality 'in isolation', that is; as long as these 'impacting' inequalities still exist. Intersectionality is then interpreted as a concept that aims to better understand/grasp (how to achieve) gender equality by paying attention to the way in which other inequalities interact with gender. Gender equality policies, in which no attention at all is paid to other inequalities that impact upon gender equality, logically cannot live up to this 'intersectionality promise'. At the same time, we have to be cautious to conclude that gender equality policies that do in fact pay attention to other inequalities are automatically 'better' than policies that do not. Intersectionality can be framed and named in many different ways and it is to be seen how the particular way in which 'intersectionality is done' in a country resonates with the political climate of that country and with what is going on in broader society (like: existing stereotypes regarding certain groups of people; possible racist, sexist, homophobic, or ethnocentric tendencies in society; and one has to have knowledge about structural intersectionality on the level of society to know which groups are discriminated or deprived and in fact need special attention). Other legitimate worries could be: that a focus on other inequalities than gender endangers the attention paid to gender in equality policies; that attention paid to particular intersectionalised groups of women might lead attention away from other (intersectionalised) groups of women who equally are in need of supporting/empowering measures, and; that attention for intersectionality might lead to shifts in gender equality policies whereby an inclusion frame gains importance over a more transformative frame.

So, what evaluative statements can be made about the Dutch attention to intersectionality in gender equality policies? What are the positive, promising aspects of this attention and what are the negative aspects? Is there an imbalance in the direction of either the positive or the negative

side or is the picture in the end rather ambiguous? In particular, we will think through the implications of the Dutch attention for the *gender-ethnicity intersection* in Dutch gender equality policies.

On the positive side, it seems that the attention to other inequalities than gender has not endangered the attention paid to gender in equality policies. Unlike a country such as Belgium, the Netherlands has not witnessed a shift towards the development of more general 'equal opportunities' policies – where the focus is equally shared between several inequalities – that (partly) replace '*gender* equality policies'. The Netherlands does not have any general equal opportunities policy plans or policy dossiers. The emancipation policy plans that are published regularly and set out the main lines of emancipation policy still specifically depart from *gender* emancipation. In the Dutch analysed gender equality policy documents intersectionalised actors make up around half (depends a bit on the issue, see table 6 in chapter 4) of the actors (excluding institutional actors) that are mentioned. But in the majority of cases gender is one of the axes involved and if we look at the overall prominence of the separate inequality axes that have been researched, gender indisputably is the most important axis. So, in Dutch gender equality policies there is attention for *gender+*.

While the gender axis has not been robbed of its strength, what is the effect of the strong attention for *ethnicity* as intersecting with *gender* on the overall quality of gender equality policies? Our first impression is that the implications of this strong attention are ambivalent. It might be helpful to first provide a rough sketch of current Dutch gender equality policies before we start to explain this ambivalence. In the earlier gender equality policy, we clearly saw a combination of an inclusion frame and a transformation frame. Broad transformative aims, such as changing attitudes and prevailing images of femininity and masculinity and female/male roles and resolving structural power inequalities between men and women, were clearly present in the gender emancipation policy plans (these plans set out the main lines of gender equality plans for the years to come) published in the period 1976-1992. Over the years, the transformation frame has lost importance. In some of the gender emancipation plans published during the QUING period (1995-2008), the issue of men and women having to share care responsibilities was raised, but in the most recent plan it has disappeared all together. The issue that is found most persistently/consistently through time is 'increasing women's labour participation'. In the more recent gender emancipation plans measures directed at women and girls from ethnic minorities appear more distinctively. This target group was already visible in the first years of the QUING research period, and the visibility has grown in the gender emancipation plans since 2000. Other characteristics of Dutch gender equality policy are that not all of the analysed documents pay strong attention to gender equality. Less than two thirds of the analysed documents – that were selected because of their importance with regard to gender equality – see gender equality as relevant to the policy and from these documents only half regard gender equality as solely an end in itself) and we see quite some de-gendering in the three specific topics (non-employment, intimate citizenship and especially in gender based violence).

Now we return to explain the ambivalent implications of the strong attention paid to the gender-ethnicity intersection, specifically for ethnic minority women and girls. A positive implication is that policy measures that specifically target ethnic minority women (and sometimes their men and communities) can provide help, support and even empowerment for these women. The negative implications have several consequences. Firstly, the way in which ethnic minorities are 'positioned' within the broader gender emancipation policy shapes an us/them dichotomy which sets the 'Dutch native majority group' apart from the ethnic minority groups and this will probably feed already existing negative/stereotypical ideas that are alive in Dutch society regarding ethnic minorities (and especially the Muslim groups among them). Secondly, the disproportionate attention paid to ethnic minority women and the way in which ethnic minorities

are 'positioned' within the broader gender emancipation policy can have a negative impact where it comes to certain groups that – as an effect – are *not* targeted. On the one hand it can lead attention away from other (intersectionalised) groups of women who are in equal need of supporting/empowering measures. On the other hand it can lead attention away from more transformative aims such as counteracting structural power inequalities between the genders and (transforming) patriarchal traditions that do not only exist within minority culture(s)/group(s) but just as well in the majority group/culture. Thirdly, the absence of attention to the racialising of Islamic citizens based on their religion and the simultaneous absence of attention to combating discrimination based on these axes – is a missed opportunity.

The idea that an 'us'/'them' dichotomy is shaped by the way that ethnic minorities are positioned in gender equality policies is based on the following considerations. To start with, the actor-positioning analysis that was conducted in chapter four (for the issue of general gender equality policies) showed that ethnicised-gendered actors form an actor category in diagnosis that is isolated from other actor groups of persons in society. The 'majority' group or 'privileged' group is never seen as part of the problems that are connected to ethnic minority actors. They only appear as the 'normgroup' sometimes (mostly named 'authochthonous' women or people). Ethnicised-gendered actors are a separate group that causes or is suffering from separate/own problems.[48] Furthermore, the few hints at more transformative or structural aims that can be found in more recent (generic) gender emancipation policy (such as changing patriarchal culture or involving men) predominantly are 'projected' at ethnic minority men and women and their culture. They are the ones having to change their culture and traditional ways of thinking about female/male roles. One could question whether this can truly be regarded as a form of 'transformative framing' or whether it rather is an example of paternalism. A parallel is clearly visible in the issue of Gender Based Violence. In this field a shift has taken place in more recent years towards the 'culturalisation' of sexual violence by placing a strong emphasis on honour killings, arranged marriages, and female genital mutilation, which are grouped together under the heading of "culturally specific forms of violence". Domestic violence and "culture-specific" forms of gender violence are treated as separate policy domains, institutionally located in different ministries. Documents that were analysed for the sub-issue 'FGM and honour violence' clearly contrast with documents analysed for the sub-issues 'domestic violence' and 'sexual harassment'. Gender equality is more often seen as relevant to the policy in FGM and honour violence, which for the main part is gendered. The sub-issues of domestic violence and sexual harassment, on the contrary, are mainly de-gendered and gender equality is regarded as less relevant. There are two problematic implications that follow from this. One is that it is detrimental for the image about ethnic minority groups, which is already quite negative. In the specific Dutch context, it reinforces already existing tendencies. Under the influence of more right-wing, anti-immigration and neo-liberal policy agenda's regarding immigration and integration issues the idea that problems with emancipation lie mostly with non-Dutch, non-Western (and in fact Islam) communities that live in the Netherlands and less so with the "native" Dutch community has gained ground in society. The other problematic implication is that this way of framing puts up a barrier, or at least makes it less easy, to expect that Dutch gender emancipation policy will aim at transforming the patriarchal culture that exists society-broad (and not only within ethnic minority culture!). On these more structural matters, the majority of society is not targeted.

The disproportionate attention paid to ethnic minority women as a specific target group within gender emancipation policy can also cause that less 'room' is left for other specific groups of women who are equally in need of supporting/empowering measures. An observation from

---

[48] However, this analysis at the same time showed that gendered-ethnicised actors were not mainly seen as problem causers – they were in fact more often seen as problem sufferers. Gender-ethnicity intersectionalised actors are scarcely seen as bearing individual responsibility for solving the problem. More often they are the target group of the policies. These findings argue against further stigmatisation of already stigmatized social groups.

chapter four that supports this claim is that in the more recent gender emancipation policy plans, ethnicity seems to 'overrule' class a bit, which implies that attention to 'poor women' is moving more to the background. More generally seen, the near absence of attention to gender intersecting with sexual orientation and with disability in general gender equality policies and the not very marked presence of gender intersecting with class either, is also an indication strengthening this statement.

The absence of religion and race is remarkable. In chapter four it was stated that although the analysed documents consistently use the terms '(women from) ethnic minorities' or 'allochthonous people/women'. Referring to Islam or speaking about 'Muslims' (as racial group) seems to be avoided. This is quite striking, because in the media and public debate this happens all too often (in everyday use 'allochthonous' or 'ethnic minorities' are often interpreted in a more narrow manner, namely as referring to Muslims). The documents do, however, refer sometimes to the different 'culture' of ethnic minority groups and link these groups to certain 'cultural' practices (like honour violence, female genital mutilation) which are generally regarded as practices that relate to the Islam and Muslims. Also, if specific countries of origin are mentioned they are usually Morocco (that is: Moroccan women) and Turkey (that is: Turkish women). This means that religion and/or race are in fact present, but predominantly below the surface. It might be that the authors of the analysed policy texts do not want to stigmatise Muslims even more than already is the case in broader society. However, in order to counteract this stigmatisation it would probably be wiser if religion and race would be placed higher on the gender equality policy agenda, but then framed as a *discrimination/racism* problem. Discrimination of ethnic minority women is now only loosely and occasionally mentioned in the context of the labour market. Of course, we have race and religion and gender covered by the Dutch equal treatment law, but this law regards the inequality strands as separate. Furthermore, there are clear signs that the agency which monitors the implementation of equal treatment law (Equal Treatment Commission) treats these grounds – just as the law – as separate from each other without being sensitive to intersectional discrimination. Some of the analysed civil society documents – a good example is the most recent CEDAW shadow report – however express worries about the government tending to reinforce instead of acting against the discrimination and the stereotyping that allochthonous (particularly Muslim) women are confronted with. So, civil society has the potential to counterbalance such negative tendencies in government policies, especially since intersectional civil society organisation around gender and ethnicity is quite developed.

In this chapter we started with claiming that although theoretically intersectionality holds a promise of being well equipped to reach real gender equality, this does not necessarily mean that every intersectional attention that is found in gender equality policy documents will have a positive impact on the quality of gender equality policies. Several concerns were raised in this respect. A first tentative conclusion is that attention to the gender axis has not become marginalised or endangered as a consequence of a focus on other inequality axes. Subsequently, we chose to pay particular attention to the implications that the central attention for the gender-ethnicity intersection and for gendered-ethnicised actors might have for the quality of gender equality policies. This limitation is legitimated by the research findings in chapter 3 and 4 and it also connects closely to the country specific questions that were raised in the literature review. In the end, the negative implications of the strong attention to gender-ethnicity intersections and of the way these are framed seem to outweigh the positive ones. It would be wrong, however, to overlook the importance of various policy actions that support, facilitate or encourage the emancipation of ethnic minority women in the Netherlands.

6. CONCLUSIONS

In this report the appearance of intersectionality in Dutch gender+ equality policies was researched. A leading question has been: What are the implications of different versions and forms of intersectionality for the quality of gender+ equality policies? In order to research this question chapter three focused on describing the meaning of gender equality in Dutch gender equality policies while chapter four particularly focussed on intersectionality in these policies. Overall, the Dutch gender equality policy during the QUING research period (1995-2008) can be typified as predominantly displaying an 'inclusion' framing going hand in hand with attention to intersectionalised categories/groups that need to be included in our society and need to have the same range of choices and opportunities, while displaying some transformative framing as well. Fitting this picture, gender equality is named 'emancipation' in the Netherlands, which has a liberation connotation; it is about the empowerment of deprived groups. Gender equality is therefore hardly framed as an issue of discrimination. While the pre-QUING emancipation policy could be characterised as combining a transformative frame with an inclusion frame, the transformative aspects of (generic) gender equality policies have diminished more and more over time to almost disappear from the most recent gender emancipation policy plan. At the same time, in more recent gender equality policy, measures directed at women and girls from ethnic minorities appear more distinctively than before. In line with this, one of the conclusions in chapter three was that gender equality is mainly to be achieved for 'women in general' and ethnic minority women in particular. Other intersectionalised groups (for instance lone parents/mothers, and girls or older women) also receive attention, but overall they are less visible. Variation exists across issues though (see chapter 4). Other characteristics of Dutch gender equality policy are that a significant part of the analysed documents do not pay strong attention to gender equality and we also see quite some de-gendering in the three specific topics (non-employment, intimate citizenship and especially in gender based violence). Adjacent frames that appear next to an equality framing, are often closely linked to the issue being studied (e.g. economic development in the non-employment issue and 'crime and justice' in the gender based violence issue).

Key findings in chapter four, the chapter dedicated to describing the range of inequalities that appear in gender equality policies and to researching the naming, framing and practice of intersectionality, are that a wide range of inequalities and intersections is found in Dutch gender equality policies, but that ethnicity overall is the second most important axis after gender. It has high visibility in all four issues. Age is particularly visible in the issues of general gender equality and gender based violence. Family status has particular relevance in the issues of non-employment and intimate citizenship. Class is particularly visible in the non-employment issue. Religion and disability are practically absent in all four issues, while sexual orientation is particularly visible in the issue of intimate citizenship, but almost absent in the three remaining issues. Dutch equal treatment law covers all inequalities researched within QUING – except for class! – as well as several 'extra' inequalities. The body that monitors equal treatment law (Equal Treatment Commission), covers the same range of inequalities. Just as the law, this body seems to regard all strands as separate. Intersectional/multiple discrimination is not covered. The equality agency located within government (Directorate for Emancipation Policy) has gender(+) as its main focus. Since recently, sexual orientation policy is also their responsibility, but there are no signs of any real integration (gender policy and sexual orientation policy are separate policy dossiers). As to the naming, framing and practice of intersectionality: in the Dutch gender equality policies, many references to (de-)gendered intersectional actor groups are included. This implies that when other inequality strands than gender appear, they often intersect with gender (gender can be de-gendered though). It also means that intersectionality is hardly named as such, but usually takes the form of mentioning such intersectional categories. More explicit terms that might denote intersectionality, like 'multiple disadvantage', 'additive disadvantage', 'mutually constitutive', 'intersecting inequalities' or 'intersectional discrimination' are practically absent with

some exception to be found in civil society texts. The term 'diversity' is sometimes used both in governmental and in civil society texts. While intersectional groups take quite a central place, gender equality policy documents often display a lack of any explicit articulation or conceptualisation concerning how the inequalities that 'make up' these intersectional groups relate to each other. If a more articulate framing appears this usually is an 'additive inequalities'-framing. Much less often intersectionality is framed as 'interacting inequalities' or as 'genderedness of structural mechanisms'. Moreover, there is hardly any analytical/theoretical attention paid to the meaning, usefulness and necessity of intersectionality in the analysed documents and in the emancipation policy plans. This all means that a 'broader' vision concerning intersectionality – which would (better) explain or 'embed' the emergence of intersectionalised categories throughout the rest of the document – is usually lacking. Instead, intersectionalised groups usually enter the picture in a more casual, less embedded way. Civil society can be regarded as 'doing intersectionality' a bit better than government, since some of the analysed civil society texts show more awareness of how inequalities interact at the level of society and (subsequently) are also somewhat more sensitive for intersectional structural power differences in society. In the Netherlands, there are civil society organisations around each of the inequality strands that QUING highlights. Organisations that have an intersection or multiple inequality strands as their organising base are much less numerous then 'single strand organisations'. It is remarkable that when gender is one of the inequality axes involved it mainly concerns organisations for/of black, migrant and refugee women. Overall, there definitely is a kind of 'intersectional awareness' present in Dutch gender equality policies, but a more articulate, reflective and in-depth conceptualisation or vision of intersectionality is usually missing. There is hardly any sensitiveness to 'intersectional power differences' in society. This sensitiveness seems a bit higher in civil society.

In the literature review (chapter 2) some additional country specific questions were raised. The key interest in this review has been the academic debates on intersectionality in relation to gender and ethnicity. This – together with the fact that one of the main findings in chapter three and four is that the attention to other inequalities in Dutch gender equality policy shows a typical and biased pattern where the gender-ethnicity intersection is the most central – made it rather obvious to particularly focus in chapter 5 on the implications of this strong attention to the gender-ethnicity intersection.

Chapters three, four and five provide the material to give some tentative answers to the questions that were raised in the literature review. An 'intersectional' analysis of the coded documents in chapter four shows that a 'gender-ethnicity bias' indeed exists in Dutch gender+ equality policies. While this is most obvious for the issues of general gender equality and gender based violence, ethnicity is one among the more prominent inequality strands (intersecting with gender) in the issues of non-employment and intimate citizenship.

The scarce Dutch academic literature on intersectionality predominantly focuses – much like the American literature[49] – on the gender and ethnicity strands (and sometimes on class). In this literature a distinction is made between 'diversity thinking' and 'intersectional thinking' (Wekker and Lutz, 2001; Lutz, 2002). Which type of thinking best characterises the (biased) attention that is paid to gender and ethnicity in Dutch gender+ equality policies? It would be typical of diversity thinking when gender and ethnicity are regarded separately and then enumerated/accumulated (additive inequalities) and differences are placed outside the power discourse (Wekker and Lutz, 2001; Lutz 2002). Dutch intersectionality theorists on the contrary advocate 'intersectional thinking' where gender and ethnicity are seen to simultaneously constructing each other and where people are seen to be positioned on both the axes of gender and ethnicity and where there

---

[49] The American literature on intersectionality, among other things, was reviewed in: Walby, Sylvia. 2007. Report (theory) on intersectionality. Deliverable 13 QUING STRIQ activity.

is awareness that these positions are not the same for everyone and that some are more powerful than others. This type of thinking can transcend (racist, sexist, homophobic, ethnocentric) dichotomies and can uncover and counteract power structures/hierarchies. In chapter four it was described that while gender-ethnicity groups take quite a central place in Dutch gender equality policies, the way this intersection is framed shows a tendency towards either inarticulacy or an 'additive inequality' type of framing. There is not much attention paid to structural (intersectional) power relations between the 'ethnic minority' and the 'ethnic majority' (we use this term here, but it is never used in the policies). Chapter five shows that the way in which ethnic minorities are 'positioned' within the broader gender emancipation policy contributes to an 'us'/'them' dichotomy which sets the 'Dutch native majority group' apart from the ethnic minority groups. The 'majority' group or 'privileged' group is never seen as part of the problems that are connected to ethnic minority actors. They only appear as the 'norm group' sometimes. What also sets ethnic minority groups apart from the 'Dutch majority' is the fact that gender equality policies seem to reinforce the already existing tendency in broader society to link more structural problems with gender emancipation (such as a patriarchal culture) mainly to non-Dutch, non-Western (and in fact Islam) communities that live in the Netherlands. The message that speaks from this is that 'the' Dutch culture is modern and emancipated and has gender equality as one of its central values, while the culture of (Muslim) migrants is backward in this respect. These processes of setting apart ethnic minority groups/women and their culture(s) from the rest of Dutch society and its culture precludes the possibility to counteract existing racist dichotomies and existing power hierarchies, but rather reinforces them. So, in the end we can tentatively conclude that the way in which attention is paid to gender and ethnicity in Dutch gender equality policies is not in line with the type of thinking that is advocated by Dutch intersectionality literature. It resembles more the diversity thinking that is described in this literature.

After the above explanation it will come as no surprise that the overall picture as sketched in the article by Verloo and Roggeband also applies to the selection of documents that was analysed within QUING.

Finally, we are now able to give a tentative answer to the leading question that inspired the literature review: Does the attention that is paid to gender and ethnicity (and their intersection) in Dutch gender+ equality policies have the potential to 'do well' (leading to qualitatively better, more 'inclusive' policies) or rather to 'be harmful' (negatively impacting on the quality of the policies, because they become more 'exclusive')? When regarded in isolation, the *presence* of attention for ethnic minority women and the introduction of various policy actions that support, facilitate or encourage the emancipation of ethnic minority women in the Netherlands can be valued positively. However, it is the simultaneous *absences* that cause the balance to tip over to the negative side. The (disproportionate) attention paid to ethnic minority women partly seems to coincide with less attention being paid to other (intersectional) groups of women (for example poor women) who equally might be in need of supporting/empowering measures. Moreover, it seems that more transformative aims such as counteracting structural power inequalities between the genders and resolving patriarchal traditions in the majority group/culture are blocked because of the existence of such problems is almost denied. Finally, because ethnic minority groups are treated almost in isolation from the 'Dutch majority', racist tendencies in Dutch society in broad might be supported instead of counteracted, the more so since discrimination on the basis of religion/race often is not part of the framing.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Crenshaw, Kimberlé Wiliams. 1991. Mapping the margings: Intersectionality, identity, politics, and violence against women of colour. *Stanford Law Review* 43, 6: 1241-1299.
- Davis, Kathy. 2008. Intersectionality as buzzword: a sociology of science perspective on what makes a feminist theory successful. In *Feminist theory* vol. 9(1): 67-85.
- Ghorashi, Halleh. 2003. Ayaan Hirsi Ali daring or dogmatic? Debates on multiculturalism and emancipation in the Netherlands. In *Focaal: European Journal of Anthropology,* no. 42: 163-173
- Goldberg, David Theo. 2006. Racial Europeanization. In: *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, vol. 29(2), March 2006. pp. 331-364
- Kambel, Ellen-Rose. 2001. Op het kruispunt van sekse en etniciteit, ZMV-vrouwen in het Nederlandse werkverkeer. [On the intersection of gender and ethnicity. Black, migrant and refugee women on the Dutch labour market]. *Nemesis* 17: 103-106.
- Kambel, Ellen-Rose. 2001. Op het kruispunt van sekse en etniciteit, ZMV-vrouwen in het Nederlandse werkverkeer. [On the intersection of gender and ethnicity. Black, migrant and refugee women on the Dutch labour market]. Nemesis 17: 103-106
- Lauwers, Sophie and Femke van der Wal with contributions from Conny Roggeband and Mieke Verloo. 2008. *QUING Deliverable No. 40: Series of LARG Country reports: The Netherlands.* Nijmegen, Vienna: Radboud University Nijmegen, Institüt für die Wissenschaften vom Menschen.
- Lauwers, Sophie and Femke van der Wal. 2008. *QUING Deliverable No. 41: WHY Country Context Study: The Netherlands.* Nijmegen, Vienna: Radboud University Nijmegen, Institüt für die Wissenschaften vom Menschen.
- Lauwers, Sophie. 2007. *QUING Deliverable No. 19: Timelines of policy debates: The Netherlands. Nijmegen,* Vienna: Radboud University Nijmegen, Institüt für die Wissenschaften vom Menschen.
- Lauwers, Sophie. 2007. *QUING Deliverable No. 33: Selection of documents for frame and voice analysis: The Netherlands.* Nijmegen, Vienna: Radboud University Nijmegen, Institüt für die Wissenschaften vom Menschen.
- Lauwers, Sophie. 2007. *QUING Deliverable No. 8: LARG - state of the art and mapping of competences report: The Netherlands.* Nijmegen, Vienna: Radboud University Nijmegen, Institüt für die Wissenschaften vom Menschen.
- Lombardo, E. and M. Verloo. Forthcoming 2008. Stretching gender equality to other inequalities: Political intersectionality in European gender equality policies. In: Emanuela Lombardo, Petra Meier, Mieke Verloo (eds.), *The Discursive Politics of Gender Equality. Stretching, Bending and Policy-Making.* Routledge, forthcoming 2008.
- Lutz, Helma. 2002. Zonder Blikken of blozen. Het standpunt van de (nieuw-)realisten [Without looking or blushing. The standpoint of the (new) realists]. In *Tijdschrift voor Genderstudies*, issue 3: 7-17
- Mariette Hermans (E-quality). November 2002. Intersectionaliteit: een uitnodiging tot inclusief denken over gender, etniciteit, discriminatie en beeldvorming [Intersectionality: an invitation to inclusive thinking about gender, ethnicity and image]. Den Haag: E-quality experts in gender en etniciteit [The Hague: E-quality experts on gender and ethnicity]. http://www.e-quality.nl/e-quality/pagina.asp?pagkey=42483
- Mariette Hermans. 2002. "dit geldt voor iedereen", verslag van de conferentie 'intersectionaliteit: van theorie naar praktijk' ["This applies to everyone". Report of a conference on intersectionality: from theory to practice]. 15 November 2002. Den Haag: E-quality experts in gender en etniciteit [The Hague: E-quality experts on gender and ethnicity]. http://www.westpers.nl/Dit_geldt_voor_iedereen.pdf

- Matsuda, M. July 1991. Beside my Sister, Facing the Enemy: Legal Theory out of Coalition. In *Stanford Law Review* 43: p. 1189.
- Ministerie van Sociale Zaken en Werkgelegenheid [Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment]. May 1982. Een analyse van het "vrouwenvraagstuk" [an analysis of the "women's issue"]. Directorate for the Coordination of Emancipation Policy (DCE): Working Group on theoretical Framework (Marjan van der A, Tieneke Dijkstra, Saskia Grotenhuis, Joan Meyer, and Joke Swiebel).
- Ministry for Education, Culture and Science. 2007. Multi-year emancipation policy plan 2008-2011. September 2007. More opportunities for women: emancipation policy 2008-2011 [Meer kansen voor vrouwen: emancipatiebeleid 2008-2011]. Document no. 30420 – 50. 83 pages http://www.minocw.nl/documenten/emancipatienota_def_versie.pdf
- Ministry for Social Affairs and Employment. 1995. Emancipation Policy memorandum, 'Emancipation under Execution'. Parliamentary year 1995-1996. Document 24406, no. 5, 23 pages.
- Ministry of Culture, Recreation and Welfare. 1976. Policy plan emancipation. 'Emancipation: process of change and growth'. Parliamentary year 1976–1977, document 14 496 no. 1-2.
- Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment. 1985. Emancipation Policy plan. Parliamentary year 1984-1985. Document 19052, no 1-2, 89 pages
- Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment. 2006. Dutch Multi-Year Emancipation Policy Plan 2006-2010 Emancipation: Self-evident but not yet self-supporting!. 92 pages. http://www.emancipatieweb.nl/uploads/-p/SD/-pSDwNmB9nlCidsdxsKJuA/evaluatie_meerjaren_emancipatie_engels.pdf
- Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment. November 2000. Multi-year policy plan Emancipation. The emancipation policy for the short and middle term. 119 pages. http://docs.szw.nl/pdf/35/2002/35_2002_3_2190.pdf
- Nextgenderation Network. 8 March 2004. Not in our names! Feminist statement on the occassion of the 8th of March 2004. http://www.nextgenderation.net/projects/notinournames/english.html
- Objective of emancipation policy taken from the official government website on emancipation: http://www.emancipatieweb.nl/emancipatie_algemeen#1932, accessed on 19 June 2008
- Outshoorn, Joyce and Jantine Oldersma, 'Dutch Decay: the Dismantling of the Women's Policy Network in the Netherlands', in Outshoorn, Joyce and Johanna Kantola. 2007. *Changing State Feminism*. Houndmills/Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan
- Poldervaart, Saskia. 2002. De meervoudigheid van 'het andere'. Multiculturalisme, feminisme en affiniteitenpolitiek van 'de' (protest-)beweging [The multiplicity of 'the other'. Multiculturalism, feminism and affinity politics of the (protest) movement]. In *Tijdschrift voor Genderstudies,* issue 3: 34-47
- Prins, Baukje and Sawitri Saharso. 2006. Cultural Diversity, gender equality: the Dutch Case. Paper for the workshop on 'gender equality, cultural equality: European comparisons and lessons', Amsterdam Free University, 8-9 June 2006
- Roggeband, Conny and Mieke Verloo. June 2007. Dutch women are liberated, migrant women are a problem: the evolution of policy frames on gender and migration in the Netherlands (1995-2005). *Social Policy and Administration* vol. 41(3): 271-288
- Römkens, Renée. 2002. Over cultuurbarbarij gesproken. Geweld tegen vrouwen en het debat over multiculturaliteit. In *Een verdrag voor alle vrouwen: verkenningen van de betekenis van het VN-vrouwenverdrag voor de multiculturele samenleving* [Violence against women and the debate on multiculturality. In *A treaty for all women: explorations of the signification of the UN-women's treaty for the multicultural society*]*,* ed. R. Holtmaat, pages 95-106. Den Haag: E-Quality experts in gender and etnicity. http://www.e-quality.nl/assets/e-quality/publicaties/def-vnverdrag2.pdf

- Walby, Sylvia. 2007. Report (theory) on intersectionality. Deliverable 13 QUING STRIQ activity.
- Wekker, Gloria and Helma Lutz. 2001. Een hoogvlakte met koude winden. De geschiedenis van het gender- en etniciteitsdenken in Nederland. [A wind-swept plain: the history of gender and ethnicity-thought in the Netherlands]. In: Botman, Maayke, and Nancy Jouwe and Gloria Wekker (eds), *Caleidoscopische visies. De zwarte, migranten en vluchtelingenvrouwenbeweging in Nederland. [Kaleidoscopic visions. The black-, migrant- and refugee- women's movement in the Netherlands]* Amsterdam: Koninklijk Instituut voor de Tropen, 2001: 25-49.
- Wekker, Gloria. 2002. Nesten bouwen op een winderige plek. Denken over gender en etniciteit in Nederland [Building nests at windy spots. Thinking about gender and ethnicity in the Netherlands]. In *Tijdschrift voor Genderstudies,* issue 3: 24-33
- www.cbs.nl
- www.scp/nl
- Quing database of frame and voice analysis results: http://quing.ceu.hu