

ANDREA KRIZSAN

Equality Architectures in Central and Eastern European Countries: A Framework for Analyzing Political Intersectionality in Europe

Abstract

Equality institutions are major arenas for analyzing political intersectionality. This article looks at equality institutions in the context of European equality policy changes since 2000 and argues for an institutional typology that differentiates gender equality machineries from anti-discrimination bodies and consultative equality bodies. These functionally different equality institutions build up into larger equality institutional architectures in which the different components serve complementary strategies in pursuing complex gender equality policies. Equality institutional architectures vary in how they institutionalize the relationships between gender inequality and other inequality categories. Layered, hierarchical, and integrated models of equality institutional architectures are identified as different in institutionalizing the intersections and hierarchies of different inequality axes. The article argues that analyzing equality institutions through such a

conceptual framework contributes to a more nuanced research agenda for analyzing intersectionality in policy practice, one that could be applicable, beyond equality institutions, also to the analysis of policy texts and civil society mobilization patterns. The article illustrates the developed conceptual framework through a comparative analysis of gender equality institutional architectures emerging in the last twenty years in the ten new European Union member states of Central and Eastern Europe.

Introduction

Until quite recently, academic discussions on gender equality machineries revolved around how these institutions provide substantive representation and voice to women's interests in mainstream policymaking (Rai 2003; Stetson and Mazur 1995; Weldon 2002). More recent discussions (Kantola and Nousiainen 2009; Krizsan, Skjeie, Squires 2012a; Lombardo and Verloo 2009; Outshoorn and Kantola 2007; Squires 2008; Walby, Armstrong and Strid 2012) have increasingly moved on to examining and debating how these institutions engage with intersectionality, meaning how different inequality axes intersect with each other thus constituting qualitatively different forms of disadvantage (Crenshaw 1989; Hancock 2007). This change in emphasis takes place in the context of an equality policy shift across the European Union (EU) in the early 2000s. Two major changes can be noted in EU policy. EU equality policy moves from its sole focus on gender equality that had been in place for decades toward an extended focus on several inequality grounds that include race and ethnicity, religion, age, disability, and sexual orientation. The EU equality policy shift has also made establishing equality bodies for race and gender part of mandatory hard law. Changes in EU law have resulted in major institutional changes in the realm across Europe: In the creation of new institutions as well as changes in previously existent equality institutional structures, to accommodate multiple inequalities (Kantola and Nousiainen 2009; Krizsan, Skjeie, Squires 2012a; Lombardo and Verloo 2009; Squires 2008).

Against this background, recent research has been dealing with both the losses that the focus on multiple inequalities might mean for gender equality at national level and the EU alike, and also the potential this new focus has for better responding to intersectionality (Kantola and Nousiainen 2009; Krizsan, Skjeie and Squires 2012a; Lombardo and Verloo 2009; Squires 2008; Walby, Armstrong and Strid 2012). These processes of policy and institutional change and the debates around them brought equality institutionalization across

Europe in the spotlight for analyzing and understanding political intersectionality (Verloo and Walby 2012).

While earlier discussions on gender equality machineries (Outshoorn and Kantola 2007; Rai 2003; Stetson and Mazur 1995; Weldon 2002) defined them with reference to their role in providing substantive representation for women, bringing about inclusive governance, and giving voice to different groups of women within the political community, the latest discussions on institutional changes seem to have a much fuzzier concept of equality institutions at their core, in which different types of equality institutions including policy machineries, enforcement, and complaint bodies, and consultative bodies are lumped together to argue about the shift away from single-focus on gender equality to an integrated focus on multiple inequalities. The need emerges for a more nuanced understanding of different types of equality institutions, of the equality institutional architectures in which they combine, and of the ways in which those architectures capture, prioritize, or play down gender equality in intersections with other inequality categories. No theoretical analysis has looked so far at institutionalization of gender together with the institutionalization of other inequality categories. This article aims to contribute by conceptualizing complex gender equality institutional architectures, made up of different types of institutions serving gender equality along with other inequality groups in different complementary ways. The article first differentiates equality institutions by their functions. It argues that different types of institutions serve different functions: Anti-discrimination bodies are quasi-judicial complaint mechanisms that come to addressing different inequalities from an equal treatment approach and gender equality machineries are regulatory mechanisms that give specific voice to women as a group from within the government, while consultative bodies provide formal access to women's groups to policymaking. The three different institutions can be seen to serve different strategies toward gender equality, and possibly even different visions of gender equality (Walby 2005), and in this they complement one another. Moreover, the three institutions can also be seen to open up different venues for addressing the intersection of gender inequality with other inequalities. Understanding the types of equality institutions separately contributes to understanding the wider institutional picture developed in the next step of the article.

Secondly, the article moves on to show that in order to understand how the intersection of inequalities is institutionalized in a state these three different types of equality institutions should be analyzed together in their specific configurations as gender equality institutional architectures. These architectures are crucial arenas

where relationships between different inequalities are shaped and their intersections can be analyzed. The article identifies three different equality architecture models, which convey different patterns of relationship between different inequality categories, potential modes of intersection between them. These three models are: Layered, hierarchical, and integrated. The layered models allow both variation and similarity in addressing inequalities, hierarchical models set the primacy of one specific inequality, while downplaying the others, and integrated models treat all inequality categories as essentially similar. The article aims to contribute to a political intersectionality research agenda by developing the three models of interaction. While the conceptual framework is based on the case of equality institutionalization, the developed models may also be applicable to other realms of policy analysis like policy text analysis or analysis of mobilization patterns.

The article explores the applicability of the developed framework of the three models of gender equality architecture in the context of the ten new Central and Eastern European (CEE) member states of the EU. It analyzes how equality has been institutionalized in CEE reflecting on critical influences on change coming from interactions between local and transnational NGOs, international actors, and local policymakers, and compares the emergent equality institutional architecture models and the ways in which they establish different relationships between gender and other inequalities.

The article uses the most similar systems method focusing on the ten new EU member states from CEE: Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, and Slovenia. They are similar in having short and easy to capture histories of developing equality institutional structures since the early 1990s, and are similar in their exposure to different waves of international influence that pushed them toward creating their institutional structures. The specifics of the CEE region also make the analysis of gender equality institutions particularly interesting. With some delay, following the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1990, countries in the region started to join the processes of equality institutionalization that were already prevalent in many post-industrialized Western states by that time (Stetson and Mazur 1995). In the context of the post-communist transition and the emerging need to improve the genuine voice and representation of women in the region, gender equality state institutions are particularly important. A number of typical factors are indicative. The political representation of women, as well as their representation in high-level political positions and in public administration in the countries of the region, is generally well below that of most post-industrialized Western states (Rueschemeyer

and Wolchik 2009). Misogynistic political speech is prominent. While a lot of variation can be seen among countries in the region in terms of the quality of their gender equality policies and policy debates, it is overwhelmingly true that patriarchal, anti-gender equality framing is more present in their debates of gender-relevant policy issues than it is in most post-industrialized Western states (Krizsan et al. 2009). Moreover, these countries, with some notable exceptions, have relatively young and weak women's movements and a small number of (usually underfinanced) feminist NGOs (Roth 2007). In addition, the victims of discrimination are in strong need of institutional support for coming forward with their claims. The judicial systems are slow and inefficient, and a culture of legal complaints is also lacking (Goldston 2006). All these factors point to the heightened importance of state institutions that promote gender equality and support victims of gender discrimination. In the case of CEE, it becomes even more important that gender equality institutions work to complement traditional channels of political representation and traditional judicial channels and are prepared even to work as substitutes for women's movement mobilization (Weldon 2002).

The article relies on data gathered within the framework of the European project Quality of Gender + Equality Policies in Europe (QUING). The project used comprehensive process tracing as well as document analysis for understanding policy debates and processes of policy change in all countries analyzed in this article (www.quing.eu). Data collection for this article was closed in 2009.

Based on the comparative analysis of equality institutional architectures in CEE countries, using the institutional architecture models the article shows the predominance of the layered model of equality institutional architectures in CEE countries. This model allows an approach based on multiple inequalities across the equal treatment and anti-discrimination agenda set by the EU, but maintains distinctive approaches to different inequalities in other institutions, conveying a message of some similarity along with considerable differences. Hierarchical models of equality institutional architecture that privilege gender, while level protection for all other inequalities only emerge in Slovenia and two countries in the Baltics. Integrated equality architectures that convey a message of similarity between all inequality categories develop only in Bulgaria and Poland. The article proceeds in four sections. First it develops the conceptual framework for the article. The next section analyzes typologies of equality institutions in CEE countries. The following section looks into the incidence of models on equality institutional architecture in these countries. The final section comes back to the conceptual framework and discusses its potentials and limits.

Institutionalizing Equality

Equality institutions are one of the most specific pillars of equality policies. They are meant to compensate, both in a declaratory and in a functional sense, for the failures of regular policymaking and policy implementation processes in protecting status-based vulnerable groups in their respective societies. In declaratory terms, such institutions stand to represent the recognition of the state that certain disadvantaged groups require special protection. Through these acts of recognition they may establish or deny hierarchies of inequality, produce or reproduce privileged categories, and recognize or facilitate the recognition of their intersections. Functions of equality bodies may range from remedying individual discrimination cases and cases of structural discrimination, to empowering disadvantaged groups by giving them voice and access to policymaking and instituting structural and/or systemic changes in society, to better accommodate the needs of these groups. Equality institutions play a crucial role not only in implementing equality policies but also in defining and changing them. Therefore, they are pivotal to the response to new challenges faced by equality policy, and as such, the recognition of intersectionality.

In the context of intersectionality research, equality institutions become relevant in two ways. They are critical to the discussion of intersectionality as discursive arenas for political intersectionality (Crenshaw 1991), arenas for political struggles and claim-making, where group-based identity politics may be used to make invisible the social disadvantages faced by marginal subgroups, or eventually transversal politics may become the norm (Yuval-Davis 2006a, 2006b). But equality institutions may become agents both in the reproduction of structural intersectionality or in addressing it (Crenshaw 1991). They may fail to remedy the disadvantages specific to vulnerable groups at the points of intersection between different inequality grounds or may actually engage in innovatively addressing those intersectional disadvantages. Equality institutions at the junction between identity politics and practical policymaking are crucial hubs for operationalizing intersectionality and translating the theoretical thinking of feminist scholars into policy practice, a field gaining speed much more slowly than theoretical advances in intersectional research (Yuval-Davis 2006a).

This section of the article provides a conceptual framework for equality institutions that moves beyond single institutions and can be termed equality architecture. It also argues that in the current European context one has to move beyond discussing single equality machineries to discussing equality architectures. Equality institutional

architectures are made up of a set of institutions working complementarily toward meeting gender equality objectives, with the different institutions serving different functions, following different gender equality strategies and establishing different kinds of relationships between gender and other inequalities.

Research on equality bodies discusses them from two distinct angles. One originates within gender and politics literature and has since been termed the literature on state feminism (Stetson and Mazur 1995) and the other originates in the literature of anti-discrimination policy enforcement.

Gender and politics sees equality bodies as core institutions giving voice to politically disempowered groups of women in the policymaking process from within the government (Outshoorn and Kantola 2007; McBride and Mazur 2010; Rai 2003; Squires 2007; Stetson and Mazur 1995). When set alongside other strategies for pursuing gender equality, equality bodies emerge primarily as agents of the women's movements capable of channeling women's interests into policymaking (Squires 2007).

Women's policy machineries were initially oriented toward the improvement of the status of women, being embodiments of positive "action-thinking" (Rees 1998). After the Fourth World Conference on Women in Beijing in 1995, these institutions have increasingly shifted focus toward addressing gender relations rather than just women's issues and became the main instruments of gender mainstreaming (Rai 2003). However, the approach taken by gender equality machineries always came from an idea that specifically focused on gender. State feminism stems from a strong assertion of the distinctiveness and political salience of one inequality—gender. In this context, the relevance of gender equality machineries for advancing intersectional policy thinking depends on their capacity to move away from a categorical homogeneity and identity-based approach toward intracategorical complexity, as McCall (2005) termed it: The recognition of diversity within the category and of the multiplying and mutually constitutive effects of gender disadvantage and other disadvantages based on other inequality grounds (Yuval-Davis 2006b).

The United Nations (UN), in tandem with the transnational women's movement, has played a decisive role in promoting the idea of gendering the state through machineries for the advancement of women (Rai 2003: 1–5). From Mexico City (1975) through Nairobi (1985) to Beijing (1995), the World Conferences on Women have provided a strong impetus for countries around the world, both directly and indirectly, to set up such machineries.

Research evaluating the activity of these machineries showed that their effectiveness was highly dependent on their status within the

executive branch of the government and their resources (both human and financial) (Rai 2003; Stetson and Mazur 1995). The higher a gender equality machinery is in the governmental hierarchy, the better it is resourced and the more chances it has to bring gender equality issues forward.

Another key aspect to the success of gender equality machineries highlighted in earlier research was their relation to women's movements and other gender equality groups. The desirability of formalizing communication with women's groups in the form of consultative bodies, councils, or other institutions working adjacently to the gender equality machinery was a persistent finding in earlier comparative work (Stetson and Mazur 1995).

Another, second type of equality institution emerges along these lines, one that is particularly important in political contexts that have no tradition of inclusive governance practices and are vulnerable to the whims of political cycles: These are council-type *consultative equality bodies*. Such consultative bodies emerge in a corporatist format, mostly as tripartite bodies that bring together experts, NGO representatives, and representatives of some or all government ministries in an attempt to channel the voices of civil society and experts into the policy process. While only consultative in their mandate, and as such possessing mostly weak authority, they often provide the only formalized state civil society interface for women's groups, and therefore, their role in the equality institutional architecture cannot be neglected. While gender equality machineries may have mandates to consult with NGOs, the absence of formal structures and mechanisms for such an engagement make the relationships that these institutions have with NGOs very unstable and dependent on the personal and political context. Research indicates that gender equality machineries tend to speak for some subgroups of women, rarely for all women (Outshoorn and Kantola 2007). Formal consultative bodies have the potential to address this accountability dilemma faced by women's policy machineries.

The role of consultative equality bodies in bringing together NGOs and experts with representatives of several ministries can also be seen to be coordinative in the implementation of a comprehensive gender mainstreaming strategy. Little analytical work is available within gender studies of consultative bodies and their effectiveness on pursuing gender mainstreaming. These bodies are concerned mainly with gender equality and aim primarily to give voice and access to policymaking for women's organization, but also aim to bring in expert knowledge to support increasingly complex gender equality policy tasks.

The contribution of consultative bodies to intersectionality is their potential to become platforms for transversal politics (Yuval-Davis 2006b). Defined as a politics of dialogue and cooperation, which ties understanding to dialogue, a major feature of transversal politics is that the notion of equality within its framework also encompasses the notion of diversity without establishing a hierarchy among the diverse positions (Yuval-Davis 2006b: 281). The focus on one category is not excluded in transversal politics; nevertheless, such a focus cannot be seen as an exclusive one (Yuval-Davis 2006b). Consultative bodies are platforms where different gender equality actors meet and dialogue, potential locations for re-politicizing gender equality (Verloo 2005). The intersectional contribution of consultative bodies is their focus on dialogue and coalition building between different civil society actors, negotiations on gender equality claims representing non-unitary visions of gender, and inclusive representation.

Another type of equality body is primarily discussed by the literature on anti-discrimination policy enforcement (Krizsan 2006; MacEwen 1997). It identifies *anti-discrimination bodies* as indispensable because of the difficulties in enforcing anti-discrimination policies. The main rationale for creating anti-discrimination bodies is to empower individual victims of discrimination and to tackle, with expertise and independently from government, individual as well as structural and institutional forms of discrimination against different vulnerable groups (Krizsan 2006; Lustgarten 1980; MacEwen 1997). The focus of these bodies is on a procedural approach. Victims of discrimination are seen to be in disadvantaged positions to prove their cases and to receive remedy; therefore, these institutions are meant to compensate for the power, information, and expertise asymmetry. Anti-discrimination bodies are seen as an embodiment of a symmetrical equal treatment approach to inequalities (Rees 1998), which are meant to compensate for the weakness of victims of discrimination in the complaint procedures, but not in the overall policymaking process. While the existent analysis of anti-discrimination bodies attributes some structural functions to such bodies (such as initiating *ex officio* investigations into patterns of structural or institutional discrimination, raising awareness, and generating knowledge of discrimination, or regularly monitoring and reviewing policy MacEwen 1997), overall, they are not seen to have a role in giving voice to women's movements or movements advocating for other vulnerable groups. Rather, anti-discrimination bodies strive to establish their legitimacy as independent arbiters, particularly in cases when they have the mandate to decide cases. The focus of anti-discrimination bodies is generally individualistic and complaint

driven; the problem addressed is rarely a group problem, but one of individual cases of discrimination. This institutional model fits equally well with approaches that treat different inequality grounds separately as well as with those that treat them in integrated ways under one institutional umbrella. These bodies are established in most of the cases to enforce anti-discrimination legislation, which also defines their mandate and scope of action.

Before 2000, anti-discrimination bodies were set up only in a few pioneering countries, mainly Anglo-Saxon, that had advanced anti-discrimination policies. They spread rapidly after 2000, when EU legislation formulated binding requirements for member states to establish equality bodies with mandates to promote equal treatment on the grounds of racial or ethnic origin and gender. A wave of equality bodies followed in the EU member, with several countries establishing equal treatment bodies that cover multiple inequality grounds along the ones named by the Directive (Bell 2002: 167; Krizsan, Skjeie, Squires 2012a). The Commission readily welcomed the trend and encouraged it in soft law recommendations.¹ Scholars and policymakers alike expressed their expectations that an integrated equality institutional approach would be more favorable to deal with multiple, intersecting inequalities, and thus would better capture the complexity of inequalities and disadvantages (Fredman 2005; Squires 2008).

Anti-discrimination bodies, by addressing multiple inequalities under one institutional umbrella, bring an intercategorical approach to intersectionality (McCall 2005) in equality policy. Their flexibility and expertise-driven nature may favor innovative approaches to equality thinking. Their potential, however, will be determined by their capacity to overcome the inherent contradiction between strongly categorical approaches represented by legal and policy thinking and loosening up categories and diversifying them. The difficulties of legal thinking to genuinely engage with intersectionality has been repeatedly confirmed (Crenshaw 1989; Fredman 2005; Hannett 2003). The inherent danger in bringing in intersectional thinking into anti-discrimination bodies is a tendency to fragment existent categories and multiply them (Yuval-Davis 2006a), rather than allowing their dynamic interaction. However, the quasi-legal status of equality bodies and their potential as legal innovators (Krizsan 2006) might open a window of opportunity for overcoming legal inertia in relation to intersectionality.

This section this far has identified different types of equality institutions present in current European equality thinking and policy practice. Their core distinctive features are the functions they serve, the equality strategy they stand for, and the different approaches

they use for relating to intersecting inequalities. Gender equality machineries as well as consultative bodies have a regulatory mandate to introduce the voice of women as a vulnerable group and the gender perspective into decision-making and to be the main coordinative bodies for developing specific, targeted gender equality policies. Therefore, the higher their status in the governmental hierarchy, the better embedded they are in decision-making and the more effective and successful they can be. Anti-discrimination bodies have a quasi-judicial and investigatory mandate and their independence from the executive is imperative, as the target of their investigation is often the government as an employer or a service provider. But the two types of institutions also differ markedly in terms of the equality strategy they represent. The activity of gender equality machineries and consultative bodies can be viewed along the lines of a combination of transformative and positive action approaches. They stand to compensate for disadvantages of women in policy-making, but they also stand to transform society and policymaking in acting as a coordinating body for gender mainstreaming. Anti-discrimination bodies place the emphasis on an equal treatment approach; though they can be seen to have a more short-term individual impact than machineries as they bring direct remedies to individual victims, they also have a more limited understanding of inequality as they largely neglect structural components and wider transformation (Rees 1998). The different institutions work along different strategies, and as such they complement one another much along the conceptual lines of the “three-legged equality stool” (Booth and Bennett 2002), rather than competing with one another. They also complement one another in their approach to intersectionality. Gender equality machineries are ideal arenas for intracategorical diversification coming from within gender, and consultative bodies are arenas for transversal politics, while anti-discrimination bodies tend to have intercategorical potential.

Therefore, the types of equality institutions discussed this far in this section have to be viewed together taking into account their complementarities. Anti-discrimination bodies, gender equality machineries, and consultative equality bodies complement one another in forming specific equality architectures. Viewed together, they provide an understanding of the place of gender vis-à-vis other inequalities within institutional structures of a country, establishing hierarchies of inequality, which may be more or less favorable to intersectional approaches (Krizsan, Skjeie, Squires 2012a). The section turns now to discuss complex equality architectures formed by different types of equality institutions and the way those capture intersections between different inequalities.

Equality institutional architectures help us conceptualize political intersectionality by allowing variation in approaching the relationship between different inequalities. Their different institutional pillars may indicate different relationships: Some prioritize addressing certain inequalities and others treat all inequality categories similarly conveying a message of symmetry between them. Hierarchies of inequalities are institutionalized through equality architectures, privileging protection along the lines of some inequalities, while sidelining others. Symmetrical approaches to several inequalities convey a message about the inherent similarities between inequalities and the ways in which they can be addressed. These relationships then set different frameworks for addressing intersections between inequalities. Intersectional approaches may be possible within all of them but the framing of intersectionality will be different in each. As such, identification of these relationships contributes to the conceptualization of political intersectionality. Equality institutional architectures, as composed by the three different institutional pillars described above, are one form of manifestation of these different relations between inequalities.

Different models of equality institutional architectures can be differentiated, each expressing different relationships between inequalities (Krizsan, Skjeie, Squires 2012a). This article proposes to distinguish three such models. *Layered models* allow different relationships to be established in each institutional pillar, which often means integrated approaches in anti-discrimination bodies, while keeping separate institutional approaches for different inequalities in the other two institutional pillars. This model conveys the message of the coexistence of some similarities between inequality categories as well as important specificities. Similarity, or a lowest common denominator, is in the realm of equal treatment and anti-discrimination policy, where all inequality categories may be handled together. Meanwhile, more proactive policy approaches and consultation are fields where specifics are emphasized and separateness maintained. *Hierarchical models* elevate gender above the other inequalities keeping separate gender institutions within all institutional pillars or at least specific focus on gender. This model stands for affirming the specificity and distinctiveness of gender inequality vis-à-vis all other inequality categories. Gender equality is not only kept institutionally separately in this framework, but also the protection provided for gender equality is more in-depth, proactive, and far reaching than that provided for other inequalities. Current European practice shows that it is particularly countries with strong feminist mobilization and a long tradition in promoting gender equality that follow such a model (Krizsan, Skjeie, Squires 2012b).

Finally *integrated models* opt for integrated institutions in all institutional pillars. This model conveys the message of similarity and comparability of all inequality categories including gender (Krizsan, Skjeie, Squires 2012a), and tends to play down specifics of gender inequality (Table 1).

Scrutiny of equality institutional landscapes referring to the different institutional types and in relation to the institutional architecture in which they are embedded provides a more nuanced reading of intersectionality in policy practice. The models provided may extend conceptualization for intersectionality analysis beyond structural intersectionality to political intersectionality (Verloo 2013).

The next part of the article uses the conceptual framework on equality institutions developed above for analyzing patterns of equality institutionalization in ten countries of CEE, all new member states of the EU.

Gender Equality Architecture in CEE

Two main waves of equality institutionalization can be distinguished in CEE coinciding with different international influences. The first wave was set off primarily by UN's World Conferences on Women and brought gender-specific institutions, primarily gender equality machineries to countries of the region. The second wave responded to the conditionality requirements of the EU accession process. This wave brought primarily anti-discrimination bodies to these countries. Importantly, however, these influences were mediated by key domestic actors and domestic structural and discursive factors (Krizsan and Zentai 2012). The institutional structures that result show important variation across the different countries. Sections of the chapter discuss equality institutions by type.

Gender Equality Machineries

The main influence that brought gender equality policy and institutions into most of the countries of our sample has been the UN's World Conferences on Women, a major source for norms on equality institutions globally (Rai 2003). In Poland, gender equality arrived on the policy agenda with the establishment of the Plenipotentiary for Women as early as 1986, linked to the Nairobi Third World Conference on Women (Nowakowska 2000). Slovenia, which had an exceptionally active feminist movement and some history of state support for gender equality during socialism, launched its first gender equality machinery in 1992. But the main influential momentum in launching gender equality institutions across the region was the Fourth World Conference on Women in

Table 1. Models of Equality Institutional Architecture: Configuration of Equality Bodies

Model of equality architecture	Type of equality body		
	Anti-discrimination body	Gender Equality Machinery	Consultative body
Layered model	Covers multiple inequalities under one institutional umbrella	Separate machineries for different inequalities—separate gender equality machinery	Separate consultation processes for different inequalities
Hierarchical	Gender separately, all the others together	Separate gender equality machinery (other inequalities may have no machinery at all)	Separate consultation with women’s groups
Integrated	Covers multiple inequalities under one institutional umbrella	Covers multiple inequalities under one institutional umbrella	Covers multiple inequalities under one institutional umbrella

Beijing in 1995. Beijing placed gender equality initiatives on the policy agenda in the majority of the countries, including the creation of the first gender equality institutions in the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Romania, Lithuania, and with some delay in Slovakia and Latvia. The institutions established in this wave were without exception gender equality machineries, largely in the meaning discussed in the previous chapter, and were put in place by gender equality strategies implementing the Beijing Platform for Action.

Lithuania and Bulgaria followed somewhat later. Lithuania constituted an exception in that, along with the gender equality machinery within the government already in 2001, in the first wave of EU accession negotiations, and partly under Nordic influence, it also established an anti-discrimination body: The Ombudsman for Equal Opportunities between Women and Men. Bulgaria, on the other hand, established no gender equality machinery for quite some time. The momentum of the Bulgarian gender equality agenda launched by the Beijing conference was blocked by the country's deep economic crises. This resulted in a shift away from gender toward issues of race and ethnicity from 1997 onwards (Stoykova 2007). Bulgaria has created its first gender equality machinery only in 2004 amidst strong EU pressure (Stoykova 2007) after several failed attempts. The machinery, however, kept its gender focus only for a very short time. In 2005, it was transformed into an integrated body: Its mandate was amended to cover multiple inequalities along with gender.

Along with Bulgaria, Romania also responded to EU incentives in consolidating its gender equality machinery in 2004. However, unlike its Bulgarian counterpart the Romanian National Agency for Equal Opportunities between Women and Men came to be one of the most pro active and well-resourced gender equality machineries of the region. Quite importantly, major impetus to its development came from a EU twinning project in which the Romanian machinery had the opportunity to cooperate with the Spanish *Instituto de la Mujer*, one of the strongest gender equality machineries in Europe (Popa 2007; Krizsan and Zentai 2012) (Table 2).

Gender equality machineries in countries of the region show a lot of variation. But a few common denominators can be discerned. The mandate of these institutions included the representation of women's interest within the government and reflected a targeted gender equality policy approach with a focus on implementation of often quite meager, and internationally determined, gender equality policies of the country. Their mandate allocated, in almost all cases, a central place to the responsibility to respond to international obligations

Table 2. Gender Equality Machineries (Parenthesis Indicates Year of Change or Consolidation)

Country	Year of Launch	Current name	Shift
Bulgaria	2004 (2005)	Equal Opportunities Unit	Initially Equal Opportunities for Women and Men unit, turned into integrated unit in 2005.
Czech Republic	1998 (2007)	Unit for Equality between Women and Men	Integrated in umbrella Ministry for Human Rights and Minorities (2007). Separate units for different inequalities.
Estonia	1996 (2004)	Gender Equality Department.	Consolidated in 2004.
Hungary	1995 (2002)	Gender Equality Department	Integrated under equal opportunity umbrella state secretariat. Separate units for different inequalities maintained.
Latvia	1999	Gender Equality Unit	
Lithuania	1995 (2001)	Gender Equality Unit	Integrated in umbrella Department of Equal Opportunities and Social Integration. Separate units for different inequalities.
Poland	1986 (2008)	Plenipotentiary for Equal Status	Initially established Plenipotentiary for Women's Affairs reframed several times replaced by integrated machinery in 2008.
Romania	1995 (2005)	National Agency for Equal Opportunities between Women and Men ²	Consolidated by law in 2005. (There is no direct continuity between the 1995 and 2005 versions.)
Slovakia	1999	Department of Gender Policy and Equal Opportunities	In the 2003–2007 period was a merged unit called the Department for Equality and Anti-discrimination.
Slovenia	1992 (2002) (2004)	Office for Equal Opportunities	Office for Equal Opportunities between Women and Men complemented in 2002 with Advocate, shift in 2004 to integrated approach. Priority on gender.

(for example, reports to the Committee on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination against Women [CEDAW], Beijing reporting, representation at hearings and CEDAW meetings, and increasingly the task to respond to EU requirements on gender). This shows that the core motivation for the establishment of these institutions at this point was primarily internationally driven. International obligations featured in a central place of the mandates in Slovenia, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Latvia³, Poland, Romania, and to some extent Slovakia.

The lack of independence of these machineries from political cycles was one of their most important problems, especially in the context of the marginality of gender equality on the political agenda. Gender equality machineries in most of CEE remained extremely exposed to political shifts. The number of name changes, shifts between and within ministries, and shifts in framing the policy issues within their mandate are informative in many of the cases, but have been particularly excessive in the Hungarian, Latvian, Polish, and Slovak cases.⁴

The Polish case illustrates an extreme vulnerability to political cycles. The Polish gender equality architecture, while the oldest in the region, is also the one with the most troubled history, explained both by the strength of Catholic anti-gender equality traditions and by prolonged periods of right-wing governments in the country. The Plenipotentiary for Women's Affairs, originally established in 1986, has been renamed and reframed to belong to different government departments several times throughout its history, shifting between different missions: From more gender equality focused ones to missions serving often traditional family policy purposes. Its legitimacy *vis-à-vis* gender equality groups was also very problematic, with long periods when the relationship was completely stalled (Dabrowska 2007; Nowakowska 2000). Finally in 2008, in the context of preparing the long-awaited anti-discrimination law, the office of the Plenipotentiary for Women's Affairs was closed down. The new Plenipotentiary for Equal Status created within the Prime Minister's Office, which replaced the previous one, is mandated to cover a variety of different inequalities going well beyond gender and is notorious for its homophobic and anti-women statements (Krizsan and Zentai 2012).

The Slovenian and Lithuanian machineries demonstrate relative stability compared with the others (Kuhar et al. 2007; Pilinkaite-Sotirovic 2007). While the tradition of an active feminist civil society and its role is a marked difference in the Slovenian case (Kuhar et al. 2007), explanations for the Lithuanian case need more investigation.

Finally, another important and distinctive feature of the majority of gender equality machineries in CEE is their troubled relationship with women's movement organizations in nearly all the cases, with the exception of Slovenia. The access of women's NGOs to these policy machineries was often limited, if not controversial (Krizsan and Zentai 2012; Open Society Institute 2005; QUING 2007). While there have been instances and periods when cooperation was better and steadier in a number of countries, the role of machineries in the region was rarely seen to give true voice to women's interests toward the state. They can hardly be seen as embodiments of state feminism in the region (Stetson and Mazur 1995 for Poland, Open Society Institute 2005).

Consultative Equality Bodies

In the context of an ambiguous and often conflictual relationship between the gender equality machineries and feminist groups, the creation of alternative consultative mechanisms for channeling the voice of NGOs into the policy process came at least partly as a compensatory process. Consultative bodies were established in almost all countries,⁵ mostly because of pressure from NGOs to have adequate representation in policymaking (the pressure is particularly visible in Bulgaria, Hungary, Latvia, Poland, and Slovakia). Others were created upon pressure from the EU to improve implementation of gender equality policies in place (Bulgaria and Czech Republic). In the majority of the countries, these bodies bring together the three main stakeholders of gender policymaking: NGOs, experts, and policymakers, in order to improve implementation processes and to give better and more direct access to women's NGOs in the process. They complement women's policy agencies with a formalized mechanism for inclusion of NGOs in policymaking. Consultative bodies are often coordinated from within the gender equality machineries (Hungary, Czech Republic, Latvia, Romania, and planned for Estonia). Some of these bodies are also intended as coordination bodies for gender mainstreaming (for example, Hungary, Latvia, and Lithuania). Meanwhile, it is important to note that recent cross-country evaluations (Krizsan and Zentai 2012; Open Society Institute 2005; QUING 2007) emphasized the weak mandate such consultative bodies have, and similar to gender equality machineries, their extreme exposure to political cycles. Almost all consultative bodies in the sample had periods when they stopped operating; most of them have also gone through shifts including renaming and redrawing of their mandates (especially Bulgaria, Hungary, Latvia, Poland, and Slovakia). Consultative bodies were established in almost all the countries. In some places (Hungary and Poland), they

were established, and after being dormant, reestablished, mostly on the demand of NGOs for better consultation processes. Slovenia, where NGO voice was more prominent all along and had good access to the gender equality machinery anyway, had no such consultative body until 2005. The Council of the Government for the Implementation of the Principle of Equal Treatment established in 2005 focuses on multiple inequality grounds and serves primarily the purpose of giving voice to other groups newly provided with protection (Table 3).

The combination of gender equality machineries and consultative bodies geared more or less efficiently toward promoting gender equality was in place in most countries of the region by the time they entered EU accession negotiations. Two outlier cases could be named, deviating somewhat from the general pattern. In Bulgaria, specific protection of gender equality was sidelined very early, and a specific gender equality machinery existed only for a year between 2004 and 2005. In Poland the Plenipotentiary for Women's Affairs was closed, and a new Plenipotentiary was created for covering multiple inequalities but often representing an anti-gender equality agenda.

Anti-discrimination Bodies

Since the early 2000s, the EU accession processes, coupled with increased NGO mobilization, have generated increasing institutionalization in the field of equality policy. The EU accession of CEE countries overlapped with the changes in the EU equality policy. These countries were the first and best students to harmonize their legislation with the newly adopted equality directives (Falkner, Treib and Holzleithner 2008). While the hard incentives of the accession forced the entire region to accommodate the new European equality framework, their policy responses depended on equality policy processes that ensued in the context of previously established equality institutional structures and complex political spaces animated by different civil society groups and more or less friendly governments.

From the beginning of the 2000s these countries started to develop anti-discrimination bodies. While the gender equality machineries discussed above were inequality specific, debates on anti-discrimination policy were integrated discussions of several inequalities. At the core of the discussions were the six inequality grounds recognized by the EU; however, in several countries the discussion revolved around many more, often unrealistically large, lists of inequalities. Beyond the difference in focus between targeting specific inequalities and targeting multiple inequalities under one umbrella, another difference between the newly created anti-discrimination bodies and gender

Table 3. Consultative Equality Bodies (Parenthesis Indicates the Year of Change or Consolidation)

Country	Date created	Name	Notes
Bulgaria	1994 (2004)	National Council for Gender Equality with the Council of Ministers	NGO and EU pressure leads to consolidation.
Czech Republic	1999 (2003)	Government Council for Equal Opportunities	Initial CEDAW Committee consolidated in 2003 under EU influence.
Estonia	2004	Gender Equality Council	Provided for by 2004 Gender Equality Law. Unclear whether operational.
Hungary	1997	Council for Gender Equality	Consolidated in 2008. Has an allocated seat for intersectional groups.
Latvia	2001 (2002)	Interministerial gender equality coordination group. Council for Gender Equality	The two complement each other. The Council has a stronger NGO component. Geared to mainstreaming.
Lithuania	2000	Interministerial Commission on Equal Opportunities for Women and Men	NGOs only included since 2007.
Poland	1996 (2001)	Forum for Cooperation of NGOs and Plenipotentiary	NGO membership largely dependent on political cycles.
Romania	1999 (2005)	National Commission for Equal Opportunities between Women and Men (has regional commissions as well)	Consultative Interministerial Commission for Equal Opportunities between Women and Men. Consolidated in 2005.
Slovakia	1996 (2003)	Commission for Equal Opportunities and Status of Women in the Society	Currently not operational.
Slovenia	2005	Council of the Government for the Implementation of the Principle of Equal Treatment	Integrated all inequalities.

equality machineries was the focus on individualistic, complaints-driven, equal treatment approach rather than a group-based, structural approach (Rees 1998).

In countries with the most political commitment to anti-discrimination thinking, new anti-discrimination bodies covering multiple inequality grounds were created. Such bodies were created in Romania in 2002, in Hungary in 2005, and in Bulgaria in 2005. All the three have a wide mandate that goes beyond the six inequality grounds protected by the EU to cover several other inequalities and also have open lists to include additional ones. Two of them (Bulgaria and Romania) also specifically have a mandate to deal with multiple discrimination.

Countries that made a relatively limited political commitment to introducing comprehensive anti-discrimination policy for addressing all protected inequalities, including the Czech Republic, Latvia, and Slovakia, have chosen a less demanding institutional solution. They amended the mandate of general human rights protection bodies to explicitly refer to anti-discrimination law enforcement duties. Latvia has still not passed a comprehensive anti-discrimination law; Slovakia has passed a law but has an extremely weak enforcement record this far (Repar and Ocenasova 2007); and the Czech Republic only passed its law in 2009 against the threat of EC sanctions. While their solutions followed the letters of the *acquis communautaire*, they failed to commit to the more general idea behind the need for specialized anti-discrimination bodies: Namely, the need for specialized in-depth knowledge, expertise, and focused attention (Krizsan 2006; MacEwen 1997).

A distinctive path in establishing anti-discrimination bodies is taken by three countries in the sample, which have chosen to build upon their well-established and strongly embedded gender equality machineries that they already had in place. This path was followed by the two countries with relatively stable and successful gender equality institution: Lithuania and Slovenia, and Estonia which had a somewhat more recent history in institutionalizing gender. In all the three cases the competences of their gender equality institutions were extended to cover additional protected inequality categories. The mandate of the Lithuanian Ombudsman for Equal Opportunities, which was the only gender equality specific complaint body operational in the region since the end of the 1990s, was extended to cover complaints based on all inequalities protected under EU law. The Slovenian Office for Women's Policy's mandate was first extended to address gender equality complaints by adding to the institution the Advocate for Equal Opportunities in 2003. In a next step in 2005, the Advocate's mandate was also extended to

cover all protected inequality categories beyond gender. In Estonia, the Gender Equality Commissioner was established as a gender equality specific anti-discrimination body in 2004 under the Gender Equality Act. In 2009, its competences were extended under the new Equal Treatment Act and the institution was renamed Gender Equality and Equal Treatment Commissioner in charge for all inequalities covered by the gender equality and the equal treatment legislation. However, as its name indicates, it maintained its primary focus on gender even after the formal change (Table 4).

Emerging Equality Institutional Architectures

Institutionalization of anti-discrimination policy in countries of the region combined in different ways with equality institutions already in place depending on national institutional and discursive contexts and the political will available for instituting change in equality policy in accordance with EU norms. The three models of equality institutional architecture, layered, hierarchical,¹ and integrated, all emerged in countries of the region.

Layered Models

The new wave of institutionalization brought new equality institutions to the equality architecture of the majority of the examined countries. The new institutions complemented the previous gender equality architecture, rather than displacing it. They brought changes both by introducing new institutional actors and by strengthening a different equality understanding. New institutions placed the emphasis on anti-discrimination policy symmetrically covering a diversity of protected inequality grounds, compared with the more group-based, structural, gender equality specific approach already in place. While variation occurs in the form and strength of these new bodies, depending mostly on the political commitment of the countries to introduce new equality institutions, what is common to all of them is that they create an additional institutional layer on top of previous gender equality machineries, but they do not modify them. Importantly, these new institutional arrangement did not interfere with gender equality machineries and consultative bodies already in place, but provided another institutional pillar in the equality architecture.

In countries that follow a layered institutional architecture, the separation between equal treatment and structural gender equality approaches remained evident in institutional terms. They maintained specific gender equality machineries and consultative bodies, while they all followed an integrated multi-inequality approach for their anti-discrimination bodies. As such, layered models provide two or

Table 4. Anti-discrimination Bodies (Parenthesis Indicates the Year When Function Was Allocated or When Integration Took Place)

Country	Year launched	Name	Number of inequalities covered
Bulgaria	2005	Commission for Protection against Discrimination	17, open ended + multiple discrimination
Czech Republic	1999 (2009)	Office of the Ombudsman	9
Estonia	2004 (2009)	Gender Equality and Equal Treatment Commissioner	6
Hungary	2005	Equal Treatment Authority	19, open ended
Latvia	1996 (2005)	National Human Rights Office	9, open ended
Lithuania	1999 (2005)	Office of Equal Opportunities Ombudsman	7, open ended
Poland	2008	Plenipotentiary for Equal Legal Status	No AD law, Race, gender, religion, age
Romania	2002	National Council for Combating Discrimination	14, open ended + multiple discrimination
Slovakia	1994 (2004)	Slovak National Center for Human Rights	13, open ended
Slovenia	2003	Advocate for the Principle of Equal Treatment	7, open ended

even three distinctive arenas for intersectionality, each of which establishes distinctive relations between gender and other inequalities and provides different entry points for engaging with intersectionality.

Countries that created new anti-discrimination bodies without downgrading or closing their gender equality machineries and consultative bodies belonged here: Czech Republic, Hungary, Latvia, Romania, and Slovakia. Bulgaria followed this model during the year its gender equality machinery was in place, after that moving to an integrated model.

Hierarchical Models

Institutional architectures that follow a hierarchical model evolved primarily in countries that had well-established and strongly embedded gender equality institutions already in place: Lithuania and Slovenia. Both the Lithuanian Ombudsman for Equal Opportunities and the Advocate for Equal Opportunities within the Slovenian Office for Equal Opportunities have formally become integrated equality institutions in the midst of the EU accession. However, given their legacy in dealing with gender equality, their priorities have remained focused on gender.⁶

Estonia should also be mentioned here. While its gender institutionalization legacy is not as long as that of Lithuania and Slovenia, Estonia maintained the strong gender primacy of its Gender Equality Commissioner created in 2004 despite the formal shift to an integrated approach that occurred in 2009 with passing the Equal Treatment Law.⁷ Estonia also kept gender equality separately throughout its other equality institutional pillars.

The changes that occurred in the institutional arrangements of Estonia, Lithuania, and Slovenia reinforced a hierarchical relation between inequalities, with a primacy given to gender. Indeed, on the one hand, changes fueled worries by gender equality advocates that the protection of gender equality might be downgraded with the new institutional setup. On the other hand, advocates for other inequalities contemplated the privileged status of gender at the expense of neglecting other inequalities (Kuhar et al. 2007; Pilinkaite-Sotirovic 2007, 2008). This institutional reshuffling has encouraged competition between advocates of different inequality categories rather than being a celebration of their meeting points and diversity within them.

Integrated Model

The third, integrated, model of institutional architecture implies a comprehensive shift in equality institutionalization from the previous gender equality focus to an integrated focus on multiple inequalities across all institutional pillars. The model seems to pay no specific

attention to any inequalities but treats them symmetrically under a single umbrella. The integrated model emerged only in two countries of the region: Bulgaria and Poland, both countries following quite different trajectories of development and having very different rationales for integration. As explained before, the Polish Plenipotentiary was closed down in 2008 and a new Plenipotentiary for Equal Status was created in the Prime Minister's Office. While the new institution has competence to deal with multiple inequalities, it has no mandate: Neither to address wider structural inequalities nor to efficiently deal with anti-discrimination cases and its activities remain in the realm of the symbolic. The Polish story points to a strategic use of the EU-driven integrated equality agenda to displace a controversial gender equality institution, but the weakness of the resulting equality architecture also points to the absence of political will to support any kind of equality policy agenda.

The Bulgarian story is marked by the absence of political will to support gender equality in its specific terms. No gender equality machinery was in place in Bulgaria until 2004, despite repeated attempts by women's NGOs. In 2005, however, when the Bulgarian anti-discrimination body was created, the scope of the gender equality machinery was amended to integrate protection for all inequalities. In Bulgaria, we first see a layered institutional architecture created with the new anti-discrimination institution that is complementing the activity of the previously established gender equality machinery and the National Council for Gender Equality. However, the short-lived gender equality machinery is soon replaced with a new institution representing an integrated approach consistent with the anti-discrimination body, this moving Bulgaria closer to an integrated model. The consultative body established in 2004 (National Council for Gender Equality) remains the only specific gender equality focused institution in Bulgaria.

The two country cases nevertheless convey different messages. While in Poland political will is absent for any kind of equality agenda, and this affects all elements of the equality institutional architecture, in Bulgaria the absence of political will concerns the institutionalization of gender equality in its specific terms. A complex equality architecture emerges in Bulgaria in 2005, though it is one that pays little specific attention to gender, or any other inequality. In both cases, however, what happens is a systematic sidelining of specific gender equality thinking and its replacement with more or less committed equal treatment approach based on a variety of inequality grounds.

Integrated models of equality architectures, particularly where they are driven by genuine political will to promote equality, are ideal test cases for looking into the intersectional potential of

multiple equality agendas. While Bulgaria stands out as one of the only two countries in the region that cover multiple inequalities in their legislative frameworks, the extent to which this is put into practice is up for further research (Table 5).

The three discussed models of equality institutional architecture illustrate the emergent complexity of institutional forms addressing gender equality and the variation in the institutional relationship established between different inequalities. They set different structural, institutional, and discursive frameworks in which the relationship between gender inequality and different other inequality categories is produced and reproduced, and arenas within which the potential for engaging with intersectional policy thinking is present in different ways.

Discussion and Conclusions

The analysis showed that the equality policy shift in the EU, met by CEE countries during their candidacy for accession to EU membership, has diversified their equality institutional landscapes resulting in the creation of complex equality architectures that open up possibilities for a variety of institutionalized relationships between different inequality categories. Nevertheless, the changes have rarely brought all-encompassing institutional shifts from specific gender equality institutions toward institutions that treat different inequalities in integrated ways across the board. The resulting models of equality institutional architecture provide a framework to look at the institutional relationship between gender and different other inequalities in more nuanced ways.

The analysis showed that almost all countries (with the notable exception of Estonia) placed the anti-discrimination law enforcement mandate for all protected inequality grounds into one integrated body. Variation occurred, however, in terms of how the new institutions were embedded in the institutional structures already in place. Three equality institutional architecture models were identified: *Layered*, *hierarchical*, and *integrated*. In countries that follow the *layered model*, gender equality machineries were maintained alongside the new, mostly integrated anti-discrimination bodies. This model treats anti-discrimination institutions and gender equality institutions as separate institutional pillars, working in parallel, but each having a distinct focus and implying different relationships between different inequality categories. In countries following the *hierarchical model*, existent gender institutions were amended to respond to the multiple inequalities focused equal treatment agenda of the EU, but in practice the hierarchical relation between gender

Table 5. Equality Institutional Architecture by Country

Institutional model	Layered	Hierarchical	Integrated
Countries	Bulgaria until 2005 Czech Republic Hungary Latvia Romania Slovakia	Estonia Lithuania Slovenia	Bulgaria from 2005 Poland

and the other inequalities remained in place. In this model strong, previously existing institutions accommodate other inequalities but they do not elevate them to the same level as the traditionally prioritized issue of gender equality. Finally, countries following an *integrated model* are the only ones where an all-encompassing shift occurs from a focus on gender to an integrated focus on multiple inequalities. The equality policy approach is reframed altogether in light of the new European paradigm leaving little or no specific focus on gender equality. The integrated inequalities approach transpires not only in their anti-discrimination bodies, but also in changes that reach gender equality machineries in these countries.

The three equality institutional architecture models suggest different frameworks for addressing the intersections of inequality grounds. Hierarchical models are vulnerable to competitive relationships between inequality categories, but given their in-depth multidimensional approach to one inequality, they have the potential for intracategorical diversification, with possible entry points within each institutional pillar. The main advantage of integrated models is their openness toward intercategory approaches, given their symmetrical understanding of relationship between inequalities. Their main disadvantage is linked to their wide scope of action targeting several inequalities, whether it is feasible at all to address intersectionality in their context. Finally, layered models allow a variety of entry points for intersectionality sensitive approaches, depending on each institutional pillar.

The aim of the analysis was to propose that using the concept of equality architecture, as discussed in the conceptual part of this article, brings an improved understanding of the emergent CEE equality institutional domain, and is feasible to discuss complex equality institutionalization processes at work in current Europe.

Distinguishing between equal treatment-driven anti-discrimination bodies and structural gender equality-driven equality machineries and consultative bodies gives a more sensitive reading of the European institutional landscape, and also opens a window of opportunity for better understanding policy engagement along with intersectionality. The current debates on equality institutions in Europe (Kantola and Nousiainen 2009; Outshoorn and Kantola 2007; Krizsan, Skeje and Squires 2012a; Squires 2008) are strongly linked to the recognition that gender policy and equality institutions need to address the intersection of gender with other inequalities. The conceptualization proposed by this article for gender equality institutional architectures in today's Europe aimed to make a contribution toward this literature by arguing that it is along the lines of the concept of institutional architecture proposed here that a better understanding can be achieved of how equality institutions can engage with intersectionality. Going beyond the equality institutionalization realm, the models of institutional architecture developed here might also serve as elements of a conceptual framework for political intersectionality analysis applicable to analysis of policy texts, civil society mobilization, and campaigning.

The paper has developed a conceptual framework for intersectionality research into the practice of gender equality institutions, and illustrated it in the context of equality institutional architectures in place in countries of CEE. While it has indicated some instances of manifestations of intersectionality, it could not go into the details of how intersectionality is ultimately integrated into the activity of all of these institutions. Given its scope, the paper could also not go more in detail into evaluating the working and efficiency of the discussed equality institutions. Finally, systemic explanations of why certain types of institutional architectures emerged in some countries and not in the others were also not offered. Even if certain explanatory factors (such as institutional legacies, strength of civil society, and competing discourses) emerged as relevant from the discussion, more systematic explanatory work was beyond the scope of this article.

NOTES

Andrea Krizsan is at Center for Policy Studies, Central European University, Nador utca 9, 1051 Budapest, Hungary. Tel: +36-1-327-3000/2306; Fax: +36-1-235-6170. E-mail: krizsana@ceu.hu. Between 2006 and 2011 she was researcher of the European research project, Quality of Gender + Equality Policies in Europe (QUING). She has a PhD in Political Science from the Central European University. She works on policy change in Central and Eastern Europe, with special focus on equality policies and

equality institutions, gender mainstreaming, and domestic violence policies. Her articles have appeared or are forthcoming in the *Journal for Ethnic and Minority Studies*, *Social Politics*, *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *European Journal for Women Studies*, *Violence Against Women* and several edited volumes.

This article benefited immensely from writing projects that I had together with Violetta Zentai and Raluca Popa, and Judith Squires and Hege Skjeie. I am grateful for the many enlightening discussions on the topic with all of them. I also thank Mieke Verloo and Sylvia Walby for invaluable comments throughout the editorial process of this special issue. The paper builds on research data and reports developed within the framework of the European comparative project *Quality in Gender+ Equality Policies in Europe* (QUING)—www.quing.eu. I am indebted to QUING country researchers from CEE for their extremely valuable work channeled into QUING reports. In alphabetical order, they are: Magda Dabrowska, Tamas Dombos, Majda Hrzenjak, Martin Jaigma, Vlasta Jalusic, Erika Kispeter, Roman Kuhar, Marja Kuzmanic, Zuzana Ocnasova, Vilana Pilinkaite-Sotirovic, Aivita Putnina, Stanislava Repar, Ingrid Roeder, Elena Stoykova, and Melinda Szabo. The original reports are available on the QUING project website. Finally, I thank four anonymous Social Politics reviewers for their constructive comments.

1. The European Commission Green Paper “Equality and Non-discrimination in an Enlarged European Union” (2004), for example, supported the trend among some member states to establish “single equality bodies dealing with all of the grounds of discrimination covered by the Directives” (p.12).

2. The Czech Republic, Hungary, and Latvia had periods when the unit belonged to the Department of European Integration and International Affairs.

3. The National Agency for Equal Opportunities between Women and Men was dissolved in July 2010. It becomes a department within the Ministry of Labor along with the National Agency for the Protection of the Family and the National Agency for Persons with Disabilities.

4. The prolonged Bulgarian failure to pass a gender equality law and establish a related policy agency to some extent also speaks to this point.

5. Currently unoperational in Slovakia and Estonia. In Slovakia, it existed previously but then stopped working. In Estonia, it is stipulated by law but has not been created because of lack of resources. Thanks to Martin Jaigma for this updated information.

6. A review of areas of work of the Slovenian Office as presented on the website is indicative. http://www.uem.gov.si/en/areas_of_work/. (accessed June 17, 2012).

7. Naming of the Commissioner: Gender Equality and Equal Treatment is already indicative. The website of the Commissioner further supports this argument. <http://www.svv.ee/index.php?t=2>. (accessed June 17, 2012).

REFERENCES

- Bell, Mark. 2002. *Anti-discrimination Law and the European Union*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Booth, Christine, and Cinnamon Bennett. 2002. "Gender Mainstreaming in the European Union: Towards a New Conception and Practice of Equal Opportunities?" *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 9 (4): 430–46.
- Crenshaw, Kimberly. 1989. "Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics." *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, 1989:139–67.
- . 1991. "Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics and Violence against Women of Color." *Stanford Law Review*, 43:1241.
- Dabrowska, Magdalena. 2007. *Series of Timelines of Policy Debates in Selected Topics, Poland*. Vienna: IWM and QUING Project. http://www.quiring.eu/files/results/ih_poland.pdf (accessed June 15, 2012).
- European Commission (EC). 2004. *Equality and Non-discrimination in an Enlarged European Union*. http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/other/114157_en.htm (accessed June 15, 2012).
- Falkner, Gerda, Oliver Treib, and Elisabeth Holzleithner. 2008. *Compliance in the Enlarged European Union: Living Rights or Dead Letters?* Ashgate: Aldershot.
- Fredman, Sandra. 2005. "Double Trouble: Multiple Discrimination and EU Law." *European Anti-discrimination Law Review*, 2:13–9.
- Goldston, James. 2006. "Public Interest Litigation in Central and Eastern Europe: Roots, Prospects, and Challenges." *Human Rights Quarterly*, 28 (2): 492–527.
- Hancock, Ange-Marie. 2007. "When Multiplication Doesn't Equal Quick Addition: Examining Intersectionality as a Research Paradigm." *Perspectives on Politics*, 5 (1): 63–79.
- Hannett, Sarah. 2003. "Equality at the Intersections: The Legislative and Judicial Failure to Tackle Multiple Discrimination." *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*, 23 (1): 65–86.
- Kantola, Johanna, and Kevat Nousiainen, eds. 2009. "Institutionalizing Intersectionality in Europe." *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 11: 4. Special Issue.
- Krizsan, Andrea. 2006. "Ombudsmen and Similar Institutions for Protection against Racial and Ethnic Discrimination." In *European Yearbook of Minority Issues*. Vol. 4, 2004/5. Leiden, Boston: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.
- Krizsan, Andrea, and Viola Zentai. 2012. "Institutionalizing Intersectionality in Central and Eastern Europe." In *Institutionalizing Intersectionality. The Changing Nature of European Equality Regimes*. eds. Andrea Krizsan, Hege Skjeie, and Judith Squires. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.

- Krizsan, Andrea, Tamas Dombos, Erika Kispeter, Linda Szabo, Jasminka Dedic, Martin Jaigma, Roman Kuhar, Anna Frank, Birgit Sauer, and Mieke Verloo. 2009. Framing Gender Equality in the European Union and its Current and Future Member States. Deliverable No. 61: Final LARG Report. QUING Project. Vienna: IWM. http://www.quing.eu/files/results/final_larg_report.pdf. (accessed June 17, 2012).
- Krizsan, Andrea, Hege Skjeie, and Judith Squires, eds. 2012a. *Institutionalizing Intersectionality. European Comparative Analyses*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.
- . 2012b. "European Equality Regimes: Institutional Change and Political Intersectionality." In *Institutionalizing Intersectionality. European Comparative Analyses*. eds. Andrea Krizsan, Hege Skjeie, and Judith Squires. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Kuhar, Roman, Vlasta Jalusic, Majda Hrzenjak, and Marja Kuzmanic. 2007. *Issue Histories Slovenia: Series of Timelines of Policy Debates in Selected Topics*. Vienna: QUING Project and IWM. http://www.quing.eu/files/results/ih_slovenia.pdf. (accessed June 17, 2012).
- Lombardo, Emanuela, and Mieke Verloo. 2009. "Institutionalizing Intersectionality in the European Union? Policy Developments and Contestations." *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 11 (4): 478–95.
- Lustgarten, Laurence. 1980. *Legal Control of Racial Discrimination*. London: Macmillan Press.
- MacEwen, Martin, ed. 1997. *Anti-Discrimination Law Enforcement. A Comparative Perspective*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- McBride, Dorothy E., and Amy Mazur. 2010. *The Politics of State Feminism. Innovation in Comparative Research*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- McCall, Leslie. 2005. "The Complexity of Intersectionality." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 30:1771–1800.
- Nowakowska, Ursula. 2000. "Government Mechanism for the Advancement of Women." In *Polish Women in the 90's*. Warsaw: Women's Rights Center. <http://web.archive.org/web/20090220021243/http://temida.free.ngo.pl/mechanisms.htm>. (accessed June 17, 2012).
- Open Society Institute (OSI). 2005. *Equal Opportunities for Women and Men. Monitoring Law and Practice in New Member States and Accession Countries of the European Union*. New York: Open Society Institute. http://www.soros.org/initiatives/women/articles_publications/publications/equal_20050502. (accessed June 17, 2012).
- Outshoorn, Joyce and Johanna Kantola, eds. 2007. *Changing State Feminism*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Pilinkaite-Sotirovic, Vilana. 2007. *Series of Timelines of Policy Debates in Selected Topics. Lithuania*. Vienna: QUING Project and IWM. http://www.quing.eu/files/results/ih_lithuania.pdf. (accessed June 17, 2012).
- . 2008. Report Analysing Intersectionality in Gender Equality Policies. Lithuania. Vienna: QUING Project and IWM. http://www.quing.eu/files/results/ir_lithuania.pdf. (accessed June 17, 2012).

- Popa, Raluca Maria. 2007. *Series of Timelines of Policy Debates in Selected Topics. Romania*. Vienna: QUING Project and IWM. http://www.quing.eu/files/results/ih_romania.pdf. (accessed June 17, 2012).
- QUING. 2007. *Series of Timelines of Policy Debates in Selected Topics*. Vienna: QUING Project and IWM. <http://www.quing.eu/content/view/34/52/>. (accessed June 17, 2012).
- Rai, Shirin. 2003. "Introduction" and "Institutional Mechanisms for the Advancement of Women: Mainstreaming Gender, Democratizing the State?" In *Mainstreaming Gender, Democratizing the State. Institutional Mechanisms for the Advancement of Women*. ed. Shirin Rai, 1–40. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Rees, Teresa. 1998. *Mainstreaming Equality in the European Union: Education, Training and Labour Market Policies*. London: Routledge.
- Repar, Stanislava, and Zusanna Ocnasova. 2007. *Series of Timelines of Policy Debates in Selected Topics. Slovakia*. Vienna: QUING Project and IWM. http://www.quing.eu/files/results/ih_slovakia.pdf. (accessed June 17, 2012).
- Roth, Silke. 2007. "Sisterhood and Solidarity? Women's Organizations in the Expanded European Union." *Social Politics*, 14 (4): 460–87.
- Rueschemeyer, Marilyn, and Sharon L. Wolchik, eds. 2009. *Women in Power in Post-Communist Parliaments*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Squires, Judith. 2007. *New Politics of Gender Equality*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- . 2008. "Intersecting Inequalities: Reflecting on the Subjects and Objects of Equality." *The Political Quarterly*, 79: 53–61.
- Stetson, Dorothy, and Amy Mazur, eds. 1995. *Comparative State Feminism*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Stoykova, Elena. 2007. *Series of Timelines of Policy Debates in Selected Topics. Bulgaria*. Vienna: QUING Project and IWM. http://www.quing.eu/files/results/ih_bulgaria.pdf. (accessed June 17, 2012).
- Verloo, Mieke. 2005. "Displacement and Empowerment: Reflections on the Council of Europe approach to gender mainstreaming and gender equality." *Social Politics*, 12 (3): 344–66.
- . 2013. "Intersectional and Cross-Movement Politics and Policies: Reflections on Current Practices and Debates." *Signs*, forthcoming.
- Verloo, Mieke, and Sylvia Walby. 2012. "Introduction: The Implications for Theory and Practice of Comparing the Treatment of Intersectionality in the Equality Architecture in Europe." *Social Politics*, 19 (4).
- Walby, Sylvia. 2005. "Gender Mainstreaming: Productive Tensions in Theory and Practice." *Social Politics*, 12 (3): 1–25.
- Walby, Sylvia, Jo Armstrong, and Sofia Strid. 2012. "Intersectionality and the Quality of the Gender Equality Architecture." *Social Politics*, 19 (4).
- Weldon, Laurel. 2002. "Beyond Bodies: Institutional Sources of Representation for Women in Democratic Policy-Making." *The Journal of Politics*, 64 (4): 1153–74.

- Yuval-Davis, Nira. 2006a. "Intersectionality and Feminist Politics." *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 13 (3): 193–209.
- . 2006b. "Human/Women's Rights and Feminist Transversal Politics." In *Transnational Feminisms: Women's Global Activism and Human Rights*. eds. Myra Marx Ferree, and Aili Mari Tripp, 275–295 New York: New York University Press.