Chapter 8

# VARYING DEGREES OF EUROPEANIZATION IN SWEDISH WOMEN'S ORGANIZATIONS

*Ylva Stubbergaard*

European Union (EU) institutions and EU policies have become of interest for an increasing number of civil society organizations (CSOs) in Sweden, but not for all. This study has the overall aim of understanding how and why different women's organizations[1] are active at different levels of policymaking. Scholars have found several reasons for CSOs to aim for participating in policymaking at the EU level (della Porta and Caiani 2009; Sánchez-Salgado 2007, 2014; Strid 2009). In this study the alternative—to *not* actively try to participate at the EU level—is equally interesting to analyze.

The analysis is influenced by Nancy Fraser's ( 2008, 2005; Fraser and Nash 2014) work on reimagining political space. Fraser focuses on the principal question of justice in times when political levels are being transformed in terms of transnationalization and globalization. For this chapter, the approach has particularly contributed to the dimensions of participation at different policymaking levels.

The dimensions of analysis are adjusted to suit the main research question on why women's CSOs are active to a varying extent at different levels of policymaking. The following questions have guided the analysis: What issues within gender equality do the CSOs focus on? How are formal and informal processes of policymaking at the EU level perceived and used by the CSOs? Who is formally included in decision-making processes? And how are the CSOs reacting to the principles of inclusion at the EU level?

The different reasons for organizations to Europeanize are expected to lead to different extents of Europeanization because different goals are connected to different regulations and resources and to different activities by the CSOs. With the interactive perspective on Europeanization that was outlined in chapter 1, CSOs are considered to be subjects in Europeanization processes when they participate with the aim to influence ideas, discourses, policies, or structures connected to the EU. They might also be constrained by different conditions set by political institutions, by their relations to other CSOs, or by issues on the political agenda. In this sense the CSOs can be discussed as objects in Europeanization processes.

Interviews with representatives of thirty-four Swedish women's organizations and analyzes of their websites during 2014–16 constitute the material for the study.[2] The extent of their relations and activities at the EU level are categorized as three degrees of Europeanization—weak, medium, or strong. The analysis is based on information provided by the organizations regarding the dimensions of what, how, and who, and on how patterns of participation at different levels of policymaking covary with the extent of Europeanization.

This chapter is organized into three parts. The first section introduces the analytical dimensions of participation. The second part aims to contextualize the work of women's organizations, starting with a historical overview of the development of Swedish women's organizations that helps to explain relations between state institutions and CSOs. The second part also includes a section on institutional conditions in the EU that have an impact on opportunities for women's organizations to take part in gender policymaking. This part ends with an introduction to the Nordic Forum (Nordiskt Forum 2014), the venue at which interviewees for this study were identified. Finally, in the third part the results of the analysis of the interviews are presented and discussed as patterns of participation.

## Analytical Dimensions of Participation

The theoretical point of departure is based on Fraser's metanorm on justice, formulated as "parity of participation." The norm refers to the possibility to participate in policymaking on equal terms. Fraser's way of discussing levels of representation and the questions of what matters contributes to studies of complex relations and activities connected to participation at different policymaking levels. Changed division of political and administrative space should, according to Fraser's norm of parity of participation and justice of frame-setting, be decided by those who are or will become subjects of the

regulations. Transferred to the chapter's discussion of Europeanization of CSOs, the analytical model of parity of participation raises the following questions: What kinds of issues are matters for the CSOs? How are the associations acting to influence decision-making? Finally, who is counted as a subject with the right to make claims in the EU?

The question of "what" concerns three dimensions—redistribution, recognition, and representation. Redistribution is about transforming a gendered structure of economy and refers to claims for a just redistribution of resources and wealth. Women's organizations focusing on redistribution are often engaged in welfare issues and in advocacy for equal pay for men and women. Recognition refers to claims for equal status. In this chapter this denotes gender status order and claims for structures that promote equal respect for women (Fraser and Honneth 2003).[3] Representation refers to equal political representation and is here focused on women's possibilities to have an equal impact on decision making. All three dimensions need to be considered according to the idea of parity of participation.

The question of "how" refers to procedures of decision making (Fraser 2008, 29). Answering this question gives information about the kinds of activities the CSOs make use of, and are able to use, when they aim for participation and influence. Examples of processes that can be used by CSOs are hearings, consultations, and dialogues. It should be emphasized that it is how opportunities and obstacles are perceived by the CSOs that is analyzed here (Suh 2001; Eduards 2002). Research has emphasized funding as a mechanism that strengthens CSOs' possibilities to participate at the EU level (cf. chapter 6), including funding from the European Commission as well as from member states and international organizations like the OECD (Kohler-Koch and Finke 2007; Sánchez-Salgado 2014).

The question of "who" seeks to identify the subjects of Europeanization processes that have the possibility to claim influence and emphasizes the principles of inclusion (Fraser 2008; Fraser and Nash 2014). For the aim of this chapter, the "who" question informs whether perceived obstacles to inclusion can clarify why CSOs participate to various extents at the EU level. A question of relevance for the organizations is that of who is invited to participate in dialogues. The access to these processes is also decisive for the activities used by them.

Borders of a polity and the demarcation between members and non-members of a polity are especially problematic in a time when more and more issues are important at other levels than the national and need to be regulated at other levels as well. Sometimes CSOs can make use of multiple levels of decision making, for example when transnational and global arenas facilitate women's organizations' struggles for local recognition. When organizations participate in global campaigns on women's rights, the purpose

is to transform international law, which in the next phase might affect the organizations' domestic situation (Yuval Davis 2010; Fraser 2008, 14).

Another aspect of participation, emphasized by Fraser, is about opportunities to have an impact on meta-discourses on how boundaries of the political space should be drawn. Who has the possibility to influence the political space? Fraser uses the concepts of affirmative politics and transformative politics to describe two different approaches to these discourses. With affirmative politics, the borders and decision-making levels are accepted. Transformative politics instead questions the appropriateness of the specific boundaries. This latter aspect of political space is used to draw attention to whether CSOs actively accept or resist the EU as a political and administrative level.

To summarize, the analysis focuses on how the three dimensions of what, how, and who are connected to the extent of Europeanization in terms of how the organizations are related to, and engage in activities with the EU, in terms either of its policies or its institutions.

## Swedish CSOs Working on Gender Equality in a Historical Perspective

The development of the women's movement is often described in three waves that constitute stories of how the movement has focused on different issues, but also how it has changed in character. These changes are clearly connected to the development of social movements in general as described by several researchers (e.g., Buechler 1995; Eschle 2001; Fraser 2008).

The first wave is described as a broad popular movement from the middle of the nineteenth century when women began organizing for civil and political rights with the claim for universal suffrage as the main objective. There is a general story of the Swedish women's movement as relatively homogeneous, and it is described as mainly reformist and with collaborations with male-dominated institutions during this period. However, researchers have reread historical reports of the women's movement and concluded that previous research has tried to create a consistent and homogeneous image of the women's movement despite obvious conflicts between different women's organizations (Manns 2000; Rönnbäck 2000). Differences in the women's movement appeared already in the first wave, which was concurrent with the development of other Swedish CSOs. A decision on universal suffrage was made in Sweden in 1919, which was comparatively late, and in the 1921 election women voted for the first time.

The second wave, starting in the 1960s, is described as focused on questions of work, care, and women's control over their sexuality and

reproduction. During this period women's organizations were accepted and integrated in the public sector and were invited to inform about their activities in schools and public institutions; parts of the movement developed into women's sections in party organizations (Schmitz 2007). In this second wave the women's movement was organized into flat organizations as reactions to traditional hierarchical organizations. This nonhierarchical organization created problems when, for example, women's shelters sought funding for their activities (ROKS, n.d.). To receive contributions, an organization was required to be internally democratic with a formally accountable board of directors. To receive municipal grants, the organization had to be free from sex discrimination—in other words, men had to be eligible to be members (Eduards 2002).

The third wave of the women's movement began in the 1990s and is described as a phase when internal conflicts and power relations within the movement can be recognized. Even the organizational forms changed during this time, and the movement developed into several different networks (Gustafsson, Eduards and Rönnblom 1997). This third wave has particularly criticized the earlier movements for defining sisterhood and women's interests as if they were universal to all women. Instead, it is important to recognize how multiple bases of power intersect in a context-specific way (Eschle 2001; Mohanti 2003; de los Reyes and Mulinari 2005; Stoltz 2000). Postcolonial feminist research also criticizes this division of the feminist movement into three different waves with the argument that it is the result of a Westernized perspective on the development of the women's movement (de los Reyes 2014).

Historically, CSOs in Sweden have had close relations to government authorities. The relations between CSOs and state institutions could be problematized because of the risk of co-optation, which is described and assessed in many ways, one of which is that the authorities set frames of what is possible to do in a way that causes the organisations to lose their critical potential toward government policies (Gamson 1968, 1990). Close connections between women's organizations and the Swedish state have resulted in an insider strategy by the CSOs (Bergqvist and Findlay 1999). One consequence of such a strategy is a weakened need to create autonomous and separate organizations (Briskin 1999, 12). An example of this insider strategy is women's sections within political parties, which were mainly created during the 1970s and 1980s. These party sections had regular contact with women's organizations, and the CSOs were invited to dialogues with government agencies. The Swedish state is moreover described as women-friendly because of the government's and parliament's willingness to initiate and implement welfare reforms that support women's positions. Since the 1970s, women's formal representation in the parliament and

the government has increased and is now one of the strongest in the world (Sainsbury 2004; Bergqvist, Adman, and Jungar 2008).

However, whether CSOs organized outside the party system and state institutions can be judged as independent from political and administrative institutions is a question that has to be investigated empirically from a broader approach.

### Gender Equality at the EU Level

The main research question in this study is why Swedish women's CSOs are active at different levels of policymaking, with an additional interest in why some CSOs are not trying to participate at the EU level at all. This section presents a brief overview of institutional conditions that promote CSOs' participation at the EU level within the area of gender equality (Stubbergaard 2015).

The EU specified a policy to strengthen its cooperation with CSOs in 2002 (EC 2002) This policy, together with the white paper on EU governance (EC 2001), has been interpreted as a desire to encourage CSOs to participate in the EU for two main reasons—first to increase the legitimacy of the EU, due to the democratic deficit, and second to get expert advice from the CSOs (Greenwood 2007). Sofia Strid (2009) describes how the European Women's Lobby (EWL) as an organization has developed in parallel with reforms within the EU and how institutions and reforms have functioned as political opportunity structures to extend women's influence on gender equality. Reforms have changed the competence of the EU political institutions, changed policymaking processes, and broadened the policy areas (Strid 2009, 130, EWL 2016). Three phases of formal reforms on gender equality have been distinguished. First were reforms that emphasized equal opportunities, especially on the labor market, second were reforms encouraging positive action, and third were reforms that promoted gender mainstreaming with the ambition of integrating gender equality in all policy areas (Mokre and Borchorst 2013). Another description of the EU focuses on the EC as a consultation regime and concludes that the development of the relations with CSOs can be differentiated in three types of formal generations—first the hierarchical relations during the 1960s–1970s, then partnerships during the 1980s–1990s, and finally participation toward full partnership as stated in the white paper on European governance (Kohler-Koch and Finke 2007).

There are several political and administrative institutions in the EU that are working on gender issues, and various women's CSOs have different relations to these institutions. The EWL has a close relation to the Committee

on Women's Rights and Gender Equality in the European Parliament (EP) (Stubbergaard 2015), among others. The EWL has become the main CSO in the policy field of gender equality. It was founded with support from the EC in 1990, and it receives the main part of its funding as a grant from the EC. It describes itself as a link between citizens and decision makers at the EU level; in addition to this political and administrative level of action it plays an advisory role in the UN. The EWL is an umbrella organization with more than two thousand member organizations; the thirty national coordinators are full members with the right to vote in the yearly assembly meetings. One of the reasons for the EC to support the EWL is its need of expert information and advice on gender equality issues because it is obliged to promote gender equality. To have a strong CSO as a partner in this policy area facilitates the policymaking processes (Strid 2009).

The EWL is also a member of the Social Platform (see chapter 2), which gives the umbrella organization a strong position in the EU network of CSOs (Cullen 2003, 2010; Johansson and Kalm 2015). The Swedish Women's Lobby (SWL) is the national coordinator in Sweden of the EWL (Strid 2009; Stubbergaard 2015; SWL 2015); it was established in 1997 as an umbrella organization and consists of more than forty member-organizations today.

## *Nordic Forum on Women's Rights*

A Nordic conference on Women's Rights was held in 2014. The SWL took the first initiative to hold this conference in 2011, and a committee made up of women's CSOs in the Nordic countries planned and arranged the conference. The conference constitutes the arena from which the interviewees for this study were recruited.

The Nordic Forum held in Malmö in June 2014 had the theme New Action on Women's Rights; it was a continuation of the Nordic conferences that were held in Oslo in 1988 and in Turku in 1994. One purpose of the Nordic Forum was to formulate a final document based on discussions from the conference and to continue the discussion of the Beijing Platform for Action on the Elimination of all forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW). The Nordic governments supported the forum and contributed financially.

CSOs, authorities, and politicians from the Nordic countries participated at the Forum together with guests from other regions in the world. The topic of the EU came up in the program only a few times. Nevertheless, it was presupposed for this study that CSOs that take an active part at the Nordic Forum are more prepared than others to participate in activities beyond national borders and are interested in making contacts with other CSOs.

This made the Nordic Forum a good opportunity to get information on the extent of participation at different policy levels from a range of different women's organizations. However, the ambition of this study was not to assess the numbers of organizations with weak or strong Europeanization but was instead to find a pattern of correlation between the analytical dimensions of what, how, and who, and the organizations' extent of Europeanization.

The selection criteria for the interviews were that the organizations should participate in the Nordic Forum, have their main activities in Sweden, be a nonprofit organization, and represent nonstate actors.

The analysis is based on telephone interviews with representatives of thirty-four Swedish CSOs that participated in the Nordic Forum in very different ways.[4] Some gave lectures on their key issues, while others organized workshops or took part in seminars. Some were well-established CSOs, and some had participated in the planning process of the Forum, while others were newly organized, and some felt marginalized in the network of women's organizations.

The interview questions were directed by the three comprehensive research questions based on the what, how, and who dimensions, and they were designed with the purpose of providing information on why the CSOs differ in their activities and commitment at different levels of policymaking.

## Participation at Different Political Levels among Swedish CSOs within Gender Issues

In table 8.1, the responses by the CSOs are categorized as representing strong, medium, or weak Europeanization according to their activities and their relations with the EU. The extent of Europeanization is linked to what kind of goals, activities, and policy levels of participation that characterize the organizations. The table is a compilation of the analyses of thirty-four interviews with CSOs representatives. An explanation of the findings presented in the table will be presented after a short clarification of the indicators of extent of Europeanization and of the dimensions of participation.

### *Indicators of the Extent of Europeanization*

- Strong Europeanization: CSOs with the strongest Europeanization are those with a commitment to issues the EU deals with. Of particular interest is whether the organizations refer to the EU and whether they actively take part in policy processes at the EU level. Organizations are also regarded as strongly Europeanized if they actively mobilize in

**Table 8.1. Extent of Europeanization Correlated to Dimensions of Participation**

| Participation | WHAT | HOW | WHO |
|---|---|---|---|
| Extent of Europeanization | Goals of the CSO | Activities | Levels of participation |
| STRONG | Redistribution Recognition Representation | Participate in formal processes | Multilevel |
| MEDIUM | Recognition | Dialogue Consult | State Bilateral |
| WEAK | Recognition Representation | Social media | Local Global |

networks and umbrella CSOs at the EU level and if they are mainly funded by the EU and cooperate in projects with CSOs from other EU member states (for instance projects funded by the European Social Fund (ESF)).

- Medium Europeanization: CSOs are categorized as medium Europeanized if they report few activities and commitments toward the EU but have some indirect relations with the EU via other CSOs, such as an indirect membership in the EWL via membership in the SWL.
- Weak Europeanization: CSOs are placed in this category if they have neither a commitment to nor participation in activities directed toward the EU. If they do have any relations, they are indirect relations that are not emphasized by the CSOs.

## *Indicators of Participation*

The three analytical key questions are operationalized in the following way:

- WHAT refers to the CSOs' main goals. Three alternative categorizations of the CSOs' responses are used; these were introduced in the section of the analytical framework—recognition, redistribution, and representation.
- HOW refers to the CSOs' strategies and actions to influence policymaking.
- WHO refers to levels of representation and principles of inclusion at the local, national, EU, European, or global levels. For the question of who has the ability to make claims at different decision-making levels, the following aspects are considered: membership and representation

in umbrella CSOs, and invitation to and representation in governmental and intergovernmental organizations. This dimension also contains the CSOs' reactions toward principles of inclusion in policymaking and in the framing of boundaries. The reactions might consist of resistance or acceptance to invitations of participation or they might be manifested in attempts at transforming decision-making processes or affirming the prevailing processes at different political levels.

### How Strong Europeanization Correlates with Dimensions of Participation

CSOs assessed as strongly Europeanized have some activities and relations in common. For instance, they are often active at multiple policy levels: at the national, EU, and UN levels. The SWL is included in this category together with several of its members.

Another common feature among these CSOs is that they are working with a variety of gender issues. The consequence is that all categories of objectives occur for the "what" question, including redistribution, recognition, and representation, although their priorities might vary. Only a few of the interviewed organizations were mainly working with topics related to economic redistribution. Nevertheless, two of the most active CSOs addressed problems of redistribution beyond representation and recognition. The two examples represent professional women, with one representing business in general and the other representing midwives as a specific profession. The Swedish Association of Midwives works for better global reproductive health and to increase the competence of midwives through education and research (Barnmorskeförbundet 2016). The issue of recognition for this CSO referred to professional identity and not particularly to gender identity, and the organization welcomes both women and men as members. The Business and Professional Women's organization (BPW) works toward equal opportunities and equal pay for professional and businesswomen. It also promotes increased representation of women on corporate boards by encouraging women to become leaders; only women are members in the organization (BPW 2015).

Most of these strongly Europeanized CSOs are umbrella organizations with overlapping memberships, which indicates complex relations between CSOs. The BPW's organizational structure is one such example. Together with the SWL it illuminates an interconnected membership: the BPW is a member organization of the SWL, which means that the BPW is related to the other forty-four member organizations in the SWL and to the EWL, and moreover the BPW is represented on the administrative board of the EWL.

**Table 8.2. Crossing Membership between the BPW and SWL and Their Relations to Governmental and Intergovernmental Organizations in a Multilevel Perspective**

| Level of organization | Civil Society Organization | Governmental and intergovernmental organization |
|---|---|---|
| National | BPW—SWL | Committees; Government Council of Equality |
| Europe/EU | BPWE—EWL; Social Platform | Council of Europe—EU Commission (consultative status) |
| Global | BPWI—EWL | ECOSOC (UN Economic and Social Council; consultative status)—CEDAW network |

In addition to their overlapping membership, they are also good examples of multilevel organizations as illustrated in Table 8.2.

At the national level the two CSOs have been invited to participate in committees and the Government Council of Equality. At the EU and European levels, both BPW Europe (BPWE; the European umbrella organization of national BPWs) and the EWL had consultative status in the Council of Europe[5] and the EWL moreover has a consultative function with regular meetings with the EC. Due to their intertwined relations, this also means that BPW has an indirect relation with the EC. The BPWE is an indirect member of the Social Platform—a nongovernmental arena—through its membership in the EWL.

At the *international* level, the BWP International (BWPI) has had several relations to the UN; for instance, in the International Labour Office the BWPI and EWL have a consultative status in the UN Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC); at the same time the two organizations participated in the Commission on Status of Women of the United Nations (2015) debates. The SWL is also the coordinator of the CEDAW network (one of the UN's human rights conventions), which writes shadow reports to the Swedish government's official reports. This description outlines how two well-organized and well-established women's organizations are working at different political levels in both nongovernmental and governmental networks. With a broad spectrum of objectives, these strongly Europeanized CSOs follow a wide set of activities and strategies to reach their goals.

The International Association for Immigrant Women (2015) is another CSO assessed to be strongly Europeanized. This is one of thirty members of the Swedish Federation of Immigrant Women's Associations (RIFFI), which

in addition is a member of the SWL and the UN Association of Sweden along with several other organizations. RIFFI is another Swedish CSO with consultative status on women's issues in the ECOSOC.

These relationships make it relevant to pose the question of whether these kinds of CSOs are better described as networks. It is common that well-established umbrella CSOs have this kind of structure, and of course this differs significantly from the conditions of smaller CSOs (Karlberg and Jacobsson 2015).

The SWL and RIFFI are basically working with matters that can be described, in Fraser's words, as representation and recognition. In particular, it was representation in the EP that was discussed. The EWL, together with its national coordinators, has worked on a campaign to increase women's representation to at least 50 percent of the EP's seats. Stronger inclusion and representation in prevailing political institutions are key issues for the two CSOs. However, all umbrella CSOs are partially the result of how the women's movements in previous periods have addressed problems of representation. Their initiating claims for the right to participate in policymaking at the EU level as well as at the UN level are examples of struggles for reframing representation. However, there is a debate over whether increased possibilities to make claims on gender equality are the result of the efforts of women's movements or if they are an effect of EC policies (Hoskyns 1992). One possible explanation for why the EC wanted to subsidize the establishment of the EWL is its need for better relations with EU citizens (Greenwood 2007).

## How Weak Europeanization Correlates with Dimensions of Participation

CSOs within this category demonstrate different relationships to the EU. Three key varieties of relations to the EU can be distinguished within this category:

1. CSOs with formal relations to the EU but only via indirect membership with the EWL or through another umbrella organization active at the EU level. The EU was not discussed or related to in the interviews despite this indirect formal connection.
2. CSOs with almost no explicit commitments or relations outside Sweden.
3. CSOs with no relations to and no interest in the EU. They are instead strongly engaged in international arenas. Organizations with direct (bilateral) contacts with other CSOs in Europe are included in this

subcategory. These contacts are not developed in relation to EU institutions or through umbrella organizations at the EU level.

Examples of the first kind of CSOs include active members of the SWL. They cooperate with other members of the SWL, and through this umbrella organization they became members of the EWL, but they did not discuss this relation in the interviews. For example, Women in the Swedish Church (Kvinnor i Svenska Kyrkan) was a member of an organization that was a member of the SWL, which in turn was represented in the EWL. This indirect representation gives rise to the question of whether it is meaningful to talk about participation at the EU level for these kinds of organizational activities and relations. Two out of the fifteen CSOs that were categorized as weakly Europeanized in this study can be described like this. The two examples have access to political institutions at the national level and have been invited to hearings and dialogues. They are mainly working for stronger inclusion in policymaking at the national level and for issues of recognition. They are similar to the dominant kinds of CSOs in the category of medium Europeanized CSOs that are described below, but they are separated from that category due to their very weak commitment to the EU.

The weakly Europeanized CSOs with few relations outside Sweden mostly have commitments to so-called recognition issues. Five organizations were assessed as clearly domestic CSOs; they are mostly active in temporary opinion-making on cultural topics on the Internet. They are weakly organized and are only active when they find it important due to a specific event or situation. Among these organizations are also local units. They are part of organizations that are clearly divided into separate administrative levels where the local organizations are rather independent from the national organization.

Some of the weakly Europeanized CSOs are active either in international cooperation or in bilateral projects with CSOs in other European countries. Based only on interviews with these organizations, one possible reason for CSOs not taking part on their own (but perhaps through indirect membership) in Europeanization is because they prefer other arenas to get in contact with transnational organizations. These kinds of CSOs are more or less questioning prevailing political borders, and some are explicitly condemning the EU. They have directed criticism either toward political border-making or toward political processes due to democratic deficiency. Some of these organizations mostly direct criticism toward the substance of specific EU policies.

Two newly established CSOs with activities on issues mainly regarding recognition and representation; in addition they addressed problems of representation with focus on state borders and the EU level of representation.

One of them discussed problems for asylum seekers who are affected by EU regulations but who have no chances to influence policies. The other opposes discriminating norms as well as nondemocratic polities, and it took part in actions where unjust regulations or other treatments affected CSOs who struggled for human rights. They are mainly, but not exclusively, active in Europe. These CSOs can be described as social movements that strive for rights through linking local issues to global discourses, but also by discussing global problems at the local level. Consequently, the associations are not related to political institutions at any level but instead rely on campaigns, information, and communication via the Internet as well as temporary relations with other CSOs.

Another CSO problematized the lack of political space for youths in general and demanded more just inclusion in policymaking processes at all levels. Among these weakly Europeanized CSOs were the only transformative CSOs found in the study—in other words, organizations that question the boundaries of political space.

However, there is another kind of CSO in this third subcategory—weakly Europeanized but strongly internationalized CSOs. These are well-established CSOs that aim for better conditions concerning gender relations in general. They are worldwide organizations, but during the interview they did not discuss their formal connection to the SWL or EWL, and they reported no other explicit relations to EU institutions or EU policies. On the other hand, they have had consultative status in the Council of Europe with its focus on democracy and human rights, and they have also been active in the UN. They have several contacts with CSOs in Europe through bilateral projects and conferences; if the concept of Europeanization were to include European networks without any institutional relations to the EU, these six examples would be categorized as strongly instead of weakly Europeanized. These organizations highlight the question of categorization and point out this demarcation problem in the concept of Europeanization.

### How Medium Europeanization Correlates with Dimensions of Participation

This in-between extent of Europeanization is not distinguished by its CSOs' strong interest in the EU, but the CSOs all have relations to the EU that matter in some aspects and were mentioned during the interviews. However, these relations are indirect and not important for the organization. These organizations have in common regular contacts with Swedish authorities, and they are also partially funded by government agencies.

Among ten organizations categorized as medium Europeanized were six members of the SWL (or members of CSOs that are members of the SWL), which were thereby also more or less linked to the EWL. All in all, eighteen out of the thirty-four interviewed CSOs are members of the SWL on their own or indirectly via an umbrella CSO. Most CSOs with a medium level of Europeanization reported working with recognition questions, and some of them in particular were devoted to recognition of women within the fields of arts and media. This means that they aim for better status of women within the fields of music and media, among others. Focus on recognition often involves activities of norm criticism so as to assess and deconstruct the dominant norms that contribute to the subordination of women.

They have few collaborative projects with CSOs in Europe, whereas some have individual contacts with Nordic CSOs. Some CSOs are well established at the national level, have been invited to take part in dialogues with agencies, and have received grants from agencies such as the Swedish ESF. One example is the Equality Development Center in Skaraborg that cooperates on a regular basis with Swedish regional and local authorities through education in norm-critical methods.

Most of the CSOs within this category inform governmental agencies about gender equality and are respected as experts. Some examples of activities among these CSOs are media monitoring, assessment of the government's gender equality, and assessing the degree of representation of women in museums. Five of these organizations have been regularly invited to meetings organized by the governmental committee on gender equality.

Individuell Mänmniskohjälp (IM) reported a general agreement with SIDA (Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency), which implies specific long-term support by SIDA. IM also reported connections to the EU via membership in the Swedish Confederation for Relief and Development (CONCORD 2016); hence IM was also a member of the European CONCORD that aimed to act as an interlocutor with EU institutions. IM is moreover an example of a CSO with strong bilateral relations and activities with different countries. The Kvinna till Kvinna Foundation is another CSO with the status as a development organization with a long-term agreement with SIDA. Compared to IM, it has strong relations and activities toward the EU and is hence assessed as strongly Europeanized.

## Concluding Remarks

The main purpose of this study was to understand why and how Swedish CSOs in the field of gender equality participate at different levels of policy-making and why some women's CSOs are not trying to participate at the EU

level. Table 8.1 summarizes the findings in the study. The overall question was analyzed using dimensions developed from Fraser's theory of parity of participation. The study demonstrates that participation at different levels differs very much between women's CSOs. Some CSOs are included as experts and advisors in decision-making processes when principles of inclusion are discussed from a gender perspective. It is also clear that some organizations have no relations to EU institutions or to the EU's policymaking processes.

Most of the strongly Europeanized CSOs are well-established umbrella organizations that are active at multiple levels. The strongly Europeanized CSOs are additionally often funded by state projects or through political or labor-market institutions (cf. Hedling and Meeuwisse, chapter 5).

These features are quite contrary to the weakly Europeanized CSOs, which were found to be either part of globalized activities or focused on local issues. Some are indirectly connected to the EU via other organizations, while others are instrumentally constructed as organizations only because of the formal criteria stated by subsidizing agencies. To receive grants, they had to register as formal CSOs. Instead of taking part in ordinary policy processes, some of these CSOs are mostly active in social media and engaged in influencing opinion on temporary topics within civil society.

Regarding what the CSOs focus on, some of the differences between them are connected to the extent of Europeanization. There is a clear preponderance on recognition among the CSOs, and few CSOs are engaged in questions of redistribution. Strongly Europeanized CSOs are slightly more evenly divided between the three kinds of substance of justice—redistribution, recognition, and representation—while a majority of the CSOs with medium Europeanization focus on recognition. The weakly Europeanized CSOs are roughly equally working on recognition and representation. Hence, there are some differences among the CSOs even if they are not sharply related to the three extents of Europeanization. One possible explanation for these differences is the close connection between Swedish authorities and CSOs based on expert knowledge. Women's CSOs are invited by national authorities to give advice and to contribute to policymaking with specific knowledge about gender issues, and they are in turn funded by Swedish grants. This mutual dependence might reinforce these CSOs in engaging mainly at the domestic level with questions that are specific for them, such as the recognition of gender (instead of, e.g., questions of redistribution). Such a pattern was in particular found in the category of medium Europeanized CSOs.

The EC has in a similar way encouraged the establishment of a few strong and specialized umbrella organizations at the EU level, such as the EWL, which in turn have contributed to the creation of national coordinators

like the SWL. In this sense, strong Europeanization among women's CSOs is a result of the EC's need for experts. However, there are other examples of organizations that are already active on the global arena that have taken the opportunity to become active at the EU level when they have found the possibilities to do so. CSOs want to have influence, and the EU wants to strengthen integration with the help of CSOs. However, there is a risk that the EC's relationships and support for some selected CSOs might prevent other CSOs from having a meaningful commitment at the EU level (Stubbergaard 2015).

Applying for financial support from various funds was considered a problem, in particular for small and medium-sized organizations without a secretariat. But even well-established CSOs expressed their frustration with the applications. One problem was that they have to pay for activities before receiving payments from the donor institution.

Some CSOs are active in Europe but are related to the Council of Europe instead of the EU. These CSOs have a strong commitment to Europe beyond institutions and policies linked to the EU, and they bring to the fore a crucial question about the concept of Europeanization (cf. introductory chapter and chapter 1). Should CSOs active in European arenas, which are not institutionally a part of the EU, be described as Europeanized? In this study they were treated as weakly Europeanized. If, instead, all systematic efforts aiming for participating in networks and issues relevant for Europe, as a geographic region, were to be included in the concept of Europeanization, these six organizations obviously have to be categorized as strongly Europeanized. No CSO in Sweden could be assessed as not Europeanized at all because in some way every organization is affected by the EU due to the fact that Sweden is a member state of the EU.

Among internationally active, but weakly Europeanized, CSOs only a few explicitly questioned the border setting and proposed the transformation of political space. Most of the CSOs, regardless of their extent of Europeanization, did not question the system of representation at different levels but rather the inequality in representation. That is to say, they are still claiming inclusion in practice but they are affirming the current division of decision-making levels.

**Ylva Stubbergaard** is Senior Lecturer in Political Science at Lund University, Sweden. Her research focuses on democracy in theory and practice. Within this field, she is particularly interested in power relations between civil society and public authorities, how citizenship status is constructed, and implications for democracy when relations between politics and public administration change.

# Notes

1. This chapter uses the term "women's organization" throughout. This means that all organizations and movements in civil society with a focus on gender equality, feminist politics, and women's rights are denominated with the same term. Their specific objectives will instead be categorized according to the three "what" questions elaborated by Fraser—redistribution, recognition, and representation.
2. Thanks to all of the women's organizations that contributed to the study by being interviewed.
3. Scholars have also problematized the risk of reification and essentializing categories of sexes and a uniform idea of women when struggling for recognitions of identities (e.g., Fraser 2005).
4. Many thanks to Sofia Rubertsson for good teamwork and for her great efforts to keep in contact with the CSOs and for carrying out most of the telephone interviews.
5. The Council of Europe aims to strengthen human rights and democratic practices. It has forty-seven member states; twenty-eight of these are also EU member states (Council of Europe 2016).

# References

Barnmorskeförbundet. 2016. Retrieved 31 October 2016, from http://www.barnmorskeforbundet.se/.

Bergqvist, Christina, Per Adman, and Ann-Cathrine Jungar. 2008. *Kön och politik.* Stockholm, Sweden: SNS förlag.

Bergqvist, Christina, and Sue Findlay. 1999. "Representing Women's Interests in the Policy Process." In Briskin and Eliasson, *Women's Organizing and Public Policy in Canada and in Sweden*, 119–46.

BPW. 2015. Retrieved 31 May 2015, from http://www.bpw-europe.org/.

Briskin, Linda. 1999. "Mapping Women's Organizing in Sweden and Canada: Some thematic considerations." In Briskin and Eliasson, *Women's Organizing and Public Policy in Canada and in Sweden*, 3–49.

Briskin, Linda, and Mona Eliasson, eds. 1999. *Women's Organizing and Public Policy in Canada and in Sweden.* Montreal, Canada: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Buechler, Steven M. 1995. "New Social Movement Theories." *Sociological Quarterly* 36, no. 3: 441–64.

Commission on Status of Women of the United Nations. 2015. Retrieved 31 May 2015, from http://www.unwomen.org/en/csw.

CONCORD. 2016. Retrieved 8 December 2016, from https://concordeurope.org.

Council of Europe. 2016. Retrieved 9 June 2016, from www.coe.int.

Cullen, Pauline. 2003. "Sponsored Mobilization. European Union Non-Governmental Organizations, International Governance and Activism for Social Rights." PhD diss. Albany, NY: State University of New York.

——. 2010. "The Platform of European Social NGOs: Ideology, Division and Coalition." *Journal of Political Ideologies* 15, no. 3: 317–31.

della Porta, Donatella, and Manuela Caiani. 2009. *Social Movements and Europeanization*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

de los Reyes, Paulina. 2014. "Introduktion—Inte bara jämställdhet." *Intersektionella perspektiv på hinder och möjligheter i arbetslivet. Forskningsrapport till Delegationen för jämställdhet i arbetslivet* 2014, no. 34.

de los Reyes, Paulina, and Diana Mulinari. 2005. *Intersektionalitet: kritiska reflektioner över (o)jämlikhetens landskap*. Malmö, Sweden: Liber.

EC. 2001. *European Governance. A White Paper*. COM (2001) 428 final. Brussels, Belgium: Commission of the European Communities.

——. 2002. *Towards a Reinforced Culture of Consultation and Dialogue: General Principles and Minimum Standards for Consultation of Interested Parties by the Commission*. COM (2002) 704 final. Brussels, Belgium: Commission of the European Communities.

Eduards, Maud. 2002. *Förbjuden handling: Om kvinnors organisering och feministisk teori*. Malmö, Sweden: Liber.

Eschle, Catherine. 2001. *Global Democracy, Social Movements and Feminism*. Oxford, UK: Westview Press.

EWL. 2016. Retrieved 29 May 2016, from http://www.womenlobby.org.

Fraser, Nancy. 2005. "Mapping the Feminist Imagination: From Redistribution to Recognition to Representation." *Constellation* 12, no. 3.

——. 2008. *Scales of Justice: Reimagining Political Space in a Globalizing World*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Fraser, Nancy, and Axel Honneth. 2003. *Redistribution or Recognition?* London/New York: Verso.

Fraser, Nancy, and Kate Nash, eds. 2014. *Transnationalizing the Public Sphere*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Gamson, William A. 1968. *Power and Discontent*. Homewood, IL: Dorsey.

——. 1990. *The Strategy of Social Protest*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Greenwood, Justin. 2007. "Review Article: Organized Civil Society and Democratic Legitimacy in the European Union." *British Journal of Political Science* 37: 333–357.

Gustafsson, Gunnel, Maud Eduards, and Malin Rönnblom. 1997. *Towards a New Democratic Order?: Women's Organizing in Sweden in the 1990s*. Stockholm, Sweden: Publica.

Hoskyns, Catherine. 1992. "The European Community's Policy on Women in the Context of 1992." *Women's Studies International Forum* 15: 21–28.

International Association for Immigrant Women. 2015. Retrieved 31 May 2015, from http://www.iffi-stockholm.se.

Johansson, Håkan, and Sara Kalm, eds. 2015. *EU Civil Society. Patterns of Cooperation, Competition and Conflict*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Karlberg, Eva, and Kerstin Jacobsson. 2015. "A meta-organizational perspective on the Europeanization of civil society: The Case of Swedish Women's Lobby." VOLUNTAS: *International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations* 26, no. 4: 1438–59.

Kohler-Koch, Beate, and Barbara Finke. 2007. "The Institutional Shaping of EU-Society Relations: A Contribution to Democracy via Participation?" *Journal of Civil Society* 3, no. 3: 205–21.

Manns, Ulla. 2000. "Så skriver vi historia—den svenska kvinnorörelsen ur ett historiografiskt perspektiv." *Kvinnovetenskaplig Tidskrift* 21, no. 4: 5–27.

Mohanti, Chandra Talpade. 2003. *Feminism without Borders: Decolonizing Theory, Practicing Solidarity*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Mokre, Monika, and Anette Borchorst. 2013. "The EU's Gender and Diversity Policies and the European Public Spheres." In *Negotiating Gender and Diversity in an Emergent European Public Sphere*, edited by Birte Siim and Monika Mokre, 141–160. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan

Nordiskt Forum. 2014. Retrieved 1 October 2016, from http://nf2014.org.

ROKS. n.d. Retrieved 15 May 2015, from http://www.roks.se/.

Rönnbäck, Josefin. 2000. "Rösträttsrörelsens kvinnor: I konflikt och i samförstånd." *Kvinnovetenskaplig tidskrift* 21, no. 4.

Sainsbury, Diane. 2004. "Women's Political Representation in Sweden: Discursive Politics and Institutional Presence." *Scandinavian Political Studies* 27, no. 3: 65–87.

Sánchez-Salgado, Rosa. 2007. "Giving a European Dimension to Civil Society Organizations." *Journal of Civil Society* 3, no. 3: 253–69.

——. 2014. *Europeanizing civil society; how the EU shapes civil society organizations.* Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Schmitz, Eva. 2007. "Systerskap som politisk handling. Kvinnoorganiseringen i Sverige 1968 till 1982." PhD diss. Lund, Sweden: Lund University.

Stoltz, Pauline. 2000. *About being (t)here and making a difference: Black women and the paradox of visibility*. PhD diss. Lund, Sweden: Lund University.

Strid, Sofia. 2009. "Gendered Interests in the European Union." PhD diss. Örebro, Sweden: Örebro University.

Stubbergaard, Ylva. 2015. "Conflict and Cooperation: Interactions among EU Level Civil Society Organizations in the Field of Gender Equality." In *EU Civil Society. Patterns of Cooperation, Competition and Conflict*, edited by Håkan Johansson and Sara Kalm 119–136. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Suh, Doowon. 2001. "How Do Political Opportunities Matter for Social Movements?" *Sociological Quarterly* 42, no. 3: 437–60.

SWL. 2015. Retrieved 10 May 2015, from http://sverigeskvinnolobby.se.

Yuval-Davis, Nira. 2010. "Theorizing Identity: Beyond the 'Us' and 'Them' Dichotomy." *Patterns of Prejudice* 44, no. 3.