University Press Scholarship Online

Theorizing Feminist Policy

Amy G. Mazur

Theorizing Feminist Policy intersects empirical feminist policy analysis with non-feminist policy studies to define and contribute to the new field of Feminist Comparative Policy. The book first identifies this new area of study, showing how it dialogues with Gender and Politics, Comparative Public Policy, Comparative Politics, and Public Policy Studies. Next, the book seeks to strengthen one of the weakest links of this new area, the study of explicitly feminist government action. In the remaining nine chapters, feminist policy is mapped out as a relatively new public policy sector, with eight sub-sectors—blueprint, political representation, equal employment, reconciliation, family law, reproductive rights, sexuality and violence, and public service delivery. A qualitative and comparative framework is developed to analyse the profiles and styles of feminist policy in post-industrial democracies in 27 different cases of feminist policy formation across 13 different countries. The initial empirical study makes the case for feminist policy as a new sector of state action, concluding tentatively that successful feminist policy formation is a subtle combination of feminist strategic partnerships, non-feminist allies, institutions, culture, and international influences. These tentative findings also shed new light on the perennial questions of Comparative Politics and Policy: do politics, institutions, national policy style, sector, institutions, or culture matter the most in determining policy processes and outcomes? The book finishes by suggesting the next steps in developing comparative theories of feminist policy formation. Theorizing Feminist Policy, therefore, goes beyond just describing the dimensions of feminist policy from existing literature, it seeks to systematically contribute to comparative theories of how the contemporary post-industrial state has taken on social change at the beginning of the twenty-first century.

The Scope of EU Government

Lieven De Winter and Marc Swyngedouw

in Political Representation and Legitimacy in the European Union

This chapter is the second of four on the question of legitimacy in the EU, and deals with the scope of government in the EU. The first part of the chapter examines to what extent and for which policy sectors European citizens allocate decision-making responsibilities to the different levels of government—the EU, the national state, and regional authorities. The second part tests a set of hypotheses concerning the structural and attitudinal characteristics that affect differences in preferences for levels of government. The last part of the chapter examines to what extent citizens' preferences on decision-making levels are congruent with those of their elected representatives who can (co-)decide on potential future shifts of competencies between the national states and the EU.

Contemporary Hong Kong Politics

Percy Luen-tim Lui

Wai-man Lam and Ian Holliday (eds)

This book is a project by the Hong Kong Political Science Association. The politics of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (HKSAR) have often been turbulent in the decade since the 1997 handover. The book presents an analysis of the main strands of continuity and change during the period. It looks first at the core institutions of the SAR, focusing on the executive, legislature, judiciary, civil service, District Councils, and advisory and statutory bodies. The book then turns to supporting structures in the wider society, paying particular attention to political parties and elections, civil society and non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and mass media and public opinion. Analyses of key policy sectors follow—notably economic policy, social policy, and urban policy. To finish, the book examines Hong Kong's relations with the Mainland and the wider world.

Conclusion

Annabelle Littoz-Monnet

in The European Union and Culture: Between Economic Regulation and European Cultural Policy

This chapter summarises the core observations of the book and their meaning in reference to the broader current theoretical debates on Europeanisation, Communitarisation, and the European integration processes. It compares the conclusions of the book to those of similar studies in other policy sectors and concludes that the EU became an active regulator in the cultural sector as it did across a broad range of policy areas. European institutions' 'creeping competence' extends to new policy areas through the application of economic principles to new issues where no Treaty competence otherwise exists.

Learning from the past, prospects for the future

Huw Davies, Sandra Nutley, and Peter Smith

in What works?: Evidence-based policy and practice in public services

This chapter draws together a summary and set of conclusions from the wide-ranging contributions to this book. The preceding chapters have revealed a surprisingly long and rich history of the use of evidence in forming public sector policy and practice in the UK. However, they also point to major shortcomings in the extent of evidence available, the nature of that evidence, and the ways in which it is disseminated and used by policy makers and practitioners. This chapter focuses on cross-sector learning by using the experiences described thus far to explore key issues relating to evidence-based policy and practice: the appropriateness of developing evidence-based approaches; the nature of credible research evidence; securing the research capacity to meet policy makers' and practitioners' need for evidence; and ensuring that the evidence is used.

The European Union and Culture

Annabelle Littoz-Monnet

This book explains how and why the European Union has started to intervene in the cultural policy sector—understood here as the public policies aimed at supporting and regulating the arts and cultural industries. It is a comprehensive account of the Communitarisation process of the cultural policy sector. Before 1992, no legal basis for EU intervention in the field of culture appeared in the Treaties. Member states were, in any case, reluctant to share their competences in a policy sector considered to be an area of national sovereignty. In such circumstances, how was the Communitarisation of the policy sector ever possible? Who were the policy actors that played a role in this process? What were their motives? And why were certain actors more influential than others?