

Sheer Numbers: Critical Representation Thresholds and Women's Political Representation

Karen Beckwith and Kimberly Cowell-Meyers

Studies of women in legislatures indicate that achieving a "critical mass" of women may have the effect of changing the legislative priorities of women, increasing the number of legislative initiatives dealing with women and the passage rate of such initiatives, and altering the legislative priorities of men. In the absence of a critical mass, "token" women may be so constrained by their minority status as to be unable to respond proactively to their environment. Popular wisdom suggests that a critical mass may be necessary for women to make a difference as women in a legislature.

Yet, critical mass is both problematic and under-theorized in political science research. The critical mass threshold is debated, the mechanism of effect is unspecified, possible negative consequences are overlooked, and the potential for small numbers of elected women to effect political change on behalf of women is neglected. Beyond sheer numbers, what are the conditions that govern the ability of women legislators to make a difference? We argue that two major contextual factors beyond the sheer numbers are likely to govern the extent to which female legislators serve to represent women. Relying on the secondary literature, this article maps parliamentary and civil society contexts to sheer numbers of women to locate conditions in which female legislators are most likely to have policy successes.

To what extent does women's substantive representation depend upon the sheer numbers of elected women? Activists and scholars often assert a positive relationship between the numbers of women elected to office and public policy outcomes that are woman-friendly and even feminist. The idea of a "critical mass" is the popular and compelling notion that increasing the numbers of women in politics will start a chain reaction, leading to a new dynamic favorable to women.¹ Studies of women in legislatures indicate that achieving a "critical

mass" of women may have the effect of changing the legislative priorities of women, increasing the number of legislative initiatives dealing with women and the passage rate of such initiatives, and altering the legislative priorities of men.² Sheer numbers of elected women (descriptive representation) is expected to facilitate policy-making in women's interests (substantive representation); increasing the numbers of elected women is expected to enhance the likelihood of woman-friendly public policy.

Yet, critical mass as a theory is problematic and under-theorized in political science research.³ First, no threshold number has been established that marks the boundaries between numbers of women too small to have an impact on legislation and numbers large enough to secure policy initiatives representing women's interests. In the literature, the threshold has been variously identified as 15, 20, 25, or 30 percent.⁴ Second, the conditions under which some large number of elected women could be translated into substantive representation of women have not been theorized or elucidated. Where representation increases from small to large minorities, as in the United Kingdom in 1997, specific mechanisms for producing substantive, women-friendly, legislative change have not been identified.⁵ Research employing critical mass as a concept has not clarified the process by which sheer numbers of women might work to advance women's substantive representation. It is not clear whether sheer numbers of women should have a proportional impact, a curvilinear impact, or an absolute numbers impact on policy-making around women's interests.⁶ What is clear is that critical mass

Karen Beckwith is the Flora Stone Mather Professor of Political Science at Case Western Reserve University and Editor, with Lisa Baldez, of Politics & Gender (karen.beckwith@case.edu). Her published work includes Women's Movements Facing the Reconfigured State (Cambridge 2003, with Lee Ann Banaszak and Dieter Rucht), Political Women and American Democracy (forthcoming, with Christina Wolbrecht and Lisa Baldez), and articles on gender and politics in the European Journal of Political Research, Politics & Society, and Signs, among others. Kimberly Cowell-Meyers is Assistant Professor in the Department of Government at American University (kcowell@american.edu). She is author of Religion and Politics: The Party Faithful in Ireland and Germany (Greenwood, 2002) and articles published in Women & Politics, Nationalism and Ethnic Politics, and Irish Political Studies among others. She has worked in the British Parliament and the United States Institute of Peace.

research cannot identify a critical number after which everything changes. It is unlikely that the New Zealand House of Representatives, for example, in which women constitute 29.2 percent of the members, would experience a major increase in women's substantive representation if women constituted an additional 0.8 percent of the membership.⁷ Similarly, no such critical threshold has been identified in the Nordic countries, where women's parliamentary representation surpassed the 20 percent threshold in the 1970s and the 30 percent threshold in the 1980s.⁸

Increasing the numbers of elected women in a legislature may even produce negative consequences. The possibility that an increase in women's descriptive representation might produce negative outcomes has not been considered in the literature. Sheer numbers of women might conceivably generate a backlash from male gate-keepers, impede cross-party legislative work among female legislators, or serve to advance individual women uninterested in (or hostile to) public policies concerning women. Furthermore, an increase in women's sheer numbers could increase the partisan, ethnic, and racial heterogeneity of elected women in a legislature, with potential concomitant increases in party discipline, dividing women by party, potentially provoking tensions involving the necessary constructions of cross-race, cross-ethnicity alliances among women. Electing more women could mean electing fewer women motivated by the absence of women in politics to "act for" other women or it may make no difference at all.⁹ In short, the processes by which increasing the numbers of women in parliaments will result in women willing to advance woman-friendly legislation have yet to be elaborated, assuming elected women are situated in contexts that would permit them to undertake such a project, even if willing.

Electing a "critical mass" of women to a national legislature may be a necessary but insufficient cause of women's substantive representation. It is also possible that sheer numbers of women are not a necessary condition for legislating women's policy issues and that small numbers of women who are well-situated may be able to deliver women's substantive representation.¹⁰ What numbers, frameworks, conditions, and contexts govern the ability of women legislators to make a difference?

This article examines the comparative political research on women's descriptive and substantive representation. First, we focus on the issue of sheer numbers with a review and critique of the literature that suggests that numbers are dispositive. We review the theoretical foundations of critical mass in women's public policy-making and consider the ways in which sheer numbers of female legislators might be theorized in connection to women's substantive representation. We then turn to a critical assessment of the empirical literature on the conditions of women elected to national legislatures and the major factors that facilitate policy-making on women's issues.

Based on our theoretical assessment and empirical critique, we map the conditions under which female legislators are most and least likely to have policy successes. We consider the range of potential interactions between sheer numbers of women, on one hand, and the legislative and political context, on the other, to identify the conditions under which elected women might maximize woman-friendly policy successes. We construct a range of conditions between the two extremes: sheer numbers of women as the sole factor predicting women's policy representation, and legislative and civil society contexts identified in the literature to have been conducive for women's substantive representation. We situate research hypotheses regarding these conditions and contextual factors for assessing the impact of each, discussing the interactive potential among seven key variables that we hypothesize should provide the greatest analytical leverage for assessing the impact of sheer numbers of women on women's policy outcomes. In doing so, we map possibilities for further development of theory concerning women's descriptive and substantive representation.

Defining Women-Friendly Public Policy

The most problematic component of theorizing the relationship between women's descriptive and substantive representation concerns establishing what constitutes, in comparative political research, women's issues.¹¹ The idea of women's substantive representation hinges on the notion of some kind of shared experience among women that fosters a sense of common social or political interests.¹² Because women's experiences are socially constructed and because they vary widely based on the specific processes of construction, women's issues differ from context to context, across and within states and across time.¹³ Women's issues in the U.S. in the nineteenth century included, for example, temperance, suffrage, child-labor, public libraries, etiquette, and children's discipline. At the same time in Britain, women's issues focused on women's rights as autonomous citizens in marriage, married women's property ownership, women's rights in divorce, and child custody. In Southeast Asia, women's issues include micro enterprise aimed at women; in parts of Africa and the Middle East, female genital mutilation, veiling, citizenship rights, and early marriage are the substance of political and social movements on behalf of women. In contemporary India, women's issues include dowry requirements, protection against domestic abuse, and employment discrimination, among others.¹⁴ Because women's substantive representation differs across time and space, what it means to be successful on behalf of women's interests is governed by dynamics of culture and history.

It is also problematic that the effects of gender may not be distinct from those of race and class. In other words,

the intersectionality of gender with other identities may limit the applicability of a women's issues paradigm.¹⁵ Much of the criticism of first-world feminism by third-world activists, for example, focuses on the perceived commonality of gendered experiences that is expected to transcend histories of colonialism, and oppression, as well as different cultures and economic experiences.¹⁶ In addition, women's experiences in the same society at the same point in history may be very different, depending on other social forces, and women may not see themselves as similar or their interests as shared. They may even organize against each other.¹⁷

In light of these challenges, definitions of women's issues tend toward the general. Carroll defines women's issues as those that "disproportionately become the responsibility of women as a result of the sexual division of labor" and as issues "where policy consequences are likely to have a more immediate and direct impact on significantly larger numbers of women than of men".¹⁸ Lovenduski defines women's issues as "those that mainly affect women, either for biological reasons (such as breast cancer screening or reproductive rights) or for social reasons (sex equality or child-care policy)".¹⁹ In the European context, Hoskyns studies women's policy as "the area of political action and activity which particularly concerns (or targets) women or groups of women, or where issues are forced onto the agenda by women".²⁰

In research on legislatures, the definition of women's issue legislation also tends to be broad. Thomas, for example, uses a definition of "policies favoring women, children and families" as women's issues.²¹ Bratton defines women's interest legislation as legislation that would "decrease discrimination or counter the effects of discrimination, or would improve the socio-economic status of women".²² Bystydziński refers to care policies and gender equality policies in her study of women's policy in Norway, writing that care policies

aim to improve the quality of life of women and children via legislation focused in such areas as child and health care, education, and parental leave. While gender equality policies are concerned with the redistribution of status and power, care policies are concerned with the redistribution of goods, services and public funds.²³

Heath, Schwindt-Bayer, and Taylor-Robinson consider the way that Latin America legislatures deal with women's issues in terms of committees that "deal explicitly with women and one of the primary locations of gender inequality—the family and home (e.g., equality in the work place, protection against violence in the home)".²⁴ Swers, in her analysis of women in the U.S. Congress, defines women's legislative issues as those "that are particularly salient to women because they seek to achieve equality for women, they address women's special needs, such as women's health concerns or child-care issues; or they

confront issues with which women have traditionally been concerned in their role as caregivers, such as education, or the protection of children."²⁵ As Swers points out, however, these definitions of women's interest policies are so broad that they could be read to include all policies or none at all.²⁶

There is also the problem of distinguishing subjective from objective interests and this is why much research on women's policy issues conflates women's policy with feminist policy.²⁷ For example, Hernes uses the term "woman-friendly" to refer to gender equality and social policies produced by state feminism.²⁸ Gardiner and Leijenaar also define woman-friendly as policy designed to "improve the status of women, the adoption of and implementation of which reflect the existence of a culture of equality."²⁹ Borchorst considers woman-friendliness to describe an atmosphere in which "patriarchal patterns of power" are debated.³⁰ Lovenduski does not distinguish between feminism and women's movement activism yet means only feminist activism when she discusses women's interests in public policy.³¹ Gelb and Palley also conflate feminism and women's activism. They consider the different success rates of feminist public policy initiatives, calling them role equity and role change issues:

Role equity issues are those that extend rights now enjoyed by other groups (men, minorities) to women. Role change issues appear to produce change in the dependent female role of wife, mother, and homemaker, holding out the potential of greater sexual freedom and independence in a variety of contexts.³²

Mazur, although explicit in acknowledging her focus on *feminist* public policy, limits her study to women's policy issues that involve at least three of five criteria:

improvement of women's rights, status or situation to be in line with men's . . . ; reduction or elimination of gender-based hierarchies. . . ; a focus on both the public and private spheres or an approach that avoids distinctions between the public and the private; a focus on both men and women; and ideas that can be readily associated with a recognized feminist group, movement or individual actor in a national context.³³

Not all women's organizations or women's activism are feminist in the sense of challenging patriarchy; women often organize around nonfeminist and even anti-feminist goals.³⁴ Instead, women's organizations can be distinguished from other types of organizations, not by a litmus test of feminism but by "the primacy of women's gendered experiences, women's issues, and women's leadership and decision making."³⁵ Much has been written on the negative connotations of the "feminist" label and this literature goes some distance to explain why individuals and movements may not identify with the label or with the framework of the broader agenda.³⁶ Some women's movements may deliberately (and strategically) avoid framing themselves as feminist;³⁷ in other contexts, rights-based approaches to pressuring the state would

be inappropriate in the absence of a rights-based understanding of the state/society relationship. Indeed, some women's movements and organizations are pointedly anti-feminist (e.g., in the U.S., Daughters of the American Revolution, the Eagle Forum; in Chile, El Poder Femenino; in Nicaragua, the Association of Nicaraguan Women "Luisa Amanda Espinosa"). Furthermore, it would be a mistake to attempt to apply objective criteria of feminist content to determine if a movement is feminist or not or to parse out the goals of different women's movements for the purpose of discerning separate policy processes that pertain to each.

While we recognize these dynamics and acknowledge that women's movements and women's issues should not be conflated with feminism, we also acknowledge that nowhere in the comparative literature on women's substantive representation is a theoretical link established between women's movements that are non- or anti-feminist and the representation of issues that in an "immediate and direct way, are about women exclusively."³⁸ Furthermore, no scholarship on elected women focuses on women in rightwing parties or theorizes about the policy produced by rightwing female legislators. Therefore, the relationship we aim to map between the descriptive representation of women and their substantive representation has most commonly (if not exclusively) been constructed around advancing women's status and equality. For the purposes of this project, we narrow the scope of women's issues and operationalize women-friendly public policy as a subset of policy advanced by women's organizations that both addresses issues that affect women exclusively and directly and that simultaneously advances their status in society. By this we mean specifically policies liberalizing divorce and reproductive rights; equalizing the civil rights of men and women in terms of education, employment, pay, training, property ownership and inheritance, marriage, mobility, and political representation; providing family and medical leave, subsidizing childcare, addressing domestic abuse, sexual assault, violence against women; and providing for women's health care; among others.³⁹

In short, our focus is on the interactions between sheer numbers of women and conducive policy-making contexts, based on the empirical political research to date. Our purpose is to theorize these interactions to identify combinations of conditions that might be expected to offer the greatest possibilities for converting women's descriptive representation into substantive representation, in the context of democratic political systems. Empirical evidence supports a general claim that the number of women elected to political office has a positive impact in terms of women-friendly public policy.⁴⁰ We identify three major sets of factors that provide the greatest analytical and explanatory leverage concerning women's substantive policy representation: sheer numbers of women, conducive parliamentary contexts, and conducive civil society contexts.

Sheer Numbers and Critical Mass

Research on the influence of sheer numbers of parliamentary women rely primarily on Rosabeth Moss Kanter's foundational study of women in a male-dominated corporate environment. Because of the structure of Kanter's argument, political scientists have discussed the impact of sheer numbers in terms of a "critical mass" of women and in terms of threshold percentages that are predicted to shift (that is, increase) women's policy representation. Kanter argued that women would have little influence as individuals or as a group in mostly uniform situations and that because they are still subject to performance pressures, role entrapment, and boundary heightening as tokens in "skewed groups," they would not be able to muster influence within the larger corporation until they reached a representational threshold of 35 or 40 percent.⁴¹ Kanter hypothesized that in "uniform" majority/minority situations and "skewed" group contexts, where women constitute less than 15 percent of the overall group, their self-perception and the attitudes of their peers would interfere with their ability to interact effectively and would limit their influence. In "tilted" group contexts, where women constitute between 15 and 35 percent, Kanter hypothesized women would be seen as potential allies and that their influence would therefore increase. In "balanced" groups, where the groups are divided, at the most extreme, between 60 and 40 percent, Kanter argued, women would have their best opportunity to affect priorities and policies.⁴²

Research on women in national and regional legislatures has established that where women constitute less than 15 percent of a legislative body, women's influence will be constrained at best. There appears to be general agreement that a critical range of between 15 and 30 percent of women in a national or regional body, from parties across the political spectrum, is necessary for women to influence the agenda or style of business within that body or its policy outputs.⁴³ The impact of sheer numbers of women at the lower boundary of this critical range can be evaluated: women constitute 15 percent or more of the lower or single house members in 81 of the 185 nations about which the Inter-Parliamentary Union reported data.⁴⁴ For the purposes of assessing the critical mass argument, we employ the minimal 15 percent threshold, which we term the *critical representation threshold*. For empirical research purposes, setting any representational threshold higher than 15 percent becomes slightly problematic, given the problem of small numbers of cases. Although 53 nations meet a critical representation threshold of 20 or higher, only nine nations have a female delegation that constitutes more than 35 percent of their lower house.⁴⁵ Moving towards higher percentages by quintile, the numbers of nations within each quintile decreases (see table 1). Nonetheless, there is currently enough variation among nations in terms of their percentage parliamentary representation of elected women to assess the impact of sheer numbers.

Table 1
Nations by percentage of women in lower house of parliament (2005)

Women in Lower House of Parliament	Number of Nations
Percent < 15	104
15 ≤ percent < 20	28
20 ≤ percent < 25	25
25 ≤ percent < 30	8
30 ≤ percent < 35	11
35 ≤ percent < 40	7
Percent ≥ 40	2

Source: www.ipu.org/wmn-e/classif.htm

It is likely that the higher the percentage of women elected to a national legislature, the more conducive the conditions for women's substantive representation. In addition, because most empirical research has found a strong relationship between women's representation within leftwing parliamentary groups or caucuses, we expect that high numbers of leftwing women elected to national legislatures will similarly effect women-friendly public policy. These claims in the literature can be hypothesized as follows:

H1: Where the percentage of women elected to a national legislature is 15 percent or higher, women's substantive representation in policy terms will be greater than in legislatures with a smaller percentage of elected women.

H2: Where the percentage of women representing leftwing parties in a national legislature is 15 percent or higher, women's substantive representation in policy terms will be greater than in legislatures with a smaller percentage of women elected by leftwing parties.

These, we argue, are the two most powerful variables concerning any critical mass of female legislators and the impact of sheer numbers of women on public policy outcomes.

Political Contexts

Critical mass and sheer numbers, however, do not take into account the context within which elected women enact political representation. We argue that political context is the necessary condition for translating sheer numbers of women into women-friendly public policy. To map the relationship between descriptive and substantive representation, we need to take into consideration not only the numbers and characteristics of the elected women but also the political context within which the women legislators are positioned. The literature on women's substantive representation suggests two major contexts: parliamentary and civil society.

Parliamentary Context

Which party is in government and how electorally secure that party is may affect the likelihood that parliament will produce women-friendly public policy. The comparative political literatures on women's substantive representation, social welfare policy and feminist public policy concur on the contributions of leftwing parties to advancing women's issues.⁴⁶ The presence of a leftwing party in parliament may not be a sufficient condition for advancing women's issues but, in general, leftwing parties have a better record than rightwing parties of initiating and supporting legislation liberalizing divorce, extending abortion rights, criminalizing violence against women, expanding employment opportunities, providing women's healthcare innovations, and advancing social welfare issues.⁴⁷ As a result, we expect that leftwing parties offer sheer numbers of women a better context for promoting women-friendly policies.⁴⁸

H3: Where the governing party (or coalition of parties) is leftwing, women's substantive representation in policy terms will be greater than in legislatures governed by center or center-right parties.

Second, it is important to consider the position of the governing party: is the governing party a long-standing governing party with a weak opposition, or is the opposition a credible threat to the government and well-positioned for the next election? Where a leftwing party is secure in government, in electoral terms, female legislators should have their best chances for enacting women-friendly public policies. Electoral security can be operationalized in several ways: the percentage margin of the vote won by the governing party/coalition in the previous election, the margin of seats secured by the governing party/coalition in the previous election, and public opinion approval ratings of the governing party/coalition. We subsume all these operationalizations in the following covering hypothesis:

H4: The stronger the electoral position of a leftwing governing party or coalition, the higher women's substantive representation in policy terms will be than where the government's electoral position is precarious.

Civil Society Context

Women and politics research indicates the importance of an active feminist movement in civil society articulating women's issues and insisting upon legislative action.⁴⁹ Feminist movements are posited to have two impacts that activate the process of women's substantive representation. First, a feminist movement militating around women's issues can create a legislative context favorable to the issues it advocates by publicizing women's issues, setting a proposed legislative agenda around those issues, and serving notice of the presence of a [potential] electoral mass supporting those issues. Second, a feminist movement can

Table 2
Conditions facilitating women’s substantive representation

	CASE 1 Sheer Numbers and Positive Political Context	CASE 2 Positive Political Context	CASE 3 Numbers and Civil Society	CASE 4 Numbers and Parliament	CASE 5 Sheer Numbers
SHEER NUMBERS					
Women in parliament ≥ 15 %	x		x	x	x
Leftwing women in parliament ≥ 15 %	x		x	x	x
CONTEXTS					
Parliamentary context					
Left party in government	x	x		x	
No strong opposition	x	x		x	
Civil Society context					
Active feminist movement	x	x	x		
Weak or no opposing movement	x	x	x		
Support in public opinion	x	x	x		
WOMEN-FRIENDLY PUBLIC POLICY	Very likely	Likely	Possible	N/A	Very unlikely

Case 1 Scandinavia, 1960–present

Case 2 US, UK, FRG, late 1960s–early 1980s

Case 3 Italy, late 1960s–early 1980s

Case 4 Soviet bloc nations; no cases for parliamentary democracies

Case 5 No examples

bring direct pressure upon (or provide immediate support to) elected women, providing them with a political (and often financial) base to strengthen their capacity to advance those issues in parliament.

H5A: The more active a feminist movement in support of women’s policy issues, the higher women’s substantive representation, than where a feminist movement is weak or nonexistent.

There are, however, negative implications of feminist movement activism, specifically in the activation of opposing movements.⁵⁰ The emergence of an active countermovement should be expected to impede the efforts of elected women to advance women’s issues and to create a legislative environment less conducive to enacting those issues. Therefore, we hypothesize that

H5B: The more active a countermovement in opposition to women’s policy issues, the lower women’s substantive representation, than in a nation where a countermovement is weak or nonexistent.

Finally, support for women’s issues in public opinion, especially among the mass of women, should provide a positive context for their substantive representation. Feminist movements often make claims based on women’s public opinion to encourage legislators and political parties to adopt their policy agenda.⁵¹

H6: The more support women’s policy issues have in public opinion, the higher women’s substantive representa-

tion, than where public opinion does not support women’s policy issues.

Mapping the Numbers/Context Intersection

Mapping these seven factors provides a way to assess the impact of critical mass against sheer numbers, in specific political contexts. These seven factors are mapped interactively, albeit not exhaustively, in table 2. Although each factor should facilitate substantive policies for women, not all are necessary for substantive representation to occur. Instead, several combinations of intersecting factors are likely to effect women’s substantive representation.

Table 2 maps five exemplary sets of intersecting factors with the potential to predict women’s substantive representation. The first column of table 2 indicates the *maximum facilitating conditions* for women’s substantive policies (Case 1). All seven facilitating factors are present: many women are in office, especially in left parties; there is a secure, leftwing government, with strong support from an active women’s movement and from public opinion more broadly. In short, Case 1 relies on large numbers of elected women in the most auspicious context, hypothetically resulting in high levels of women’s substantive representation. Although the intersection of these measures of numbers and context is likely to be rare, and data on some of the conditions are not available, Scandinavian parliaments since the 1960s come closest meet these criteria. By the early 1970s, Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden had all crossed the representational threshold of 15 percent

women in the national parliament.⁵² There were relatively high numbers of leftwing women in parliament, strong left parties in government, and popular support for women's equality. In each case, women's substantive representation was the result; each nation introduced laws regarding contraception and abortion, parental leave policies, equal pay for equal work, and equal opportunities at work, among other women-friendly policies, from the early 1960s to the mid 1980s.

Case 2 is one of few women but excellent conditions. In this case, of *positive political context*, a strong leftwing party governs with little effective opposition but with the support (or insistence) of a feminist movement encouraging women-friendly policy-making, and of women-friendly public opinion. Women's substantive representation is likely to occur under these conditions, even in the absence of sheer numbers of women. Examples of Case 2 can be found in the U.S. Congress, the German Bundestag, and the British Parliament in the late 1960s to the mid-1970s.⁵³ In each example, although there were few elected women, leftwing parties controlled the legislature, and feminist movements were active and visible. As a result, legislation concerning women's equality succeeded during this period. In the Federal Republic of Germany, abortion law and marriage and family law were reformed (1969–1976). In the U.K., the Labour government introduced social reforms that included the legalization of divorce, abortion, birth control and homosexuality, the establishment of the system of comprehensive education, and health care reform.⁵⁴ In the U.S., Congress approved federal funding for family planning (1967, 1970), proposed the Equal Rights Amendment (1972),⁵⁵ and approved national child-care legislation (1971).⁵⁶ In each of these instances, women's descriptive representation never exceeded six percent.⁵⁷

Case 3 is distinctive by virtue of the presence of women in two arenas: sheer numbers of elected women within parliament, and extra-parliamentary activist women in feminist movement in civil society. In this case of *numbers and civil society*, women are active and positioned within and outside government, in the absence of a leftwing governing party. Strictly speaking, elected women are present in relatively high numbers only within leftwing parties, for two reasons. First, no scholarly literature theorizes about the strong presence of rightwing women vis-à-vis women's public policy outcomes. Second, leftwing parties, excluded from government, are unlikely to hold a large number of seats and hence are unlikely to have elected enough members, let alone female members, to enable women's representation within the entire legislature to surpass the 15 percent representational threshold. This dual positioning, although not ideal, may nonetheless be sufficient to wrest some women-friendly public policy from national legislatures. For example, in Italy in the late 1960s and into the early 1980s, activist women in leftwing parliamentary parties, supported by a growing and militant feminist move-

ment and by shifts in public opinion, were able to enact or sustain legislation concerning civil divorce, abortion, and employment opportunities for women.⁵⁸

Case 4 is a situation of *numbers and parliament* in which the sheer numbers of women are present and the left party is in a strong position in government, with little or no support in civil society. Although we map this theoretical possibility, no empirical examples are available among parliamentary democracies. The sole empirical example appears to be that of the former Soviet bloc states under communism. In these cases, women's equal legislative representation was guaranteed as a principle of communism, in the context of a single governing left party; the percentages of women sitting in national legislatures in the Soviet Union and in the Warsaw Pact nations were consistently higher than in other nations. Strictly speaking, no civil society existed, independent of state control, and hence there was no social movement sector, and no feminist or opposing movements. In most of these states, in fact, women's descriptive representation declined sharply after the collapse of communism, in part because it was not supported by sustained women's activism.⁵⁹ These examples, however, fall outside the established democracies whose policies we seek to explain and address legislatures that had little to no policy impact; in this regard, the case is more a theoretical construct than an empirically operative one. A relatively large percentage of women are unlikely to serve in a democratically elected national legislature, leftwing government notwithstanding, in the absence of support from civil society. Similarly, women-friendly public policy is not likely to occur in parliamentary democracies in the absence of pressures from civil society.

Case 5, that of *sheer numbers only*, represents a theoretical ideal-type for which, again, there is no empirical example. In this case, strong descriptive representation of women is countered by unfavorable parliamentary and civil society contexts. We include this case for two reasons. First, the absence of such empirical examples can be attributed to the causal connection between sheer numbers and the context variables. Favorable civil society and parliamentary contexts are themselves implicated with favorable numbers conditions. In the absence of a feminist movement, supportive public opinion, or a strong left-party to adopt the agenda of women's descriptive representation, women are not likely to be elected in large numbers to the assembly. This relationship between numbers and political context variables is well-established in the literature on women's descriptive representation.⁶⁰

Second, Case 5 completes the mapping of cases across the seven factors and, to that extent, is an important theoretical construct. The theoretical contribution of its empirical invisibility is that, at some level, descriptive representation and substantive representation of women are deeply connected. It is empirically impossible, although theoretically conceivable, to have large numbers of women in a

legislature where the other conditions for women's substantive representation are hostile. At some level, women actually embody women's policy issues, because when conditions are hostile to women's public policy issues, women are not elected to parliaments. Case 5—of sheer numbers of women in a politically hostile context—would be the least favorable, and least likely, case for women-friendly public policy.

Note that one final possibility has been excluded from this table: cases where none of the conditions obtain. That is, no women sit in parliament, no left parties govern, there is no feminist movement, and public opinion does not support women's issues. We have excluded this set of cases for several reasons which, while perhaps obvious, deserve mention. First, there is no explicit theorizing in the literature on women's policy issues or women's election to parliament concerning outcomes regarding women's public policy under these unfavorable conditions. It would be possible to do so, for example, insofar as these conditions might map to fascist states, which actually legislate in regard to women's issues but not in the direction we predict for favorable conditions.⁶¹ Hypothesizing about the absence of the seven factors we have identified in the literature and mapped in table 2 would require something other than a simple statement of null hypothesis; a different set of theorizing, which no one has yet undertaken, would be required.⁶² Second, the absence of such theorizing would nonetheless require the development of another set of hypotheses suggesting that the absence of any facilitating conditions would not predict an absence of women's public policy, but would predict instead a wave of anti-women/anti-feminist public policy around issues of abortion, reproduction, marriage, rape, wife-beating, purdah, and other similar issues, a project beyond the scope of this paper.

Conclusions

We have developed a theoretical model that is parsimonious, testable in all democracies, consistent with existing empirical research, and supported by the available theorizing. There are many other variables suggested in the literature such as incumbency and newness, levels and capacity of party discipline, ethnic and racial diversity, access to leadership and legislative committee positions, attitudinal diversity among the women and their willingness to represent other women, political and electoral stability, institutional newness, design, and culture, the presence or absence of women's policy machinery in the form of an executive agency dedicated to women's issues, that might provide additional explanation for women's public policy enactment.⁶³ The seven we have selected are, however, most likely to provide the strongest analytical leverage on the question of critical mass and on the relationship between numbers of women (descriptive representation) and women-friendly policy outcomes (substantive representation).

As suggested in the discussion of the cases, above, it is unlikely that a subset of cases can be mapped to every combination of sheer numbers and favorable contexts. Nonetheless, we advance table 2 as a site for plotting more specific hypotheses and applying case data. Among the five ideal-type cases we discuss, only two are likely to predict women's policy success: Cases 1 and 2, *the maximum facilitating conditions and positive political contexts*. An arrow diagram of these two cases reveals three possibilities of strong relationships between numbers and contexts.

ARROW DIAGRAM 1: DIRECT IMPACT OF CIVIL SOCIETY FACTORS ON WOMEN-FRIENDLY PUBLIC POLICY

Civil Society Context ⇒ Women-Friendly Public Policy

ARROW DIAGRAM 2 (Case 1): CIVIL SOCIETY FACTORS AS ANTECEDENT TO SHEER NUMBERS + POLITICAL CONTEXT, WITH THAT COMBINATION DIRECTLY EFFECTING WFPP

Civil Society Context ⇒ Sheer Numbers of Women
+ Political Context
⇒ Women-Friendly Public Policy

ARROW DIAGRAM 3 (Case 2): CIVIL SOCIETY FACTORS AS ANTECEDENT TO POLITICAL CONTEXT ALONE, WHICH THEN DIRECTLY EFFECTS WFPP

Civil Society Context ⇒ Political Context
⇒ Women-Friendly Public Policy

In these models, we understand civil society context as antecedent both to sheer numbers and to political context; we also model civil society as directly affecting public policy. Two major paths, therefore, predict women's public policy outcomes: one directly through civil society, where the pressure from public opinion and feminist movements, in the absence of opposition, persuade (male) legislators to act for women (Case 2); and a second path indirectly from civil society through combinations of agency represented by favorable political conditions of leftwing governments with little opposition or sheer numbers of women (Case 1).

As data are mapped to these diagrams and to the table, competing impacts concerning sheer numbers and critical mass explanations should become apparent. A critical mass impact, relying on a percentage threshold, should emerge as a sudden or dramatic increase in women's public policy; as the percentage of elected women increases from one election to the next (in parliament as a whole or simply in a major leftwing party), a step change should not be evident until the percentage of elected women meets or surpasses the critical representational threshold. In contrast, the impact

of sheer numbers can be evinced in two ways: within a nation across time, or across nations. First, as the percentage of women in a single nation's legislature increases across time, there should be a concomitant increase in women's public policy. Second, among nations with a high percentage of women in their legislatures, public policy in women's interests should be high; nations with a small percentage of elected women should have little success in legislating on women's policy issues. Similarly, women-friendly public policy is not likely to occur in parliamentary democracies in the absence of pressures from civil society, particularly in the absence of an organized feminist movement.⁶⁴

When and under what conditions does women's substantive representation occur? Drawing from the comparative literature on women-friendly public policy, we have proposed a means to predict women's representation in policy terms. In doing so, we take the claims of critical mass theory and contextualize them in other explanatory variables, showing the limits of the sheer numbers claim but demonstrating a way to approach the relationship between women's descriptive and substantive representation. Our purpose is to advance the theoretical discussion of the link between women's elected representation and women-friendly public policy beyond the idea of critical mass and open up avenues for further research into how women's interests are advanced in the policy process.

Notes

- 1 Dahlerup 1988.
- 2 Flammang 1985; Saint-Germain 1989; Skard and Haavio-Mannila 1985. See *inter alia* Flammang 1985; Thomas 1991; Thomas and Welch 1991; Yoder 1991.
- 3 Sarah Childs and Mona Lee Krook (2005) examine the implications and limitations of critical mass theory as well as the popular history of the concept.
- 4 See *inter alia* Dahlerup 2005; Studlar and Matland 1996; Thomas 1991.
- 5 Childs 2001b; Cowley and Childs 2003, 2001; Dahlerup 1988; Lovenduski 2001.
- 6 See Crowley 2004.
- 7 Grey 2002.
- 8 Dahlerup 1988. We thank Drude Dahlerup for drawing this example to our attention.
- 9 See Carroll 2001; Childs 2001a; Childs and Krook 2005; Dahlerup 1988.
- 10 See Crowley 2004; Childs and Krook 2005; Dahlerup 1988, 287; Grey 2006; Tremblay 2005.
- 11 See Beckwith 2000; Mohanty, Russo, and Torres 1991; Molyneux 2003, 1985.
- 12 Phillips 1995, 1998.
- 13 Mohanty 2003; Weldon 2006.
- 14 Basu 1995.
- 15 See Mohanty, Russo, and Torres 1991; Lovenduski and Norris 1993; Wägnerud 2000; Youngs, Jones, and Pettman 1999.
- 16 See Mohanty, Russo, and Torres 1991.
- 17 See Baldez 2002; Luker 1984; Waylen 1996.
- 18 Carroll 1992, 28; 1994, 15.
- 19 Lovenduski 2001, 745.
- 20 Hoskyns 1996, 6.
- 21 Thomas 1994, 7.
- 22 Bratton 2002, 123.
- 23 Bystydzienski 1995, 72.
- 24 Heath, Schwindt-Bayer, and Taylor-Robinson 2005, 421.
- 25 Swers 2002, 34.
- 26 *Ibid.*
- 27 Wägnerud 2000; Jones 1990; Molyneux 1985.
- 28 Hernes 1987.
- 29 Gardiner and Leijenaar 1997, 61.
- 30 Borchorst 1994.
- 31 Lovenduski 1986; especially 207–208.
- 32 Gelb and Palley 1996, 6.
- 33 Mazur 2002, 30–31.
- 34 See Baldez 2002; Beckwith 1996, 2000.
- 35 Beckwith 2000, 437.
- 36 See, e.g., Conover 1988.
- 37 See Conover and Sapiro 1993; Guenther 2003.
- 38 Reingold 2000.
- 39 Note that there are also women's organizations that are not expressly feminist but that have mobilized in support of women-friendly public policies concerning childcare and maternal benefits, among other policies. These include the National Council of Women (Ireland; see Connolly 2002, 254, n6); the Committee of Mothers (Russia; see White 2000); and housewives' associations in the Nordic countries (Dahlerup and Gulli 1985); see also the Women's Alliance (Iceland; Sigurdjarnardóttir 1998), the Women's Cooperative Guild of England, the *Union féminisme civique et sociale* of France and the League of Women Voters in the U.S. (Black, 1989).
- 40 See *inter alia* Bystydzienski 1992, Dahlerup 1988, Darcy, Welch and Clark 1994, Haavio-Mannila 1985, Kathlene 1998, Mansbridge 1999, 2005; Swers 2002, Thomas and Wilcox 1998.
- 41 Kanter 1977, 966, 972–984.
- 42 Although Kanter hypothesized solely about women in her work, she suggested that a similar logic would apply to racial minorities in corporate settings (1977, 966).
- 43 See Studlar and McAllister 2002, 235–238; Bystydzienski 1992, 15.
- 44 “Women in National Parliaments,” as of October 30, 2005. www.ipu.org/wmn-e/classif.htm
- 45 Nations include Costa Rica, Spain Cuba, the Netherlands, Denmark, Finland, Norway, Sweden, and

- Rwanda, only two of which (Sweden and Rwanda) meet a 40 percent representational threshold. Note that eliminating the Scandinavian countries leaves only 5 nations in the 35 percent group. www.ipu.org/wmn-e/classif.htm
- 46 See, e.g., Banaszak, Beckwith, and Rucht 2003; Bashevkin 1985; Katzenstein and Mueller 1987; Lovenduski and Norris 2002; Nelson and Chowdhury 1994; Threlfall 1996.
- 47 Beckwith 1987; Staggenborg 1991, but see Htun 2003; Jenson 1987; Weldon 2002.
- 48 Any categorization of parties as leftwing is time- and nation-specific; we do not attempt such classification here. For an attempt to identify left- and right-wing parties, see Gabel and Huber 2000.
- 49 Baldez 2002; Basu 1995; Banaszak, Beckwith, and Rucht 2003; Howell and Mulligan 2006; Htun 2003; Katzenstein and Mueller 1987; Mueller 1988; Threlfall 1996; Weldon 2002, 2006.
- 50 See Beckwith 2002, 2003; Studlar and McAllister 2002; Luker 1984; Mansbridge 1986; Baldez 2002; Buechler 1990, Meyer and Staggenborg 1996; Tarrow 1998.
- 51 Mueller 1988, Mansbridge 1986.
- 52 See Skard and Haavio-Mannila 1985, table 4.3, 62–63. In Finland, women accounted for at least 17 percent of all parliamentary seats by 1966.
- 53 In the U.S., the Democrats lost control of the executive in 1968 in the context of the ongoing Vietnam War, which though divisive, did not divert public attention from other social reform movements or martialize civil society.
- 54 Note that the British example is not a perfect instance of this case as there was significant and growing Conservative opposition to the Labour governments led by Harold Wilson.
- 55 The ERA never received sufficient support from the states to achieve ratification.
- 56 President Nixon vetoed the legislation, which Congress was unable to override.
- 57 The U.S. Congress averaged less than 3 percent women from 1965–1973; the British Parliament averaged approximately 4 percent from 1964 to 1974; and the FRG's Bundestag mean representation was approximately 6 percent from 1969 to 1976.
- 58 Beckwith 1987; della Porta 2003. Note, however, that women's parliamentary representation within left parties varied by party. The Italian Communist Party (PCI) consistently elected a higher percentage of women than did the Italian Socialist Party which, from 1963 through 1979, never managed to elect more than one woman (for a "high" of 1.8 percent of the PSI delegation). In addition, from 1968 to 1992, women in the PCI delegation met or exceeded the 15 percent representational threshold only twice: in 1976 (17.6 percent) and 1983 (20.3 percent).
- 59 See Matland and Montgomery 2003; Nechemias 1994.
- 60 See Katzenstein and Mueller 1987; Kittilson 1999; Bystydzienski 1988; Gelb 1989; Studlar and Matland 1996; Lovenduski and Norris 1993; Norris 1993.
- 61 See, for example, fascist Italy under Mussolini and the development of rape provisions in the *Codice Rocco*.
- 62 See, however, Htun 2003.
- 63 See Childs 2001a; Beckwith 2007; Jeydel and Taylor 2003; Bratton 2002; Swers 2002; Cowell-Meyers 2003, 2001; Dobrowolsky 2003; Dodson 2006; Considine and Deutchman 1996; Kathlene 1994; Kenney 1996; Rosenthal 1998; Mazur 2002. Note that our project focuses on explaining women's substantive representation, not women's descriptive representation or the election of numbers of women, which would involve a list of antecedent variables well-established in the literature. See, e.g., Carroll 1994; Darcy, Welch, and Clark 1994; Matland 1998; Lovenduski and Norris 1993; Welch and Studlar 1990, 1996.
- 64 See Weldon 2002; Chappell 2002.

References

- Baldez, Lisa. 2002. *Why Women Protest: Women's Movements in Chile*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Banaszak, Lee Ann. 1996. *Why Movements Succeed or Fail: Opportunity, Culture, and the Struggle for Woman Suffrage*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Banaszak, Lee Ann, Karen Beckwith, and Dieter Rucht, eds. 2003. *Women's Movements Facing the Reconfigured State*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bashevkin, Sylvia. 1985. *Women and Politics in Western Europe*. London: Frank Cass.
- . 1996a. Losing common ground: Feminists, conservatives and public policy in Canada during the Mulroney years. *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 29 (2): 211–43.
- . 1996b. Tough times in review: The British women's movement during the Thatcher years. *Comparative Political Studies* 28 (1): 525–52.
- Basu, Amrita, ed. 1995. *The Challenge of Local Feminisms*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Beckwith, Karen. 1987. Response to feminism in the Italian Parliament: Divorce, abortion, and sexual violence legislation. In *The Women's Movements of Western Europe and the United States: Consciousness, Political Opportunity, and Public Policy*, ed. Mary Fainsod Katzenstein and Carol McClurg Mueller. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

- . 1996. Lancashire women against pit closures: Women's standing in a men's movement. *Signs* 21 (4): 1034–68.
- . 2000. Beyond compare? Women's movements in comparative perspective. *European Journal of Political Research* 37 (4): 431–68.
- . 2007. Numbers and newness: The descriptive and substantive representation of women. *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 40 (1): 27–49.
- Black, Naomi. 1989. *Social Feminism*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Borchorst, Anette. 1994. The Scandinavian welfare states: Patriarchal, gender-neutral or woman-friendly? *International Journal of Contemporary Sociology* 1 (8): 3–21.
- Bratton, Kathleen. 2002. The effect of legislative diversity on agenda setting: Evidence from six state legislatures. *American Politics Research* 30 (2): 115–42.
- Buechler, Steven M. 1990. *Women's Movements in the United States*. New Brunswick and London: Rutgers University Press.
- Bystydziński, Jill. 1988. Women in politics in Norway. *Women & Politics* 8: 73–95.
- , ed. 1992. *Women Transforming Politics: Worldwide Strategies for Empowerment*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- . 1995. *Women in Electoral Politics: Lessons from Norway*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Carroll, Susan. 1994. *Women as Candidates in American Politics*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- . 2001. *The Impact of Women in Public Office*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Chappell, Louise. 2002. *Gendering Government: Feminist Engagement with the State in Australia and Canada*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- Childs, Sarah. 2001a. Attitudinally 'feminist'? The new Labour women MPs and the substantive representation of women. *Politics* 21 (3): 178–85.
- . 2001b. In their own words: New Labour women and the substantive representation of women. *British Journal of Politics and International Relations* 3 (2): 173–90.
- Childs, Sarah, and Mona Lee Krook. 2005. "The Substantive Representation of Women: Rethinking the 'Critical Mass' Debate." Presented at the American Political Science Association meetings, Washington, DC, September 1–4.
- Conover, Pamela. 1988. Feminists and the gender gap. *Journal of Politics* 50 (4): 985–1010.
- Conover, Pamela, and Virginia Sapiro. 1993. Gender, feminist consciousness, and war. *American Journal of Political Science* 37 (4): 1079–100.
- Considine, Mark, and Iva Deutchman. 1996. Instituting gender: State representation in Australia and the U.S. *Women & Politics* 16 (4): 1–19.
- Cowell-Meyers, Kimberly. 2001. Gender, power and peace: A preliminary look at women in the Northern Ireland Assembly. *Women & Politics* 23 (3): 55–88.
- . 2003. Women in Northern Ireland: Gender and the politics of peace-building in the New Legislative Assembly. *Irish Political Studies* 18 (1): 72–97.
- Cowley, Philip, and Sarah Childs. 2001. "Critical but not Rebellious? New Labour Women in the House of Commons." Presented at the American Political Science Association Special Session on Women and Politics, San Francisco, August 29.
- Cowley, Philip, and Sarah Childs. 2003. Too spineless to rebel? New Labour's women MPs. *British Journal of Political Science* 33(3): 345–65.
- Crowley, Jocelyn. 2004. When tokens matter. *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 24 (1): 109–36.
- Dahlerup, Drude. 1988. From a small to a large minority. *Scandinavian Political Studies* 11 (4): 275–98.
- . 2005. "The Theory of a 'Critical Mass' Revisited." Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington, DC, September 1.
- Dahlerup, Drude, and Brita Gulli. 1985. Women's organizations in the Nordic countries: Lack of force or counterforce? In *Unfinished Democracy: Women in Nordic Politics*, ed. Elina Haavio-Mannila. Oxford and New York: Pergamon Press.
- Darcy, R., Susan Welch, and Janet Clark. 1994. *Women, Elections and Representation*. 2d ed. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- della Porta, Donatella. 2003. The women's movement, the Left, and the state: Continuities and changes in the Italian case. In *Women's Movements Facing the Reconfigured State*, ed. Lee Ann Banaszak, Karen Beckwith, and Dieter Rucht. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dobrowolsky, Alexandra. 2003. Shifting states: Women's constitutional organizing across time and space. In *Women's Movements Facing the Reconfigured State*, ed. Lee Ann Banaszak, Karen Beckwith, and Dieter Rucht. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dodson, Debra L. 2006. *The Impact of Women in Congress*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Flammang, Janet. 1985. Female officials in the feminist capitol: The case of Santa Clara County. *Western Political Quarterly* 38: 94–118.
- Gabel, Matthew J., and John D. Huber. 2000. Putting parties in their place: Inferring party left-right ideological positions from party manifestos data. *American Journal of Political Science* 44 (1): 94–103.
- Gardiner, Frances, and Monique Leijenaar. 1997. The timid and the bold: An analysis of the women-friendly-state in Ireland and the Netherlands. In *Sex Equality Policy in Western Europe*, ed. F. Gardiner. London: Routledge Press.

- Gelb, Joyce. 1989. *Feminism and Politics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Gelb, Joyce, and Marian Palley. 1996. *Women and Public Policies: Reassessing Gender Politics*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia.
- Grey, Sandra. 2002. Does size matter? Critical mass and New Zealand's women MPs. *Parliamentary Affairs* 55: 19–29.
- . 2006. "Numbers and Beyond: The Relevance of Critical Mass in Gender Research." Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington, DC, September 1–4.
- Guenther, Katja. 2003. A case study of local feminist mobilization in Eastern Germany, 1990–2000. *Journal of Women's History* 15 (3): 143–49.
- Haavio-Mannila, Elina. 1985. *Unfinished Democracy: Women in Nordic Politics*. Oxford and New York: Pergamon Press.
- Heath, Roseanna Michelle, Leslie Schwindt-Bayer, and Michelle Taylor-Robinson. 2005. Women on the sidelines: Women's representation on committees in Latin American legislatures. *American Journal of Political Science* 49 (2): 420–36.
- Hernes, Helga Maria. 1987. *Welfare State and Woman Power: Essays in State Feminism*. London: Norwegian University Press.
- Hoskyns, Catherine. 1996. *Integrating Gender: Women, Law and Politics in the European Union*. London: Verso.
- Howell, Jude and Diane Mulligan. 2006. *Gender and Civil Society*. London: Routledge.
- Htun, Mala. 2003. *Sex and the State: Abortion, Divorce, and the Family Under Latin American Dictatorships and Democracies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jeydel, Alana, and Andrew J. Taylor. 2003. Are women legislators less effective? Evidence from the U.S. House in the 103rd–105th Congress. *Political Research Quarterly* 56 (1): 19–27.
- Jones, Kathleen B. 1990. Citizenship in a woman-friendly polity. *Signs* 15 (4): 781–813.
- Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. 1977. Some effects of proportions on group life: Skewed sex ratios and responses to token women. *American Journal of Sociology* 82 (5): 965–90.
- Kathlene, Lyn. 1994. Power and influence in state legislative policy-making: The interaction of gender and position in committee hearing debates. *American Political Science Review* 88 (3): 560–76.
- . 1998. In a different voice: Women and the policy process. In *Women and Elected Office: Past, Present and Future*, ed. Sue Thomas and Clyde Wilcox. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Katzenstein, Mary Fainsod, and Carol McClurg Mueller, eds. 1987. *The Women's Movements of the United States and Western Europe*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Kenney, Sally. 1996. New research on gendered political institutions. *Political Research Quarterly* 49: 445–66.
- Kittilson, Miki Caul. 1999. Women's representation in Parliament: The role of political parties. *Party Politics* 5 (1): 79–98.
- Lovenduski, Joni. 1986. *Women and European Politics: Contemporary Feminism and Public Policy*. Sussex: Wheatsheaf.
- . 2001. Women and politics: Minority representation or critical mass? *Parliamentary Affairs* 54: 743–58.
- Lovenduski, Joni, and Pippa Norris. 1993. *Gender and Party Politics*. London and Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- . 2002. Westminster women: The politics of presence. *Political Studies* 51 (1): 84–103.
- Luker, Kristin. 1984. *Abortion and the Politics of Motherhood*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Mansbridge, Jane. 1986. *Why We Lost the ERA*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- . 1999. Should blacks represent blacks and women represent women? A contingent "Yes." *Journal of Politics* 61 (3): 628–57.
- . 2005. Quota problems: Essentialist dangers and potential safeguards. *Politics & Gender* 1 (4): 622–38.
- Matland, Richard E. 1998. Women's Representation in National Legislatures: Developed and Developing Countries. *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 23 (1): 109–125.
- Matland, Richard E., and Kathleen A. Montgomery, eds. 2003. *Women's Access to Political Power in Post-Communist Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Matland, Richard E., and Donley Studlar. 1996. The contagion of women candidates in single-member district and proportional representation electoral systems: Canada and Norway. *Journal of Politics* 58 (3): 707–34.
- Mazur, Amy. 2002. *Theorizing Feminist Policy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Meyer, David S., and Suzanne Staggenborg. 1996. Movements, countermovements, and the structure of political opportunity. *American Journal of Sociology* 101: 1628–60.
- Mohanty, Chandra. 2003. *Feminism without Borders: Decolonizing Theory, Practicing Solidarity*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Mohanty, Chandra, A. Russo, and L. Torres, eds. 1991. *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Molyneux, Maxine. 1985. Mobilization without emancipation? Women's interests, the state, and revolution in Nicaragua. *Feminist Studies* 11 (2): 227–54.
- . 2003. *Women's Movements in International Perspective: Latin America and Beyond*. London: Institute of Latin American Studies.

- Mueller, Carol McClurg, ed. 1988. *The Politics of the Gender Gap: The Social Construction of Political Influence*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Nechemias, Carol. 1994. Democratization and women's access to legislative seats: The Soviet case, 1989–1991. *Women & Politics* 14 (3): 1–19.
- Nelson, Barbara J., and Najma Chowdhury, eds. 1994. *Women and Politics Worldwide*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Norris, Pippa. 1993. Conclusions: Comparing legislative recruitment. In *Gender and Party Politics*, ed. Joni Lovenduski and Pippa Norris. London: Sage.
- Phillips, Anne. 1995. *The Politics of Presence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 1998. Democracy and representation: or, Why should it matter who our representatives are? In *Feminism and Politics*, ed. A. Phillips. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Reingold, Beth. 2000. *Representing Women*. Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press.
- Rosenthal, Cindy Simon. 1998. *When Women Lead*. New York: Oxford.
- Saint-Germain, Michelle. 1989. Does their difference make a difference? The impact of women on public policy in the Arizona legislature. *Social Science Quarterly* 70 (4): 956–68.
- Sigurdjarnardóttir, Sighrúdur Helga. 1998. On their own premises: The political project of the Icelandic Women's Alliance. In *Is There a Nordic Feminism?* ed. Drude von de Fehr, Bente Rosenbeck, and Anna G. Jónasdóttir. London: UCL Press.
- Skard, Torild, and Elina Haavio-Mannila. 1985. Women in Parliament. In *Unfinished Democracy: Women in Nordic Politics*, ed. Elina Haavio-Mannila. Oxford and New York: Pergamon Press.
- Staggenborg, Suzanne. 1991. *The Pro-Choice Movement: Organization and Activism in the Abortion Conflict*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Studlar, Donley T. and Richard E. Matland. 1996. The contagion of women candidates in single and multi-member district systems: Canada and Norway. *Journal of Politics* 58 (3): 707–33.
- Studlar, Donley T., and Ian McAllister. 2002. Does a critical mass exist? A comparative analysis of women's legislative representation since 1950. *European Journal of Political Research* 41 (2): 233–53.
- Swers, Michele L. 2002. *The Difference Women Make: The Policy Impact of Women in Congress*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Tarrow, Sidney. 1998. *Power in Movement*. 2d ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Thomas, Sue. 1991. The impact of women on state legislative policies. *Journal of Politics* 53 (4): 958–76.
- . 1994. *How Women Legislate*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Thomas, Sue, and Susan Welch. 1991. The impact of gender on activities and priorities of state legislators. *Western Political Quarterly* 44: 445–56.
- Thomas, Sue, and Clyde Wilcox. 1998. *Women and Elected Office: Past, Present and Future*. New York: Oxford.
- Threlfall, Monica, ed. 1996. *Mapping the Women's Movement*. London: Verso.
- Tremblay, Manon. 2005. "Understanding Women's Descriptive and Substantive Representation: Critical Mass or Surrogate Representation?" Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington, DC, September 1–4.
- Tremblay, Manon, and Rejean Pelletier. 2000. More feminists or more women? Descriptive and substantive representations of women in the 1997 Canadian Federal Elections. *International Political Science Review* 21 (4): 381–405.
- Wägnerud, Lena. 2000. Testing the politics of presence: Women's representation in the Swedish Riksdag. *Scandinavian Political Studies* 23 (1): 67–91.
- Waylen, Georgina. 1996. *Gender in Third World Politics*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner.
- Welch, Susan, and Donley T. Studlar. 1990. Multi-member districts and the representation of women: Evidence from Britain and the United States. *Journal of Politics* 52 (2): 391–412.
- . 1996. The opportunity structure for women's candidacies and electability in Britain and the United States. *Political Research Quarterly* 49 (4): 861–74.
- Weldon, S. Laurel. 2002. *Protest, Policy and the Problem of Violence against Women*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- . 2006. The structure of intersectionality: A comparative politics of gender. *Politics & Gender* 2 (2): 235–248.
- White, Anne. 2000. "New Mothers' Campaigning Organizations in Russia." In *Feminisms and Women's Movements in Contemporary Europe*, ed. Anna Bull, Hanna Diamond, and Rosalind Marsh. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Yoder, Janice D. 1991. Rethinking tokenism: Looking beyond numbers. *Gender & Society* 5 (2): 178–92.
- Youngs, G., K.B. Jones, and J.J. Pettman. 1999. New spaces, new politics: International feminist directions. *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 1 (1): 1–13.