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Executive Summary

The Women in Public Service Project (WPSP) is the flagship program of the Wilson Center’s Global Women’s Leadership Initiative. Founded in 2011 to conduct action-oriented research, WPSP’s overarching objective has been to encourage and empower women around the world to achieve equal representation in elected and appointed political and policy leadership positions by 2050. However, in order to document a country’s journey towards gender equality, the Wilson Center must first determine the status quo regarding women in politics and public administration — a task academics and practitioners in the field continue to struggle with due to limited data availability and cross-national cultural and historical variance. Initial findings, nevertheless, suggest that men and women still do not have the same opportunities to take part in the political and policymaking process.

The Wilson Center’s goal is to advocate for institutional change on a global stage, while fostering transparency and accountability. As such, our most important task as the Georgetown University Capstone Team was to systematically collect and organize evidence of women’s political and policy leadership in Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) countries, especially in the United States, Canada, the United Kingdom, Germany and Sweden. Moving forward, our database will help WPSP track the representation of women in national leadership positions and the incidence of factors that may promote or impede their ability to be elevated to such roles.

Definitions and Framing

We produced a comprehensive database on women in national political and policy leadership positions, as well as explanatory variables that may facilitate or hinder their career trajectories. For the purposes of this Capstone Project, we relied in part on Provan’s (1980) definition of leadership: holding an enacted position of power or influence. We understood enacted power or influence as being demonstrated, for example, as president or prime minister, as a national cabinet member, a national legislative representative, a national department head or another civil service decision-making role, a supreme court judge, a military commander, or a chief of police.

We studied enacted power and influence in OECD countries, with a particular focus on the US, Canada, the UK, Germany and Sweden. We chose these five nations because they recorded differences in female political and public administration empowerment, despite similar levels of socio-economic development. Based on USAID’s Diamond Leadership Model (2014), we examined the states across five political and policy pillars at the national level: the executive, the legislature, the civil service, the judiciary and security. However, we extended our security scope to also include state police forces to augment our dataset. We then generated recommendations that we hope might assist these and other countries to make further progress towards gender parity in public office.
Research Objectives

Based on the above definitions and framework, we contributed to the Wilson Center’s existing research into women’s leadership in politics and public administration by addressing the following questions:

- Are the OECD and case study countries close to (or far away from) reaching gender equality in political and policy leadership positions across the five pillars?
- What factors explain the status quo, including enabling and impeding explanatory variables?
- What impact do women have on politics and the policy-making process when they exercise leadership within their pillar?

Lessons from the Literature

To guide our analysis, we identified possible explanatory variables for each pillar by compiling five separate literature reviews. These indicators varied according to pillar but generally comprised of institutional, socio-structural, economic and demographic factors, such as the country’s political system, legal scheme, political parties and gender equity policies.

Our primary findings were as follows:

- In the executive pillar, several institutional and socio-structural factors appeared to be correlated with women’s leadership in public service. Institutional explanatory variables that we found to be positively correlated with gender equality included a parliamentary political system, a progressive party in power, a proportional representation electoral scheme, public campaign finance laws, and a specialist cabinet recruitment system. Significant structural enablers included high educational attainment, professional vocational experience and a privileged family background.
- In the legislative pillar, we could found that certain institutional characteristics — such as the electoral system, political parties, gender equity policies and quotas — could affect progress towards parity in politics and public administration, as did social/cultural factors including political culture, gender roles and family life/time constraints.
- For the civil service pillar, significant hurdles to women’s empowerment included inadequate payment, discrimination and reform agendas that do not tackle gender equity concerns. Enablers included female leaders in higher, elected office, legislative equality mandates, a merit-based recruitment system, as well as supportive legal and policy frameworks.
- In the judicial pillar, significant factors influencing a woman’s ability to obtain a leadership position included the type of legal system, court size, and the judicial selection method. Having a civil law scheme and larger court size seemed to increase
the chances of female judicial representation, while the impact of selection methods remained contentious.

- In the security pillar, barriers women faced included **historical under-representation, entry-point challenges — such as application restrictions and job availability — and discrimination in career advancement opportunities**. Although the importance of various **gender perspectives** and female participation in both military and police forces has been highlighted, **gender integration at higher levels** still seems to have strongly resisted.

**Methodology**

We built a database of women’s political and policy leadership information by pillar, across country and, in some circumstances, across time. For statistical evaluation, we also included general explanatory variables and factors specific to each pillar in the dataset. The database was structured in this manner to allow us to make **quantitative and qualitative cross-pillar, cross-national, and cross-time comparisons**.

The research methods used in each pillar are outlined below:

- Executive pillar data for OECD countries in 2005 and 2015 was analyzed to identify any changes and to see whether correlations existed between elected women heads of state or government, the percentage of female cabinet members, the general explanatory variables and specific executive indicators. We generated descriptive statistics and conducted basic statistical analysis, to ascertain whether there were any associations between the factors.
- OECD legislative data was examined for 2006 and 2016. We studied the relationships between 2016 parliamentary representation and explanatory variables, such as quotas and other gender-based policies, again using statistical analysis.
- 2015 OECD civil service data was analyzed to determine whether associations were evident between female civil service leaders, quotas, recruitment systems, cabinet members and nondiscrimination mandates.
- Judicial data from the five case study countries was examined in three time periods: 2006, 2011 and 2016. We undertook comparative analysis of the percentage of female supreme court judges across time and cross-nationally, and tested hypotheses regarding enablers and barriers.
- Security data from the case study nations was evaluated at different recent points in time, depending on accessible information. We prepared descriptive statistics about female national defense department heads and the inclusion of women in military occupations to explore whether women in commanding positions and job availability influenced female leadership in the security pillar. The same potential correlations were studied for state-level police forces.

Though our statistical research revealed some intriguing results, our research was constrained by data availability and small sample sizes. Moreover, the nature of quantitative studies meant
that our work risked missing a “deep experience” examination of women in political and policy leadership. Therefore, we mitigated these issues by producing case studies on our countries of interest. We believe this use of mixed research methods has enabled us to present an accurate depiction of gender parity in politics and public administration and analyze relationships with the explanatory variables.

Analysis and Discussion

Our central findings are as follows:

- In the executive pillar, as of June 2015, women had been elected head of state or government in 23 of the 35 OECD countries. Among our case study nations, Germany was a leader by having two female political executives in the same timeframe. With regards to cabinets, Finland, Sweden and France all achieved gender parity in 2015, with 62.5%, 52.2% and 50% women’s representation respectively. In relation to the case study states, the average female participation rate was 32.3% in 2005 and 33% in 2015. Analyzing the data, we identified statistically significant correlations between the percentage of women cabinet members, public finance schemes, cabinet recruitment mechanisms and female legislative representation, as well as between women cabinet officials and female labor force participation.

- Regarding the case study countries, there was an average increase of 4.3% in female legislative representation during the 10 years prior to 2016. This upward trend was observed across OECD nations, with a mean increase of 3.77%. We found that OECD states with voluntary political party quotas had higher women’s parliamentary participation. Further, gender-based policies — especially maternity leave, nondiscrimination laws, and equal pay mandates — appeared to be related to greater female legislative representation.

- Within the civil service, the average female participation rate within OECD countries in 2015 was 54.5%. We found that this was most likely attributable to policies and legal frameworks aimed at ameliorating workforce gender gaps in those nations. The mean share of women in decision-making positions in OECD states in 2015 was 31.5%, which reflected the disconnect between female participation and empowerment. OECD countries with anti-discrimination laws or position-based recruitment systems seemed to have more women in senior roles, though our analysis with respect to quotas and female cabinet members contradicted positive correlations suggested by some previous research.

- Analyzing data in the judicial pillar, we found that women’s representation, on average, increased from 22.88% in 2006 to 30.78% in 2016. On a country-to-country basis, gains were made in the percentage of female supreme court justices in individual nations, except for Sweden, which actually decreased, and the UK, which remained the same. We did not find clear links between the percentage of women supreme court justices, the type of legal system, court size or judge selection method of the five case study states.

- In the security pillar, the percentage of women serving as active duty military personnel in 2015 was much lower than men in all five case study countries. The average female
armed forces participation rate was only 13.5% in 2015, with a mean of 5.96% women defense department heads historically (compared to at least 30 male heads since World War II). Female representation in military forces was lower than that in police forces, at about 10% across the five case study nations. We did not find connections between women’s leadership in the security pillar, participation rates, application restrictions and job availability.

Case Study Findings and Recommendations

Findings and lessons learned from our five case study countries are summarized below:

- **The United States**
  - Women’s political and policy leadership in the US lags behind the other case study nations and most OECD states within the examined pillars. Notable factors such as the lack of equal pay and maternity leave laws, in addition to its failure to implement national election quotas, point to potential explanations for America’s low levels of female representation.
  - To address gender inequality in its legislative branch, the US should introduce voluntary political party quotas in its national elections, which appear to be correlated with higher representation in other OECD countries.
  - The US should implement more extensive gender-based policies, especially regarding equal pay and maternity leave mandates.
  - The US should consider diversity programs within its parties to emulate the success the nation has experienced in federal public employment.

- **Canada**
  - Despite relatively high female representation in its civil service and judicial pillars, Canada is a laggard in legislative and security women’s leadership.
  - Canada compels both equal pay and maternity leave, and should contemplate enforcing a nondiscrimination gender law as well.
  - The Canadian legislature should take measures to increase female parliamentary participation by improving the working environment of the institution so it is more attractive to women seeking a balanced personal and professional life.

- **The United Kingdom**
  - Although the UK has had two female heads of government and above average legislative representation, progress is lacking in the civil service, judiciary, and security pillars.
  - UK political parties should invest in recruiting and training female candidates to foster and nurture leadership potential within the legislature and cabinet, given the UK’s parliamentary system and generalist cabinet recruitment mechanism.
  - Career development programs and other initiatives should help promote female civil servants to decision-making positions, lawyers to the bench and military personnel to commanding roles.
More generally, bolstering maternity leave mandates should allow more British women to impact the political process and policy outcomes.

- **Germany**
  - Germany presents with relatively high levels of leadership across all pillars, but it still has room for progress, especially within its security sector.
  - **Institutionalizing the guarantee of equal access to public service pathways for women appears to be an effective way of moving towards gender parity.** Germany should actively seek to legislate for more even gender representation, such as establishing a quota system.
  - Germany’s empowerment schemes, including training programs for women in public life and a supportive social welfare system to balance work and family, have supplemented institutional policies.

- **Sweden**
  - Sweden is a general leader in female political and public administration leadership across the pillars, although it is also the only Scandinavian country not to have had a woman head of government.
  - **Countries with poor female representation in decision-making positions are recommended to consider following Sweden’s practice of increasing motivation and gender awareness to encourage more women to pursue leadership roles.**

**Conclusion**

Our findings, in general, indicate that men and women still do not have the same opportunities to participate in politics and the policymaking process. While most of the countries studied have made progress towards gender equality during the period analyzed, advancements continue to be necessary in order for women to achieve equal representation in elected and appointed political and policy leadership positions by 2050. To support the Wilson Center’s endeavors, further research should be conducted with an expanded Provan definition that includes potential power. Leadership should also be explored at the lower levels of the executive, legislature, civil service, judiciary and security pillars. Furthermore, more nations should be examined at different periods of time and deeper evaluations into women’s impact on politics and public administration should be undertaken. We hope that this project, combined with future efforts, will contribute to a better understanding of female leadership and gender equity.
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Measuring Women’s Political and Policy Leadership: Toward a Five-Pillared Framework of Analysis

1 Measuring Women’s Political and Policy Leadership

The Women in Public Service Project (WPSP) is the flagship program of the Global Women’s Leadership Initiative at the Wilson Center. Founded in 2011 with the idea of action-oriented research, one of the WPSP’s overarching goals has been to encourage and empower women around the world to achieve equal representation in elected and appointed political and policy leadership positions by 2050. However, in order to document a country’s journey towards gender parity, WPSP first needs to capture the status quo — a task yet to be comprehensively tackled by academics and practitioners alike. To that end, the Georgetown University Capstone Team collaborated with the Wilson Center to create a database framework that included indicators for women’s leadership in politics and public administration by pillar, country and, where feasible, time.

2 Background

Although databases exist in the context of poverty and justice research, very few have been constructed with a focus on women’s empowerment at all levels of politics and policymaking around the globe. The objective of the Wilson Center is to advocate for and drive institutional change on the world stage, while fostering transparency and accountability. As such, the most important task for us as part of this project was to systematically collect and organize evidence of women’s representation in OECD countries, especially in the United States, Canada, the United Kingdom, Germany and Sweden. Moving forward, the database will be fundamental in helping the WPSP track women in national political and policy leadership positions and the factors that may promote or impede their ability to be elevated to such roles.

3 Definitions and Framing

The Wilson Center’s practical approach to encouraging gender equality has been framed through various academic theories. The most influential concept has been Pitkin’s notion of “descriptive political representation” (1967) and Provan’s (1980) work on measuring types of influence and power exercised by and within political and policy institutions. Pitkin’s idea of descriptive representation evaluates whether elected and appointed leaders resemble their constituents, with studies showing girls inspire to serve in public life when they have women role models (Campbell and Wolbrecht 2006). After capturing the status quo with the database, we propose recommendations aimed at aiding politics and public administration to mirror the 50/50
gender breakdown of the world’s population by 2050 through a series of case studies.

Contemplating power, influence and impact, however, is a complicated undertaking. Provan’s model, for example, views political and policy institutional power as having both potential and enacted elements, with variation possible across each component. As part of this project, we considered the ramifications of potential and enacted power exercised by women leaders in public life, but our primarily focus was on collecting data about enacted power and analyzing female leadership exercised through it. This decision was made because of the difficulties associated with identifying potential power and quantifying its repercussions, yet we acknowledge women in such positions make their mark on the political process and policy outcomes.

Additionally, the project was framed through USAID’s Diamond Leadership Model (DLM) (2014). The DLM disaggregates female political and policy leadership according to four traditional structures that shape politics and public administration: the executive, the legislature, the judiciary and security at the local, state and national level. This project contributed to the existing body of research by adding a fifth pillar about the civil service to the database to gain a more nuanced understanding of women in public office. Nevertheless, due to data availability issues and resource constraints, we narrowed the scope of work to leadership centralized at the national level except for the security pillar. We extended our reach in the security pillar to include state police forces to augment our dataset. With respect to the executive, we further defined gender parity to be males and females having the same chance of being elected or appointed head of state or government.

For the purposes of this project, we formed a working definition of women’s political and policy leadership. As a result, we defined leadership as a position of enacted power, with the possibility of having potential power for influence; for instance, as president or prime minister, as a cabinet member, a legislative representative, a department head or another civil service decision-making role, a judge, a military commander, or a chief of police. Consequently, these theories allowed us to structure our analysis by first using the DLM to stratify the political environment before then exploring each pillar through the lenses of Provan’s leadership model and Pitkin’s idea of descriptive representation. Future research should expand our definition to include potential power, place more emphasis on impact, and examine leadership exerted at the local and state levels.

4 Research Objectives

Based on the above definitions and framework, we assisted the Wilson Center’s research into women’s leadership in politics and public administration by addressing the following questions:

- Are the OECD and case study countries close to (or far away from) reaching gender equality in political and policy leadership positions across the five pillars?
What factors explain the status quo, including enabling and impeding explanatory variables?
What impact do women have on politics and the policy-making process when they exercise leadership within their pillar?

5 Structure of Analysis

To deal with these research questions, we conducted both a literature review and statistical analysis to identify and evaluate factors affecting women’s political and policy leadership in the executive, legislative, judiciary, civil service, and security pillars of five case study countries over time. As previously mentioned, these nations included the US, Canada, the UK, Germany and Sweden. When possible, we also expanded our examination to compare these countries to all 35 OECD states. However, challenges such as limited data availability and small sample sizes circumvented the generalizability of our analysis. Given these concerns, we were careful to specify the generalizability of our findings and to note differences in generalizability where appropriate.

6 Women’s Political and Policy Leadership by Pillar: Lessons from the Literature

In response to the research questions, we completed a literature review into the status quo of women and factors that may contextualize female leadership in politics and public administration across the five pillars.

Our main findings include:

- In the executive pillar, institutional and socio-structural factors appeared to be correlated with women’s leadership in public service. Nevertheless, there seemed to be disagreement in the literature regarding the direction of some of the statistical relationships. Institutional explanatory variables that could be positively associated with gender equality include a parliamentary political system, a progressive political party in power, a proportional representation electoral scheme, public finance, and a specialist cabinet recruitment mechanism. Structural enablers include high educational attainment, professional vocational experience and a privileged family background.
- In the legislative pillar, institutional indicators — such as the electoral system, political parties, gender equity policies and quotas — could affect progress towards gender parity in public life, as well as social/cultural factors including political culture, gender roles and family life/time constraints.
- For the civil service pillar, hurdles to women’s empowerment could incorporate
inadequate payment, discrimination and reform agendas that do not tackle gender equality concerns. Enablers could be female leaders in higher, elected office, legislative equity mandates, a merit-based recruitment system, as well as comprehensive legal and policy frameworks.

- In the judicial pillar, potential factors influencing a woman’s ability to obtain a leadership position could include the type of legal system, court size, and the judicial selection method. Having a civil law scheme and larger court size seemed to increase the chances of female judicial representation, while the impact of selection methods remained contentious.

- In the security pillar, possible barriers women could face include historical underrepresentation, entry-point challenges — such as application restrictions and job availability — and discrimination in career advancement opportunities. Although the importance of different gender perspectives and women’s participation in both military and police forces has been highlighted, gender integration has been strongly resisted. More research should be conducted into female peacekeeping efforts.

The following sections examine these questions in details.

### 6.1 Executive Women’s Political and Policy Leadership

#### 6.1.1 Status Quo: Women are Underrepresented in the Executive Pillar

Women have been elevated to executive political and policy leadership positions, but at sluggish rates. Including the ascension of Theresa May as British Prime Minister in July 2016, there are only 10 female heads of state and nine heads of government representing the world’s 195 countries (United Nations Women 2017). In addition, only 17% of cabinet ministers or secretaries around the globe were women in 2015 (UN Women 2017). The rate was slightly higher among OECD countries; 29.3% of OECD cabinet members were female in 2015 (OECD 2015). Factors explaining this phenomenon are of interest to the Wilson Center’s WPSP, particularly after the US failed to elect its first woman president in November 2016.

Tables 6.1 and 6.2 summarize the current status of female executive leadership in the US, Canada, the UK, Germany and Sweden:

**Table 6.1 Women Heads of State or Government**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Federal presidential</td>
<td>Donald Trump (2016 -</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Same as heads of state</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>constitutional republic</td>
<td>present)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Federal parliamentary</td>
<td>David Johnston</td>
<td>Michaëlle Jean</td>
<td>Justin Trudeau</td>
<td>Kim Campbell</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

United Kingdom

Unitary parliamentary constitutional monarchy


Germany

Federal parliamentary republic


Sweden

Unitary parliamentary constitutional monarchy


Source: Central Intelligence Agency (2017).

Table 6.2 Percentage of Women Cabinet Members in 2005, 2012 and 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country Name</th>
<th>Women in Cabinets (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The tables above indicate widespread variation among the five case study countries. Although Sweden has developed a reputation as a leader in achieving gender equality, it has never elected a female prime minister. Similarly, while Canadian Prime Minister Justin Trudeau was lauded in 2015 for naming the nation’s first cabinet with an equal number of men and women, Canada’s first female prime minister Kim Campbell was appointed to the position. Germany — which has supported Chancellor Angela Merkel since 2005 and Sabine Bergmann-Pohl, as acting head of state of East Germany until its merger with West Germany, in 1990 — appeared to set the benchmark, with women comprising about one third of Merkel’s cabinet in 2015. The UK has had two female prime ministers, but approximately one in five cabinet members were women in 2015. The obvious laggard was the US, a country that has never had a female president and reports relatively low numbers of women cabinet officials.
6.1.2 Enablers and Barriers: Institutional and Structural Factors

The research has identified a spectrum of institutional and socio-structural explanatory variables that may explain cross-national differences in women obtaining executive political and policy leadership, with scholars agreeing more frequently on structural indicators than institutional ones (Bauer and Sawyer 2011; Claveria 2014; Davis 1997; Escobar-Lemmon and Taylor-Robinson 2005; Krook and O’Brien 2012; Jalalzai 2013; cf. Blumberg 1984; Chafetz 1990; Inglehart and Norris 2003):

Institutional Factors

- **Type of political system**
  - Jalalzai (2008), for example, analyzed executive political and public administration power in 132 countries between 1996 and 2006 through a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods using government data and logistical regressions. She found that women are more likely to serve in parliamentary systems than presidential ones and are more often prime ministers than presidents (Bego 2014).
  - Some academics attribute the greater success of women in obtaining prime ministerial positions as opposed to presidential ones to their ability to bypass a biased electorate and be chosen by their party according to parliamentary rules (Duke Whitaker 1999). Sczesny et al (2004) explains this trend by arguing that people tend to perceive leaders as possessing traits they associate as being male, not female.
  - However, Reynolds (1999) comes to the opposite conclusion. Although dated, Reynolds’ study of 180 cabinets around the world in 1998 is still notable because he employed 12 institutional, political, cultural, and socioeconomic independent variables in multivariate regressions.

- **Party ideology and party competition**
  - Research focusing on Canada and Western Europe suggests progressive parties are more supportive of women than conservative parties in candidate selection and policies proposals (Claveria 2014; Davis 1997; Duverger 1955; Lovenduski and Norris 1993; Norris 1987, 1997; Rule 1987; Studlar and Moncrief 1999; Blondel and Thiebault 1991).
  - Other work concludes that the effect of party ideology may diminish over time as right-leaning parties adopt female-friendly policies to avoid losing votes to left or center parties (Caul 2001; Davis 1997; Matland and Studlar 1996; Norris 1987, 1997; Phillips 1991; Skjeie 1991; Studlar and Matland 1996; Studlar and Moncrief 1997).
  - Additionally, on the basis of their study of 18 Latin American countries from 1980 to 2003, Escobar-Lemmon and Taylor-Robinson (2005) found that intense partisan competition between parties increases the likelihood that a cabinet will contain a woman. They suggest that parties locked in close competition may
need to appeal to female voters to win an election or to govern with a mandate.

- **Electoral system**
  - Reynolds (1999) shows that plurality-majority, single member district electoral systems — like the Anglo-American first-past-the-post arrangement — are disadvantageous to women because of their winner-takes-all, adversarial nature. In addition, Dolan (2004) finds that plurality-majoritarian elections do not help women because of the biases against female politicians that persist among voters.
  - In contrast, Reynolds concludes that proportional representation electoral structures yield more women candidates and representatives. See also Childs (2004).
  - Moreover, Rule (1987) and Rule and Zimmerman (1994) argue that open list systems used in Western Europe favor the election of female lawmakers because party leaders can be lobbied to place a woman on the ballot.

- **Campaign finance and election law**
  - Rule and Zimmerman (1994) note that non-incumbency and lack of public campaign finance are both barriers to women’s political and policy representation in the executive.

- **Cabinet recruitment system**
  - Claveria (2014) suggests that countries with a specialist system of cabinet recruitment, where members are sourced from outside the legislature, have a higher percentage of women in cabinets than generalist systems.

**Structural Factors**

- **Education and labor force participation**
  - Educational attainment and work experience seem to be positively correlated with women’s leadership in politics and public administration (Krook and Mackay 2011; Norton 2005; Davis 1997; Norris 1987; Sainsbury 2004; Studlar and Moncrief 1997; True and Mintrom 2001; Rosenbluth, Salmond, and Thies 2006; Darcy, Welch, and Clark 1994; Norris 1997; Rule 1987).

- **Woman head of state or government**
  - Though disputed by Jalalzai (2008), Krook and O’Brien (2012) and O’Brien, Mendez, Carr Peterson and Shin (2015), studies also imply that the percentage of female cabinet members may be associated with the presence of a woman president or prime minister (Jacob, Scherpereel and Adams 2014; Davis 1997; Norris and Lovenduski 1995).
6.1.3 Impact: Why This Research Is Important

Women shape the political process and policymaking in a range of ways. For example, some of the literature supports the argument that female leaders are more responsive to social needs, like policies that cater to women and children, and evoke more confidence in public institutions because of their tendency to compromise (OECD 2014; Atchison 2015; Bratton and Ray 2002; O'Regan 2000). Nevertheless, research also illustrates how the quality and magnitude of women's contribution can be curtailed by female stereotypes (Krook and O'Brien 2012; Beckwith 2005). These are often perpetuated by their portrayal in the media (Jalalzai and Krook 2010). This seems to be reflected in women frequently being appointed to “feminine”, less prestigious cabinet ministries, such as the education portfolio (Davis 1997; Escobar-Lemmon and Taylor-Robinson 2005; Reynolds 1999; Russell and DeLanckey 2002; Studlar and Moncrief 1997).

6.1.4 Knowledge Gaps: Unsettled Literature

There is a wealth of literature on women’s role in executive political and policy leadership, but the majority of it focuses on individual careers and their path to power rather than their behavior once in office (Genovese 1993; Liswood 1995; Opfell 1993; Jalalzai and Krook 2010; Jalalzai 2008). Two other limitations of the existing research are that it mostly covers North America and Western Europe and it is predominantly qualitative rather than quantitative. There also seems to be little discussion about the impact of working conditions and women-friendly policies on female representation in the executive. Opportunities for this project are presented by the dearth of comparative, time series studies, in addition to the academic disagreement on factors contributing to the rise of women in political and public administration leadership.

6.2 Legislative Women’s Political and Policy Leadership

6.2.1 Status Quo: Gender Inequality Persists

On average, women hold 27% of legislative seats in OECD countries (OECD 2015). Yet the gender composition of parliaments differs across countries. Therefore, we intend to investigate the reasons behind these variations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Legislature Type</th>
<th>Women in the Legislature (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Bicameral</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Bicameral</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Bicameral</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Bicameral</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Unicameral</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: World Bank (2016); OECD (2015).

From Table 6.3, Sweden has been a leader in legislative gender parity, while the US has consistently lagged behind.

6.2.2 Enablers and Barriers: Institutional and Sociocultural

Existing literature establishes two main types of enablers and barriers to women's legislative political power: institutional and socio-cultural (Shames 2015).

Institutional factors include:

- The electoral system;
- Dominant political parties;
- Gender equality policies;
- Quotas;
- Public campaign funding; and
- Work environments.

Social and cultural explanatory variables (Shames 2015) include:

- Political culture;
- Gender roles; and
- Family life/time constraints.

We aggregated data on these indicators to determine the strength of their relationships with women's leadership in the legislature for each country.
6.2.3 Strengths of the Field: Sociological Research

Women’s presence in legislatures is particularly well covered by academic literature and we were able to access information on who is and has been in each country’s parliamentary body. Moreover, we could track female outputs in these positions based on straightforward outcomes like laws passed or legislation implemented. Most of research on women’s leadership, especially within the legislature, is based on scientifically administered surveys, government data and strong sociological studies.

The existing literature explains baseline ideas, such as the interplay of sociological and political factors, forming the impetus of our analysis into how participation and leadership can be defined and evaluated.

Useful research includes:

- **Quota research**
  - Quotas can be reserved seat (constitutional/legislative), legal candidate (constitutional/legislative) or political party quotas (voluntary). These gender composition requirements strive to ensure women represent at least a critical minority of 30-40% in the legislature (Quota Project 2015).
  - Quotas in the countries of interest (Quota Project 2015):
    - **United States**: No quota
    - **United Kingdom**: Voluntary party quotas
    - **Germany**: Voluntary party quotas
    - **Canada**: Voluntary party quotas
    - **Sweden**: Voluntary party quotas
  - One study of 290 Swedish municipalities found that Social Democratic Party quotas made localities more likely to select but not reappoint female leaders (O’Brien and Rickne 2016). Quotas also appeared to increase the perception of women as qualified for leadership positions. O’Brien and Rickne identify augmenting the pool of candidates as the main accelerating effect of quotas.

- The **Minority Women Legislative Index** collects and analyzes data from governments and international organizations to examine how ethnicity and gender interact within women’s legislative representation (Hughes 2013). Hughes finds that minority women are significantly underrepresented, and points to sexism, racism, and religious intolerance as important factors in this dynamic.

- The **Norwegian Generations and Gender Survey (GGS)**, which studied adult women in private households in Norway to collate information on cultural, political, policy, and other sociological indicators (Lappegard 2015). GGS selected its variables based on theories of planned behavior. The selection of factors for the report provides guidance for our own selection, offering insight into indicators such as education, children, marriage and work status.
- **Sociological research**
  - Ruedin (2013) isolates patterns through international legislative comparisons to investigate the sociological and systemic indicators behind the representation of women and minorities in parliaments around the world. She finds that the presence of proportional electoral systems is strongly associated with female representation, and that political parties and quotas play a significant role as well.

### 6.2.4 Knowledge Gaps: Impact and Links to Leadership

Few articles or books take an in-depth look at the impact of women in political and policy leadership positions, or extend their analysis to investigate the ramifications of women’s empowerment on social norms. Though many academics evaluate explanatory variables behind participation, they fail to see past this to the broader socio-political effects of women’s leadership. Furthermore, while these studies often mention cultural indicators, they rarely assess the links between representation, culture, and impact. It is also difficult to find comparative country analyses of how factors like religion, histories of feminist movements, and women’s traditional domestic roles in each nation relate to political empowerment. The existing literature, overall, surveys gender parity at the surface level, but fails to proffer more robust cross-country analysis that takes into account culture and impact.

### 6.3 Civil Service Women’s Political and Policy Leadership

#### 6.3.1 Status Quo: Women are Underrepresented at Top Levels

Although there is no established benchmark for women’s presence in civil services around the world, women are generally underrepresented at the top levels of government bureaucracies.

- Available comparative United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) data showed that the percentage of “women in decision-making positions in public administration” was highly varied for developing countries, ranging from more than 70% in some nations — Ukraine’s civil service, for example, is 75% female — to as low as 12% in others like India.

- In the 15 OECD countries for which data was available, women were represented in only 29% of top management positions. This percentage was also varied: the highest share of female managers occurred in Canada, New Zealand, Sweden and Slovenia at about 40%; whereas the lowest shares was centered in Belgium (about 20%) and Switzerland (close to 11%) (OECD 2014).

- Other data (OECD 2009) showed that women accounted for more than one third of all
senior civil service employees in New Zealand, Mexico and Portugal, but represented less than 5% of senior managers in Korea and Japan.

- A study of 118 US agencies revealed that women remain underrepresented in federal regulatory organizational leadership, but not to the same extent as in politics and the private sector (Smith and Monaghan 2013).

The following table summarizes the state of women’s civil service political and policy leadership in the case study countries:

Table 6.4 Percentage of Women in the Civil Service in 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Women in the Civil Service (%)</th>
<th>Women in Civil Service Top and Middle Positions (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>33*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>40.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>45.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: OECD Human Resource Country Profiles (2012). *Data for the US was not available in its OECD profile.


Among these nations, Germany stands out as a laggard in terms of the percentage of female participation in its central government workforce, as well as the share of top and middle roles held by women in the same field. The US is also another obvious laggard, with lower female participation rates and a lower absolute share of women in decision-making positions. Sweden, on the contrary, perpetuates its leader image in gender equality. Underrepresentation of women in civil service leadership demands closer examination of the current enablers and barriers, and potential improvements that could be made in this area.

6.3.2 Enablers and Barriers: Workplace Policies and Organization

Enablers

- Women leaders in elected positions
  - Smith (2015) found that women are more likely to be leaders when a woman had an elected leadership position above them. Using National Education Panel Survey data, Smith found that a 10-percentage point increase in school board seats held by women was associated with a 0.65-percentage point increase in women obtaining leadership roles (Smith and Monaghan 2013).
This study also found that when women lead in government bureaucracies, they are more likely to be concentrated in areas such as education, health and human services that require more “emotional labor skills” and are considered more “feminine”. This finding is echoed in executive leadership scholarship.

**Complexity of the organization**
- Smith (2015) found that risk in organizational circumstance was an important facilitator. Risk in organization in this article was measured as a function of the consequences of failure and the likelihood of failure. The former was calculated by the visibility of the organization, in this case, the frequency at which it was mentioned in five popular news sources. The latter was measured by the legislative complexity of the environment in which the department or agency operated, particularly the number of legislative mandates. According to this analysis, women in civil services are more likely to be promoted to leadership positions in agencies with a higher likelihood of failure, where the consequence of failure was less severe.

**Comprehensive legal and policy frameworks**
- Comprehensive legal and policy frameworks are another enabler studied by the UNDP. Changes could be made in national laws, policies and constitutions and through special temporary measures — including quotas or initiatives to combat sexual harassment — to increase women’s leadership in the civil service (UNDP 2014).

**Merit-based political appointment systems**
- The selection method of top managers in the public sector could also be another correlated indicator for female civil service leadership. Political and merit-based appointments are two selection methods for senior staff in government workforces. Political appointments usually result in a vacancy being filled on the basis of trust in a pre-existing relationship or the hope of a stronger future dynamic, whereas merit-based appointments refer to a system where a candidate is chosen in accordance with a competitive, established procedure. The OECD reports that the use of political appointments in recruiting for top echelons may limit women’s access to those jobs, since they are normally less present in elite informal networks.

**Barriers**

**Inadequate payment and compensation**
- The UN Division for the Advancement of Women (UNDAW 2006) found that the fact that public professions are low-income and gender-divided make women less likely to consider government employment.
• **Discrimination against women**  
  ○ In surveys and interviews, female leaders report that they believe their careers could advance further if they were of the opposite sex. This barrier was discussed in a country study of the UK and Ghana and also stated in the UNDP’s Global Initiative on Gender Equality in Public Administration (GEPA) report (Adusah-Karikari and Ohemeng 2014; UNDP 2014).

• **Reform agendas that do not address gender parity**  
  ○ Weak gender mainstreaming in public administration reforms, which refers to the fact that equal gender participation is not prioritized in reforms more generally, also affects leadership (UNDP 2014). Additionally, the UNDP report suggests that women’s political and policy leadership within the civil service faces context-specific challenges, including post-conflict environments, economic crises and shrinking government bureaucracies.

### 6.3.3 Impact: Passive to Active Representation

Gender equality in civil service leadership is crucial because of the hope that passive representation may lead to active representation. Passive representation refers to the descriptive fact that the composition of leadership is similar to the composition of the population it seeks to serve. In comparison, active representation indicates policy outcomes that substantially benefit minorities and the disenfranchised (Adusah-Karikari and Ohemeng 2014). From the perspective of justice, the UNDAW report concludes that women need to be part of the political conversation and implementation of any resulting policy initiatives because they account for half of the population; they are a critical stakeholder for representing female interests and attracting more women to the field.

### 6.3.4 Knowledge Gap: Descriptive and Comparative Studies

Despite the rich literature on women’s role in civil services, the existing body of research primarily focuses on individual capacity and experience using survey data and interviews. The majority of the work we reviewed, for example, is qualitative. There seems to be a gap in descriptive studies on women’s civil service political and policy leadership. While UNDP and OECD research offers valuable insights, deeper descriptive analysis and comparative studies are needed to fill this void.
6.4 Judicial Women’s Political and Policy Leadership

6.4.1 Status Quo: Mixed Gains For Women Serving On The Bench

Although the trend of women’s representation in national court systems is increasing, the percentage of female judges that sat on the highest courts in OECD countries in 2016 was a mere 28%. For the five case study nations, the average percentage was also 28%, which reflected the general distribution of women’s judicial participation in the OECD pool:

Table 6.5 Percentage of Women in the Judiciary in 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Women Supreme Court Justices (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>9.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>31.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Official Supreme Court websites (2016).

The North American countries led the race for gender equality, with Canada almost reaching parity among its supreme court justices in 2016 at 44.4%. The US was slightly behind at 37.5%. Unsurprisingly given the general status of women in Scandinavian states, Sweden also had a relatively high percentage of female supreme court judges at 31.25%. However, the other two European countries captured by our database performed rather poorly in comparison, with women in Germany comprising less than 20% of justices on the country’s Federal Court of Justice. This is despite Germany having had a female head of government since 2005. Male judges dominated the UK’s Supreme Court, with less than 10% of justices being women in 2016.

6.4.2 Strengths and Gaps: Noncomparative Versus Comparative Studies

Given its unique characteristics such as selection methods, term limits, and professional requirements, the judicial branch provides a special perspective from which to study women’s political and policy leadership. While most research into women’s leadership in the judiciary concentrates on developed countries, the literature is somewhat varied in its scope and methods. There are few comparative studies offering cross-national analysis, in contrast to others that conduct cross-sector comparisons of women’s judicial representation. For different work, authors dig into one or a combination of the many facets of female judicial leadership, such as the enabling macro and micro factors. Most scholarly research is interested in what propels women to take leadership position within courts, which is a focus of the project and
contributed to our exploration of indicators. A number of studies also examine the influence of women's participation in the judicial arena and the degree to which they can exert power, if at all.

The only literature that proffers an expansive multi-national study exclusively on female leaders in the judiciary is by Dawuni and Kang (2015). Dawuni and Kang look at where and when women have risen to leadership positions on the bench in Africa between 1990 and 2014. Based on their research, they conclude that the type of legal system, the end of major armed conflict, and regional diffusion are more important than the judicial selection method in explaining why some countries have seen more women ascend to judicial leadership positions than others. However, in nations where domestic armed conflicts are far less frequent or non-existent, especially the OECD states we evaluated, these enabling factors may be less relevant and selection method may have greater significance in determining the prominence of women leaders in the judiciary.

Another comparative study on women’s judicial leadership is Nurlaelawati and Salim’s 2013 paper on female judges in the Islamic court system in Indonesia. As Indonesia is one of the very few Muslim countries that accept judgeship nominations for its religious courts from women, they explore the systematic factors contextualizing the exceptionality of Indonesia, as well as the role of female judges in the process.

Nurlaelawati and Salim find that:

- One of the key explanations of women’s leadership in the Indonesian Islamic court structure is the long-standing tradition of economic partnership between husbands and wives, which has encouraged women to hold top positions in both the private and public sector.
- Based on case studies, the authors find that these female judges play a crucial gender role, particularly in defending poor and disadvantaged litigants.
- They also find that the women have strong gender awareness, partly due to their attendance and involvement in training sessions that promote female empowerment.
  - Yet some women judges present no gender sensitivity, which has been attributed to prejudice and victim blaming.
- These problems are exacerbated by the judge panel system, through which even female judges with high gender awareness cannot advocate for gender equity in their decisions if other panel members refuse to consider gender justice.

With respect to comparative studies across different branches of government, the percentage of women in leadership positions changes pillar to pillar. Williams (2008) tries to account for the variation by looking at women’s motivation and ambition to run for disparate types of leadership roles. With significant increases in the number of women entering the legal profession since the 1970s, more women are becoming eligible to serve on the judiciary. As such, the number of female judges has risen markedly as well. Nevertheless, compared with other pillars such as the executive and the legislature, women tend to exhibit greater ambition in contending for judicial leadership opportunities. Possible explanations for this include the professionalization of the
judiciary, with clearer career pathways for female lawyers and publicized criteria in relation to eligibility and selection for vacancies. As a result, women feel more qualified and confident to pursue judicial leadership roles than in other pillars.

### 6.4.3 Enablers and Barriers: Institutional Factors

Based on the conclusions of both noncomparative and comparative literature, there are several institutional factors that might influence women’s representation in the judiciary:

- **Type of legal system**
  - According to Dawuni and Kang, women have a greater chance of rising to judicial leadership in civil law systems than common law systems. Civil law countries usually adopt a career judgeship scheme where people typically sit professional examinations and attend postgraduate law schools to become judges, which allows women to enter the judiciary at an early stage of their career. This can be compared to common law nations where judges are often selected from a pool of experienced and respected lawyers or legal practitioners.

- **Judge selection method**
  - Regardless of noncomparative or comparative studies, scholarly research does not reach the same conclusion on whether judicial election or formal nomination favors women seeking judgeships. Some find that women and minorities have a higher chance of entering judicial rank through election, while other courts with presidential nomination as the main selection method have larger female representation.

- **Court size**
  - Based on Hurwitz and Lanier’s (2003) study on US state-level courts, the most consistent factor affecting women’s participation in state judiciaries across time and court is court size. Specifically, as court size increases, women and minorities are more likely to attain seats on the bench, perhaps due to better chances of ascension.

- **Incumbent political party**
  - Sanbonmatsu (2002) demonstrated in her study that political party has an effect on women’s representation in US state legislatures by shaping the structure of opportunities. This can be applied to the judicial sector, especially in countries where supreme court judgeships are awarded via political nomination. Empirically, more progressive parties tend to select more female judges to supreme courts.
6.4.4 Impact: Influence of Gender on Case Outcomes

In measuring the impact of women’s representation in the judiciary, most of the literature limits its scope to the direct influence of gender on judicial decisions and the specific outcomes of the studied cases. Although female judges do not tend to admit that gender sways their rulings, according to Miller and Maier’s 2008 qualitative study, most of the authors find that gender does have repercussions for the judicial process (Collins et al 2010). Specifically, such influence occurs due to the unique role of women judges in issue clarification, organization maintenance, and legal reasoning (Costantini 1990; Miller and Maier 2008). However, it would also be noteworthy to explore gender’s broader consequences for the political process — for instance, their impact on policy concerning minorities, social welfare, even foreign policy.

6.5 Security Women’s Political and Policy Leadership

6.5.1 Status Quo: Historically Low Levels of Women’s Participation

According to the Diamond Report from USAID, the security pillar is multifaceted, including both military forces to protect countries from external threats and police forces to enforce domestic laws and measures (USAID 2014). In 2000, the UN Security Council formally acknowledged the changing nature of warfare, in which civilians were increasingly targeted and women continue to be excluded from involved in peace processes, through the establishment of Resolution 1325. UNSCR 1325 addresses not only the inordinate impact of war on women, but also the pivotal role they should and do play in conflict management, conflict resolution, and sustainable peace (United Nations 2000). Nevertheless, the rising representation of women in security and gender-aware leaders are not sufficient to change the male-dominated structure of peacekeeping and law enforcement. Moreover, we know little about women in police leadership globally. Research suggests that women police officers can help to create a justice system that is more responsive to women. For example, data on women’s share of police officers in 39 countries shows that higher percentages of female police officers are associated with higher levels of reporting of sexual assault (USAID 2014).

Table 6.6 shows that women have been traditionally underrepresented in security circles, especially in top military and police positions — but that does not mean they have not been elevated to prominent roles:
### Table 6.6 Percentage of Women in Military and Law Enforcement Field

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>13 (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20 (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>28 (2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>19 (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29 (2012)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Sweden was a leader in military forces, with the highest percentage of women’s participation in 2015 at 16%. The US and Canada followed with 15.5% and 15% (2014) respectively; while 14% of the US Armed Services comprised of women in 2015, only 5% were active army general officers (Shoemaker and Poiré 2014). On the other hand, female military representation in the UK was at 10.1% and Germany at 10.9%. Regardless, women’s participation in state-level police forces was better than in the military. Sweden was again a leader at 29% in 2012 and the US was a laggard at only 13% in 2013.

As for the status quo of UN peacekeeping, few women participated in designing or carrying out peacekeeping operations. Although the UN can make specific requests for missions, UN member states ultimately decide what staff to send for assignments. The UN did not issue requests for women peacekeepers until 1993, in response to a high demand for security forces — 78,500 in 1993, 76,500 in 1994, and 68,900 in 1995 (Kaufholz 2001). Yet these requests were largely ignored by member states, which exacerbated the underrepresentation of women in peacekeeping.

### 6.5.2 Enablers and Barriers: Countering Discrimination Is Key

A potential enabler in the security pillar includes:

- **Women leaders in higher office**
  - Smith (2015) found that women are more likely to be leaders when a woman holds an elected leadership position in the ranks above them (Smith and
Monaghan 2013). Smith’s civil service scholarship applies equally to military and police forces.

The possible barriers to security leadership include:

- Historical underrepresentation and inequality related to entry positions and those at higher commanding levels.
- Entry-point challenges, such as application restrictions and job availability.
- Discrimination in career advancement opportunities — also known as the “brass” ceiling, where the same ability may not equate to similar prospects — and retention.
  - According to UNDP’s GEPA report, female leaders report that they believe they could further progress their careers if they were male.

6.5.3 Most Influential Enablers and Barriers: Resistance within Military and Police Forces

Men have conventionally controlled the security pillar in the case study countries and there is still a long way to go before these nations achieve gender parity. Multiple studies of women in military and police forces have illuminated concerns about the lack of career trajectory for women into leadership positions.

With respect to the military:

- Research questions whether women face real or perceived barriers to reaching the highest ranks (Eileen and Kim 2015; Pagon 1996).
  - While a smaller number of women than men serve overall, a slightly greater proportion of commissioned officers are female compared with the share of officers who are male.
- Combat roles influence women’s representation.
  - Among living veterans from any era, only 15% of women served in combat, compared with 35% of men (Eileen and Kim 2015).
  - In the US, holding a senior rank, especially a 3- or 4-star in the Army or Marine Corps, generally requires serving in a combat arm. With the exception of aviation, combat arms were previously closed to female service members.
- Conscription policy
  - Traditionally, conscription has been limited to the male population of a given state (Ben 2003).

In policing, gender integration and the opportunity for women to participate in shaping law enforcement policy has been strongly resisted:
The UN estimates that women represent only about 9% of police globally (UN Women 2011).

- Statistics about women in the police hierarchy, however, are not systematically available, limiting studies on the advantages of female police leadership.

Acceptance by male peers has yet to occur.

- Women receive, at best, a cool reception from male officers and, at worst, a hostile reception (Pagon 1996).

6.5.4 Impact: Boons for Social Justice and Service

Promoting the inclusion of women, including women from minority groups, within the security pillar is important because of the impact female participation can have on sustaining cohesive, stable societies. For example, research has found that women’s presence positively affects local community interactions and perceptions towards military, UN and police operations (Shoemaker and Marie-Laure 2010). Additional studies suggest that women frequently render service delivery more responsive to the needs of various groups and improve the efficiency of such services (Swers 2007):

- Data on women’s representation in police forces in 39 countries demonstrates that a higher percentage of female police officers are associated with higher levels of sexual assault reporting (UN Women 2011).

- Victims of sexual violence — both men and women — prefer to report the crime to female police officers (Welch and Mason 2011).

In terms of peacekeeping, UNSCR 1325 underscores the significance of gender perspectives and women’s full participation in all aspects of UN peacemaking, peace building, peacekeeping and other security efforts. For instance, when female security forces aid dispute resolution, they are more likely to de-escalate tensions without the use of excessive force than their male counterparts (Bigio 2016). The UNSCR resolution also urges actors to increase female representation and plays an important symbolic role in altering the institutionally entrenched sexism inherent in the pillar.

6.6 Caveats and Contributions

The above exploration of literature on women in politics and public administration is not exhaustive given the limited resources available to us. One of our findings from this broad summary of preexisting work was the lack of international comparative studies of female political and policy leadership. Consequently, this project is an important contribution to the field. Our objective was to provide the Wilson Center with answers to their research questions. These were tackled through a range of quantitative research methods, including descriptive and
statistical data analysis, as well as qualitative case studies.

7 Methodology

We built a database framework that captured women’s political and policy leadership information by pillar, across time and country. We included a number of general explanatory variables and certain indicators that were specific to each pillar to facilitate statistical analysis. This data allowed us to draw comparisons between pillars, especially when we looked to see whether the benchmark gender compositions in each sector were correlated with any factors. Comparisons between pillars were complicated by the fact that each structure incorporates different manifestations of leadership. In addition, there were several challenges inherent in quantifying impact as a unit of measurement to study and observe. A more thorough analysis of impact lies beyond the scope of this project.

7.1 Country Selection

For the purposes of sound comparative analysis, we first explored OECD country data and identified trends and correlations. We then chose five nations to study in-depth based on information availability, progress towards gender equality, as well as appropriate levels of similarity and diversity in institutions, structures and socioeconomic development. As a result, we selected the US given its controversial 2016 elections and compared it with geographical neighbor Canada. In turn, we paired Canada and the UK given their shared history as part of the Commonwealth of Nations. Lastly, Germany and Sweden supplied a continental European comparison and were of note because they were considered leaders in championing women at the executive and legislative level respectively.

Basic comparative information in relation to each case study country can be found below:

Table 7.1 Basic Information on Selected Case Study Countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Population (Million)</th>
<th>GDP Per Capita ($US)</th>
<th>Political System</th>
<th>Executive Election Cycle</th>
<th>Legal System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>57,220</td>
<td>Federal presidential constitutional republic</td>
<td>Four years</td>
<td>Common law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>46,199</td>
<td>Federal parliamentary representative democracy under constitutional monarchy</td>
<td>Four years</td>
<td>Common law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>42,514</td>
<td>Unitary parliamentary constitutional monarchy</td>
<td>Five years</td>
<td>Common law in England, Wales, and Northern</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When comparing countries, we recognized the influence of diverging histories, cultures and political situations on their progress towards gender parity in politics and public administration. We aimed to account for these factors during our analysis by including them in our models and testing for bias. Besides particular indicators for each pillar, we collected general social, political, and economic explanatory variables from the OECD, the World Economic Forum, the Quota Project, and other sources for analytic rigor. These factors were then used as controls in our statistical tests and case studies.

Our general explanatory variables included:

- GDP per capita ($, PPP);
- Population sex ratio (female relative to male);
- Labor force participation;
- Years since women received voting rights;
- Whether the country’s law mandates nondiscrimination in hiring women;
- Whether the nation’s law mandates equal pay;
- Whether there is a quota for women on candidate lists in national elections;
- Whether there are voluntary political party quotas;
- Mean age of women at the birth of their first child; and
- Length of maternity leave.

The following section outlines the methodology of each pillar.
7.3 Methodology by Pillar

7.3.1 Executive Women’s Political and Policy Leadership

Based on the literature and the Wilson Center’s research objectives, we were interested in patterns in women’s executive leadership over a period of time. We examined data from 2005 to 2015 because it was the most recent decade of information that was available from the same reliable source. As aforementioned, studying the OECD countries and case study nations, allowed us to undertake a compelling comparative analysis of like states. As such, we collected descriptive statistics and conducted simple statistical hypothesis tests to identify changes and isolate potential factors that may explain female leadership in the executive pillar.

Guided by previous studies such as Davis (1997) and Escobar-Lemmon and Taylor-Robinson (2005), research methods within the executive pillar were the same regardless of the unit of analysis. Elected female heads of state or government were measured as a percentage of time in years that there had been a women executive leader during the five decades prior to 2015. Time was a critical component of our analysis because it was assumed that it had led to differing attitudes towards women in public life (Davis 1997; Studlar and Moncrief 1997). Cabinet representation, on the other hand, was captured by the percentage of female cabinet ministers in 2015. We did not consider women heads of state that had inherited their role nor did we distinguish between women holding permanent or interim power.

Executive pillar explanatory variables can be found below in Table 7.2:

Table 7.2 Executive Pillar Explanatory Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Explanatory Variable</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>system_pol</td>
<td><em>=1 if parliamentary political system, =0 if presidential system</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>party_ideo15/party_ideo05</td>
<td><em>=2 if left political ideology, =1 if center ideology, =0 if right ideology</em> in 2005 and 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>party_maj15/party_maj05</td>
<td><em>=1 if political party of the executive also controlled the legislature, =0 if party of the executive did not also control the legislature</em> in 2005 and 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>system_pr</td>
<td><em>=1 if proportional representation electoral system, =0 if no proportional representation</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>system_plur</td>
<td><em>=1 if plurality electoral system, =0 if no plurality system</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>system_list</td>
<td><em>=1 if list recruitment system, =0 if no list system</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>system_fin</td>
<td><em>=3 if both regular public finance and public campaign finance system, =2 if regular public finance system, =1 if public campaign finance system, =0 if no public finance system</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>system_cab</td>
<td><em>=1 if specialist cabinet recruitment system, =0 if generalist system</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data for the above variables was sourced from the OECD, the WEF, the Database of Political Institutions and the International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance’s Political Finance Database. One weakness of our methodology was the dearth of information on whether OECD countries had a specialist or generalist cabinet recruitment system. Consequently, we had to make our best estimation and code the indicator based on academic work in the area. Moreover, coding political party orientation was difficult due to few demarcations along the political ideology spectrum, particularly in Europe where there are many parties.

The following hypotheses were tested:

\( H_0: \) Political system has no relationship with the percentage of women in the executive.
\( H_1: \) Political system has a relationship with the percentage of women in the executive.

\( H_0: \) The political party in power has no effect on the percentage of women in the executive.
\( H_1: \) The political party in power has an effect on the percentage of women in the executive.

\( H_0: \) Electoral system does not vary the percentage of women in the executive.
\( H_1: \) Electoral system does vary the percentage of women in the executive.

\( H_0: \) A public finance system has no relationship with the percentage of women in the executive.
\( H_1: \) A public finance system has a relationship with the percentage of women in the executive.

\( H_0: \) Cabinet recruitment system has no effect on the percentage of women in the executive.
\( H_1: \) Cabinet recruitment system has an effect on the percentage of women in the executive.

\( H_0: \) A female head of state/government has no relationship with the percentage of women in their cabinet.
\( H_1: \) A female head of state/government has a relationship with the percentage of women in their cabinet.

Results that supported these hypotheses showed a coefficient on the factor of interest that was statistically significant (\( P < 0.05 \)), which confirmed there was a statistical relationship between the unit of analysis and the explanatory variables. Results that did not support these tests did not show a significant coefficient. Therefore, there was no correlation between the indicators.

The impact of women heads of state or government from Canada, the UK and Germany was discussed in the attached case studies. These case studies also explored the background of
these female executives.

“Background” was defined as (Jalalzai 2004):

- Age upon election or appointment to office;
- Educational level;
- Field of study;
- Profession before entering politics;
- The extent of political experience before becoming president or prime minister; and
- Familial ties to other political actors in the country.

7.3.2 Legislative Women’s Political and Policy Leadership

Given that our dataset was expansive enough to run accurate hypothesis tests, we generated descriptive statistics and undertook statistical analysis to explore factors influencing women’s leadership in the legislative pillar in OECD countries in two time periods, 2006 and 2016. Data came from the Inter-Parliamentary Union’s Women in Politics database among other sources. As part of our examination of female parliamentary representation, we included both institutional and societal indicators from the general explanatory variables list as well as unique factors collated to depict women’s legislative participation.

Legislative explanatory variables included:

Table 7.3 Legislative Pillar Explanatory Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Explanatory Variable</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>percentage of women in the legislature</td>
<td>percentage of women serving in the country’s national legislature in 2006 and 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>percentage of women heading committees (upper house)</td>
<td>percentage of women leading committees in the legislature’s upper house in 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>percentage of women heading committees (lower house)</td>
<td>percentage of women leading committees in the legislature’s lower house in 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voluntary party quota</td>
<td>“=1 if voluntary party quota, =0 if none”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>legal quota</td>
<td>“=1 if legal quota, =0 if none, “</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maternity leave length</td>
<td>days of maternity leave permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>political party in power</td>
<td>“=5 if right, =4 if right/center, =3 if center, =2 if left/center, =1 if left, =0 if mixed”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We compared the number of women in the legislature, the number of female committee heads, and quota types for each legislature and more to determine whether women’s legislative leadership varied across countries. Another important aspect of our legislative analysis was the
change across time component. We contrasted the most recent parliament to preceding compositions to gain a firm understanding of each nation’s legislative make-up, as well as to report themes in terms of female empowerment.

We conducted written and tabular analysis on descriptive statistics between OECD states to garner a more nuanced conception of the factors affecting women’s legislative leadership. Correlations were tested based on the statistical significance of the variable of interest's coefficient.

Hypothesis tests included:

\[ H_0: \text{The dominant political party has no relationship with the percentage of women in the legislature.} \]
\[ H_1: \text{The dominant political party has a relationship with the percentage of women in the legislature.} \]

\[ H_0: \text{The type of quota has no relationship with the percentage of women in the legislature.} \]
\[ H_1: \text{The type of quota has a relationship with the percentage of women in the legislature.} \]

\[ H_0: \text{Gender-based policies have no relationship with the percentage of women in the legislature.} \]
\[ H_1: \text{Gender-based policies have a relationship with the percentage of women in the legislature.} \]

Non-quantitative hypotheses reflected in the case studies included:

- Women would be more likely to participate in the most recent legislature than the previous one, indicating that women are making progress.
- Progressive party dominance would be positively correlated with women’s participation, suggesting a higher number of women in the legislature.

### 7.3.3 Civil Service Women’s Political and Policy Leadership

The biggest challenge for our methodology in the civil service pillar was data collection. According to the UNDP, building a database measuring women’s leadership within the public sector is hard because “sex and age disaggregated data is not readily available, and what can be accessed (often raw data) is not regularly analyzed” (2014). Modeling our database in light of the UNDP’s GEPA report, we collated information from OECD Human Resources Management Country Profiles and relied on UNDP GEPA data on civil servants to undertake comparative analysis on female government employees in decision-making positions across the case study countries. Specifically, we provided a descriptive overview on the variation of data related to the percentage of women in management roles in the civil service field. We then combined the legal and policy indicators from the list of general explanatory variables and used bivariate crosstabs to produce preliminary findings for possible future regression analysis:
Table 7.4 Civil Service Explanatory Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Explanatory Variable</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%female_ptcp_CGW</td>
<td>percentage of female participation in central government workforce in 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%top/middle_female_leaders</td>
<td>percentage of female share of top and middle civil service positions in 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>position_based_recruitment</td>
<td>type of recruitment system in 2010 using OECD as a baseline: “=1 if position-based, =0 if career-based”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%GGemployment_laborforce</td>
<td>total employment in the central government in 2012 as a percentage of the labor force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG_Total_Employment</td>
<td>central government total employment in 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEF_cover_all</td>
<td>GEF covers all employees: “=1 if yes, =0 if no”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEF_cover_Contracts</td>
<td>GEF includes fixed-term contracts: “=1 if yes, =0 if no”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research focuses included whether women were more likely to lead government departments or agencies with gender quotas or strict sex discrimination laws. This data was also compared across pillar, especially with executive leaders at the political appointee level, to test the idea brought by Smith that women are more likely to be leaders when a woman holds an elected leadership position above them (Smith and Monaghan 2013). What is more, the effects of various political appointment systems mentioned in the OECD report were looked it (OECD 2014).

Hypothesis tests included:

$H_0$: The percentage of women leaders in the civil service does not vary by the percentage of elected executive female leaders in the same organization.

$H_1$: The percentage of women leaders in the civil service does vary by the percentage of elected executive female leaders in the same organization.

$H_0$: A gender quota law in civil service does not have an effect on the percentage of women in senior civil service.

$H_1$: A gender quota law in civil service has an effect on the percentage of women in senior civil service.

$H_0$: Appointment method in civil service has no relationship with the percentage of women in senior civil service.

$H_1$: Appointment method in civil service has a relationship with the percentage of women in senior civil service.

$H_0$: Strict sex discrimination laws have no relationship with the percentage of women in senior civil service.

$H_1$: Strict sex discrimination laws have a relationship with the percentage of women in senior civil service.
7.3.4 Judicial Women’s Political and Policy Leadership

Much of the literature on women’s judicial leadership uses qualitative methods — such as interviews and surveys — to study the enabling and/or hampering factors at an individual level, while the rest conducts quantitative regressions to examine the systematic and structural elements affecting female judicial representation. To fulfill the Wilson Center’s research objectives, we collected data on the percentage of women supreme court justices for the case study countries to determine the indicators contributing to the fluctuations in female judicial participation across time and space. The information we gathered on women’s judicial leadership came from three time periods based on data availability: 2006, 2011, and 2016. The primary sources of data for the judicial pillar were the European Commission Gender Equality database and information from official national government websites.

The reason for compiling information at different times rather than merely evaluating current data was that we hoped to avoid bias incurred from a static analysis. This is because the percentage of female judges at one point in time is not representative of the overall status of women in the case study nations’ legal systems. Additionally, since judges at the national level usually enjoy long terms, we extended the observation time frame to a decade so we could capture any changes in judgesship. However, since the pool of data we obtained was still not large enough to achieve the significance requirements for running effective regressions, we used in-depth descriptive analysis and case studies to answer the Wilson Center’s research questions.

7.3.5 Security Women’s Political and Policy Leadership

To analyze the security pillar, we focused on the top positions within each case study country’s security forces (USAID 2014). Data for the security pillar proved difficult to find, as most of the required military information was not publicly available. The data we collected was gathered from a small number of international organizations that specialize in security studies for particular geographical regions; for example, Statistics Canada and NATO member national report summaries. We extended the scope of our project to include state police forces to augment our dataset. To supplement existing knowledge, we collated data from the case study nations and looked at quantitative patterns in women’s leadership in the military and police forces in the five states. We also highlighted outliers and anomalies in the attached case studies. It is important to note that the dependent and independent variables in the security pillar were studied from consistent data sources.

7.4 Additional Qualitative Analysis

In addition to compiling descriptive statistics and running statistical tests, we undertook
qualitative case studies on the five case study countries. We identified interesting trends and leaders and laggards as we analyzed the data. We then delved deeper into the cases, using literature to complement our statistical examination. These case studies were based on the selected nation and evaluated across time, as well as pillar, to enhance the comparative aspect of our research.

7.5 Weaknesses and Strengths of the Methodology

7.5.1 Weaknesses of the Methodology

Limitations to our methodology included:

- **Dependence on data availability**
  Our methodology required access to data sources for all units of analysis and explanatory variables across at least five countries and, in some instances, several time periods. Despite our best efforts, our study was constrained by data availability.

- **Small sample size**
  The majority of our analysis pertained to 35 OECD countries, including five case study nations. As a result, the efficacy of our statistical analysis was limited by this small sample size.

- **Lack of impact analysis**
  Building a database does not fully capture the impact and influence of women’s political and policy leadership. This undermined our research’s ability to guide states and pillars on what can be done to improve the status quo. However, we alleviated this issue by conducting comprehensive literature reviews and case studies.

7.5.2 Strengths of the Methodology

The strengths of our methodology mitigated its weaknesses:

- **Reliability of critical analysis**
  The advantage of developing a legitimate quantitative database was that information was collected from credible sources using appropriate statistical methods and critically analyzed. This methodology allowed us to present an accurate depiction of gender parity related to women’s political and policy leadership and to extensively examine its relationship with the explanatory variables.

- **Replicability**
  The methodology adopted is replicable for future analyses. While this is a study of five to
35 countries, the methodology can be extrapolated to evaluate other nations as part of research into women’s leadership in politics and public administration beyond the scope of this project.

8 Analysis and Discussion

The key findings of our analysis are as follows:

- In the executive pillar, women had been elected head of state or government in 23 of the 35 OECD countries, as of June 2015. Among our case study nations of the US, Canada, the UK, Germany and Sweden, Germany was a leader by having two female political executives in the same timeframe. Concerning cabinets, Finland, Sweden and France all achieved gender parity in 2015, with 62.5%, 52.2% and 50% women’s representation respectively. In relation to our case study states, the average female participation rate was 32.3% in 2005 and 33% in 2015. Analyzing the data, we identified statistically significant correlations between the percentage of women cabinet members, public finance schemes, cabinet recruitment mechanisms and female legislative representation, as well as between women cabinet officials and female labor force participation.

- Regarding the case study countries, there was an average increase of 4.3% in female legislative representation during the decade prior to 2016. This upward trend was observed across OECD nations, with a mean increase of 3.77%. We found that OECD states with voluntary political party quotas had higher women’s parliamentary participation. Further, gender-based policies — especially maternity leave, nondiscrimination laws, and equal pay mandates — appeared to be related to greater female legislative representation.

- Within the civil service, the average female participation rate within OECD countries in 2015 was 54.5%. We found that this was most likely attributable to policies and legal frameworks aimed at ameliorating workforce gender gaps in those nations. The mean share of women in decision-making positions in OECD states in 2015 was 31.5%, which reflected the disconnect between female participation and empowerment. OECD countries with anti-discrimination laws or position-based recruitment systems seemed to have more women in senior roles, though our analysis with respect to quotas and female cabinet members contradicted positive correlations suggested by the literature.

- Analyzing a 10-year period in the judicial pillar, we found that women’s representation, on average, increased from 22.88% in 2006 to 30.78% in 2016. On a country-to-country basis, gains were made in the percentage of female supreme court justices in individual nations, except for Sweden, which actually decreased, and the UK, which remained the same. We did not find clear links between the percentage of women supreme court justices, the type of legal system, court size or judge selection method of the case study states.
In the security pillar, the percentage of women serving as active duty military personnel in 2015 was much lower than men in all our case study countries. The average female armed forces participation rate was only 13.5% in 2015, with a mean of 5.96% women defense department heads historically (compared to at least 30 male heads since World War II). Female representation in military forces was lower than that in police forces, at about 10% across the case study nations. We did not find connections between women’s leadership in the security pillar, participation rates, application restrictions and job availability.

These findings will be expanded upon below.

### 8.1 General Analysis

We first investigated a number of economic and social trends in OECD countries. Between 2005 and 2015, OECD nations grew in both wealth and size. The average gross domestic product per capita for OECD states in 2015 was $US37,295, with GDP per capita slightly higher in the US, Canada, the UK, Germany and Sweden at $US43,711 (OECD 2017). The GDP per capita average increased by $US3,278 for OECD countries between 2005 and 2015 and by $US3,281 in our case study nations. The mean population in OECD states in 2015 was 36.4 million people and 102.6 million in the case study countries; the large population in the US skewed this number. Average OECD populations grew by 2.2 million people between 2005 and 2015, while populations in the case study nations grew by 6.6 million. The OECD female-to-male population ratio dropped by 0.4 from 104.31 to 103.95 during the times analyzed. In the case study states, this effect was larger at 0.8, down 103.12 to 102.36.

These changes happened against a backdrop of other economic and social dynamics. For example, the 2015 OECD female labor force participation rate was 67.5% and 73.3% in our case study countries (OECD 2017). This represented a 4.3-percentage point increase for OECD nations and a 2-percentage point gain for the case study states. Between 2005 and 2015, the OECD labor force female-to-male ratio tightened from 0.7 to 0.8, and from 0.8 to 0.9 in the case study countries. Further, the 2015 OECD fertility rate was 1.7 births per mother, up by 0.03 from 2005. The rate also grew by 0.02 births in the case study nations, with the 2015 rate reported as 1.8. At the same time, the average age of an OECD woman’s first childbirth in 2015 was 30 years in comparison to the case study state age of 31. Both data points embodied a one-year increase from 2005. All in all, OECD women were working more, having more children, but having them later in 2015 in contrast to 2005.
8.2 Analysis by Political and Policy Structure

8.2.1 Executive Women’s Political and Policy Leadership

For the executive pillar, our goal was to report whether or not there had been an increase in the number of elected women heads of state or government and cabinet members in OECD countries between 2005 and 2015, focusing on the US, Canada, the UK, Germany and Sweden. Specifically, we measured progress towards gender parity and looked at the incidence of potential explanatory factors in regard to female leadership in the pillar. Among the indicators we explored were political systems, party ideology, electoral structures, public finance, cabinet recruitment mechanisms, and whether there had been a woman executive leader.

8.2.1.1 Heads of State and Government

OECD countries exhibited variation in women’s leadership in politics and public administration between 2005 and 2015. As of June 2015, elected female heads of state or government have led 23 of the 35 OECD nations (WEF 2015). The state that made the most progress towards gender equality was Switzerland, which supported five women executive leaders during the same time. This may be explained by the fact that Switzerland has a seven-member federal council, which operates as a cabinet and collective presidency. Among the case study countries, Table 8.1 shows that Germany has had two female leaders. The US and Sweden have never had a woman head.

Other OECD countries that had never had a female executive included:

- Belgium;
- The Czech Republic;
- Estonia;
- Hungary;
- Italy;
- Japan;
- Luxembourg;
- Mexico;
- The Netherlands; and
- Spain.
Figure 8.1 Years of Elected Women Heads of State and Government by Country

Table 8.1 Elected Women Heads of State and Government Leaders by Country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number of Women Executives</th>
<th>Number of Years with Women Executives in the Last 50 Years (2005)</th>
<th>Number of Years with Women Executives in the Last 50 Years (2015)</th>
<th>Years with Women Executives out of the Last 50 Years (2005) (%)</th>
<th>Years with Women Executives out of the Last 50 Years (2015) (%)</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
<th>Female-to-Male Executives Ratio for the Last 50 Years (2005)</th>
<th>Female-to-Male Executives Ratio for the Last 50 Years (2015)</th>
<th>Ratio Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From Figure 8.1 and Table 8.1, there was wide distribution not only in terms of the number of OECD female heads of state or government, but also in the length of time they served. The ramification of this is that women with shorter terms potentially had less of an impact on politics and the policymaking process. In the five decades prior to 2015, two women led Ireland for a total of 21 years, the longest period of female executive leadership among OECD countries to date (WEF 2015). Among the case study nations, the UK was the leader, with Margaret Thatcher acting as prime minister for 11.5 years. Kim Campbell, who was Canada’s prime minister from June 25 to November 4, 1993, had one of the shortest tenures. Of all the OECD and case study states, Germany experienced the most progress towards gender parity between 2005 and 2015, with Angela Merkel governing as Chancellor for nine years during that timeframe.

Comparing the proportion of years that women were executive leaders in the five decades prior to 2005 and 2015, the average percentage change for OECD countries and the case study nations was 3 and 3.6 percentage points respectively. Germany recorded the largest gain, with an increase of 18 percentage points from 2% in 2005 to 20% in 2015. As a result, any lessons from Germany may improve executive gender equality in the other case study states.

Many countries did not present any improvement, including:

- Belgium;
- Canada;
- The Czech Republic;
- Estonia;
• Greece;
• Hungary;
• Israel;
• Italy;
• Japan;
• Luxembourg;
• Mexico;
• The Netherlands;
• Portugal;
• Spain;
• Sweden;
• The UK; and
• The US.

8.2.1.2 Cabinets

Women’s representation on OECD national cabinets between 2005 and 2015 was more volatile than the general trend of more female heads of state or government during the same time. As can be seen in Figure 8.2, Finland, Sweden and France achieved gender equality in cabinet participation in 2015, with 62.5%, 52.2% and 50% women’s representation respectively. This marked an increase from 2005 when only Sweden (52.4%) and Spain (50%) reported reaching gender parity. Examining the case study countries, as depicted in Table 8.2, 32.26% of cabinet officials were women in 2005 and 33.02% in 2015. Female participation in OECD cabinets was bolstered by an average of 8 percentage points between 2005 and 2015, but in the case study nations it only increased by 0.76 percentage points. Slovenia gained the most ground during the time analyzed, with a 37.5-percentage point change in female cabinet representation. This can be compared to the US; the most improved among the case study states, with an 11.8-percentage point increase. Women’s cabinet participation in Germany, however, fell by 9.6 percentage points. Consequently, progress towards gender equality with respect to cabinets may be haphazard moving forward.
Figure 8.2 Percentage of Women Cabinet Members by Country

The chart shows the percentage of women in cabinet positions across various countries. For example, Hungary had 0% female cabinet members in 2015 and 12% in 2005. Japan had 13% female cabinet members in 2015 and 22% in 2005. The chart includes data for several other countries as well.
Table 8.2 Percentage of Women Cabinet Members by Country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>+11.8</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>+0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>+7.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>+0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>-5.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>-9.6</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Study Country Mean</td>
<td>32.26</td>
<td>33.02</td>
<td>+0.76</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Study Country Standard Deviation</td>
<td>15.32</td>
<td>11.48</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD Mean</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>+8</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>+0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD Standard Deviation</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


We next sought to understand the institutional and socio-structural trends related to these changes.

8.2.1.3 Political System

The literature suggests a possible association between elected women heads of state or government and a country’s political system, with research pointing towards a positive correlation with parliamentary structures (Jalalzai 2008). We defined political systems as parliamentary or presidential using the Database of Political Institutions (DPI 2015) and examined them with T- and Wilcoxon rank-sum tests. From Table 8.3, we found no evidence of a relationship between the percentage of years an OECD nation had a female executive in the 50 years prior to 2015 and its political system, despite the vast majority of states having parliamentary structures. The 29 countries with parliamentary systems had, on average, a woman leader for 9.1% of the five decades prior to 2015. The mean for the six nations with presidential institutions was 3.3% of the 50 years prior to 2015. As a result, female executives were more likely to lead parliamentary rather than presidential systems.
Table 8.3 Descriptive Statistics Between Elected Women Heads of State/Government and Political System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years with Women Executives out of the Last 50 Years in 2015 (%) by Political System</th>
<th>Number of Countries</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum Value</th>
<th>Maximum Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parliamentary System</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>0.123</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidential System</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-Test P-Value/Rank-Sum Z-Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.273/0.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


As summarized by Table 8.4, we found no evidence of an association between the percentage of OECD women’s cabinet representation in 2015 and a country’s political system. There was less discrepancy between different political structures and cabinet participation than with a female heads of state or government. On average, women comprised 29.7% of cabinets in parliamentary systems as opposed to 26.4% within presidential institutions.

Table 8.4 Descriptive Statistics Between Women Cabinet Members and Political System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Women Cabinet Members in 2015 (%) by Political System</th>
<th>Number of Countries</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum Value</th>
<th>Maximum Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parliamentary System</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.297</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidential System</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.264</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-Test P-Value/Rank-Sum Z-Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.633/0.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: OECD (2015); DPI (2015).

8.2.1.4 Party Ideology

Academics posit a link between women heads of state or government and progressive political affiliations (Claveria 2014; Escobar-Lemmon and Taylor-Robinson 2005). We classified party ideology according to the DPI, which coded party orientation with respect to economic policy: “left” for parties that were considered progressive, communist, socialist, social democratic or left-wing; “center” for parties considered centrist or that advocate for strengthening private enterprise in a social-liberal context; and “right” for parties considered conservative, Christian democratic or right-wing. Switzerland was among the missing data because the ideology of Switzerland’s federal council was evenly split and could not be categorized.

Utilizing a simple regression model, Table 8.5 illustrates how we did not identify a statistically significant correlation between OECD women executives and party ideology in 2015. Most
OECD countries had conservative parties in power in 2015, with those 18 nations having had a female leader for an average of 9.93% of the 50 years prior to 2015. In comparison, the mean length of time that the nine states with progressive parties in power in 2015 had a women head in the five decades prior to 2015 was only 2.65%. Countries with centrist governments performed better, with those nations having female executives for 9.2% of the 50 years prior to 2015. These findings contradict the literature by suggesting women are more likely to elevated to executive office with a right rather than left party.

Table 8.5 Descriptive Statistics Between Women Heads of State/Government and Political Party Ideology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years with Women Executives out of the Last 50 Years Since 2015 by Executive Political Party Ideology in 2015 (%)</th>
<th>Number of Countries</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum Value</th>
<th>Maximum Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Left</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>0.173</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-Value/R2</td>
<td>0.151/0.068</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Similarly, from Table 8.6, we did not establish a statistically significant association between OECD women cabinet officials and party ideology in 2015. This time centrist parties outperformed both progressive and conservative parties, with average female cabinet representation of 32.06% compared to 31.42% for left parties and 28.18% for right parties.

Table 8.6 Descriptive Statistics Between Women Cabinet Members and Political Party Ideology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Women Cabinet Members in 2015 by Executive Political Party Ideology in 2015 (%)</th>
<th>Number of Countries</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum Value</th>
<th>Maximum Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Left</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.314</td>
<td>0.164</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.321</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td>0.176</td>
<td>0.444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.282</td>
<td>0.157</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.233</td>
<td>0.195</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-Value/R2</td>
<td>0.572/0.011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: OECD (2015); DPI (2015).
8.2.1.5 Electoral System

Reynolds (1999) and Rule and Zimmerman (1994) write about how proportional representation electoral systems enable women to reach executive leadership roles. Employing T- and Wilcoxon rank-sum tests on DPI data, we did not find a statistically significant relationship between OECD female executives and proportional representation in 2015. Table 8.7 shows that most OECD countries had some form of proportional representation. On average, the 30 nations with proportional representation had women leaders for about 8.23% of the 50 years prior to 2015. In contrast, states without proportional representation had female heads for 7.12% of the five decades prior to 2015.

Table 8.7 Descriptive Statistics Between Women Heads of State/Government and Proportional Representation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years with Women Executives out of the Last 50 Years Since 2015 by Proportional Representation (%)</th>
<th>Number of Countries</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum Value</th>
<th>Maximum Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportional Representation</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.0823</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Proportional Representation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.097</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-Test P-Value/Rank-Sum Z-Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.844/0.771</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Further, we did not discover a statistically significant correlation between OECD women cabinet members and proportional representation in 2015. As seen in Table 8.8, countries with proportional representation, on average, had 32.89% female participation in their cabinets in 2015 compared to only 28.53% representation in nations without proportional representation.

Table 8.8 Descriptive Statistics Between Women Cabinet Members and Proportional Representation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Women Cabinet Members in 2015 by Proportional Representation (%)</th>
<th>Number of Countries</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum Value</th>
<th>Maximum Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportional Representation</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.329</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>0.227</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Proportional Representation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.285</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-Test P-Value/Rank-Sum Z-Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.561/0.509</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: OECD (2015); DPI (2015).
8.2.1.6 Public Finance

Rule and Zimmerman also discuss the benefits of public finance for parties and candidates. We defined types of public funding as regular public finance to parties, public finance only for political campaigns, both regular public finance and public finance for campaigns, and neither. This aligned with coding used in International IDEA’s Political Finance Database (2012). Table 8.9 demonstrates how we did not find a statistically significant association between OECD women executives and public funding in 2015 using regression analysis. The majority of countries had both types of public finance schemes, but nations with regular public funding had the highest average of years with a female leader in the five decades prior to 2015 (14.2%).

Table 8.9 Descriptive Statistics Between Women Heads of State/Government and Public Finance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years with Women Executives out of the Last 50 Years Since 2015 by Public Finance (%)</th>
<th>Number of Countries</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum Value</th>
<th>Maximum Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Campaign Funding</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Public Funding</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.142</td>
<td>0.152</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P-Value/R² 0.575/0.01


From Table 8.10, we did ascertain a statistically significant relationship between OECD women cabinet officials and public finance in 2015 (P=0.032, R²=0.131). Regular public funding again yielded the most female cabinet representation, with a mean of 36.4% in 2015. However, the correlation between women cabinet participation and public finance did not hold in 2005 (P=0.374/R²=0.025).

Table 8.10 Descriptive Statistics Between Women Cabinet Members and Public Finance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Women Cabinet Members in 2015 by Public Finance (%)</th>
<th>Number of Countries</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum Value</th>
<th>Maximum Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Campaign Funding</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.247</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.172</td>
<td>0.308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Public Funding</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.364</td>
<td>0.132</td>
<td>0.222</td>
<td>0.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.219</td>
<td>0.152</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.434</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.429</td>
<td>0.438</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.2.1.7 Cabinet Recruitment System

Claveria (2014) argues that cabinet recruitment systems — either generalist or specialist — have repercussions for women’s representation, with a positive association expected for the specialist category. Utilizing regression, we found a weak relationship between recruitment mechanisms and female cabinet participation rates in OECD countries in 2015 (P=0.053/R2=0.153), which did not hold in 2005 (P=0.073/R2=0.133). Nations with specialist schemes had an average of 37.2% women’s representation, in comparison to the generalist mean of 26.7%. While almost an equal number of nations had specialist systems as they did generalist ones, Table 8.11 notes the amount of missing data for this explanatory variable. This has implications for the generalizability of our findings.

Table 8.11 Descriptive Statistics Between Women Cabinet Members and Cabinet Recruitment System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Women Cabinet Members in 2015 by Cabinet Recruitment System (%)</th>
<th>Number of Countries</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum Value</th>
<th>Maximum Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specialist System</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.372</td>
<td>0.149</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalist System</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.267</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.216</td>
<td>0.169</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.462</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P-Value/R2 0.053/0.153

Sources: OECD (2015); Claveria (2014); Siaroff (2000); Davis (1997).

8.2.1.8 Woman Head of State or Government

Jacob, Scherpereel and Adams (2014) contended that the percentage of women cabinet members might be influenced by the presence of a female executive. As can be seen in Table 8.12, we did not uncover evidence of a correlation between OECD women’s cabinet representation and a female leader in 2015. Nevertheless, there was an association between the percentage of women cabinet officials and lower houses of parliament representatives in 2005 (P=0.000, R2=0.716) and 2015 (P=0.000, R2=0.383). This finding may be connected to generalist cabinet recruitment systems, through which ministers and secretaries are appointed from the legislature.
Table 8.12 Descriptive Statistics Between Women Cabinet Members and Woman Head of State/Government

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Women Cabinet Members by Woman Head of State/Government in 2015 (%)</th>
<th>Number of Countries</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum Value</th>
<th>Maximum Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Woman Head</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.302</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Woman Head</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.289</td>
<td>0.161</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-Value/R2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.836/0.666</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Although we did not generate any statistically significant findings in regard to women executives, the findings we derived about female cabinet representation can be used to improve women's political and policy leadership in the executive pillar. We found a statistically significant correlation between OECD female cabinet participation rates and cabinet recruitment systems, public funding and the percentage of women serving in lower houses of parliament in 2015. These lessons were adapted for policy recommendations aimed at empowering women to succeed in politics and public administration. We also found a statistically significant association between female cabinet representation and labor force participation in 2005 and 2015. This suggests that, with time, the more women become cognizant of how they can contribute to society, the more opportunities they will have to make an impact on politics and policymaking.

8.2.2 Legislative Women’s Political and Policy Leadership

There was an increase in national female legislative participation in OECD countries during the last decade, from 2006 to 2016, on average 3.77%. This upward trend could be observed across our case study nations, with a mean gain of 4.2%. The UK emerged as a frontrunner in our analysis, with a growth rate 6.23% higher than the OECD average. Although Sweden consistently had the highest representation in our dataset, it actually experienced a decrease of 3%. However, starting with a lower percentage contributes to a higher growth rate even if the relative change is small.

Table 8.13 Percentage of Women Legislative Representatives by Country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>2006 (%)</th>
<th>2016 (%)</th>
<th>Percentage Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>+4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>+10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Lower House (%)</th>
<th>Upper House (%)</th>
<th>Joint (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>43.48</td>
<td>31.25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Official government websites (2016).

### 8.2.2.1 Political Characteristics

Each of the case study countries chosen for our analysis has a democratically elected legislative branch of government. The US, Canada, Germany and the UK all have bicameral parliaments, while their Swedish counterpart is unicameral. As can be seen in Table 8.15, the US is the only case study nation that does not employ a quota in its legislative arm, which may have contributed to its low women’s parliamentary participation. The rest of the states have a voluntary party quota to require female legislative representation. Nevertheless, none of the case study countries stipulate that a certain percentage of women be reflected in candidate lists for national elections.

Table 8.15 Legislative Political Characteristics by Country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>Majority</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>Majority/Other</td>
<td>Voluntary Party</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Women in Legislature (2016) (%)</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>Left/Center</td>
<td>Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>Majority/Other</td>
<td>Voluntary Party</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Center</td>
<td>Mixed/Other</td>
<td>Voluntary Party</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>Proportional</td>
<td>Voluntary Party</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD Means and/or Distributions</td>
<td>28.77</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>Majority - 5.88</td>
<td>Voluntary Party - 5.71</td>
<td>Yes - 34.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: WEF (2016); World Bank (2016); The Quota Project (2016).

Table 8.16 Descriptive Statistics Between Women Legislative Representatives and the Last Political Party in Power (2014)

Our cross-tabular analysis did not reveal a strong relationship between political parties and women’s legislative representation. Although all countries with female participation below 20% had a right-wing parliament, it should also be noted that more than half of all mid-range nations had dominant right-wing legislatures as well. An equal number of countries with above average female parliamentary representation (greater than 30%) presented with left- and right-wing legislatures.

We did not find a statistically significant correlation between dominant party ideologies and women’s legislative leadership (P=0.183, R²=0.062). However, the limitations of a small sample size must be considered.
Table 8.17 Descriptive Statistics Between Female Legislative  Representatives and Legal Quotas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Women in the Legislature (%)</th>
<th>No Legal Quota</th>
<th>Legal Quota</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 to 20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.18 Descriptive Statistics Between Female Legislative Representatives and Voluntary Quotas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Women in the Legislature (%)</th>
<th>No Voluntary Quota</th>
<th>Voluntary Quota</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 to 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Through cross-tabular analysis, we found voluntary quotas to have a stronger relationship with higher legislative participation than legal quotas. Every country with women representing more than 40% of its legislature required a voluntary party quota. Furthermore, the majority of nations with female parliamentary participation greater than the OECD average (28.77%) necessitated voluntary party quotas. Although there were several outliers, such as the four states with the lowest women’s representation mandating quotas, the majority of countries above or near the OECD mean required quotas. This analysis suggests a relationship between voluntary party quotas and female legislative participation.

Our examination did not ascertain any statistically significant relationships between women’s parliamentary representation in OECD countries and voluntary quotas (P=0.9, R2=0.0005), legal quotas (P=0.666, R2=0.007), or national candidate list quotas (P=0.882, R2=0.0007). This outcome was contrary to expectations in relation to female participation and affirmative action measures, although the limitations of a small sample size must be taken into account.

8.2.2.2 Gender-Based Policies*

Our case study countries recorded mixed results in terms of gender-related policies. While Germany does not legally mandate equal pay or gender nondiscrimination, its female legislative representation was higher than the OECD average. Canada requires equal pay and provides
maternity leave, but had a lower than average proportion of women lawmakers. The US does not have compulsory equal pay or maternity leave provisions, and consistently had the lowest parliamentary female participation. It would appear from overall OECD observations, however, that higher maternity leave allowances and equality measures contributed to greater women’s political and policy empowerment.

Table 8.19 Legislative Policy Characteristics by Country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Women in the Legislature (2016) (%)</th>
<th>Equal Pay Laws</th>
<th>Nondiscrimination Laws</th>
<th>Maternity Leave (Days)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Study Country Mean</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD Means and/or Distributions</td>
<td>28.77</td>
<td>No - 25.71</td>
<td>No - 31.43</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes - 74.29</td>
<td>Yes - 68.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: WEF (2016); World Bank (2016). * This analysis does not include family leave policies. Maternity leave was examined alone to limit the analysis to a policy directly addressing women. The relationship between family leave and female leadership opportunities presents an opportunity for future research and analysis.

Table 8.20 Descriptive Statistics Between Female Legislative Representatives and Maternity Leave Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Women in the Legislature (%)</th>
<th>Maternity Leave &lt; 27 Days</th>
<th>Maternity Leave 27-54 Days</th>
<th>Maternity Leave 54-108 Days</th>
<th>Maternity Leave &gt; 108 Days</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.21 Descriptive Statistics Between Female Legislative Representatives and Nondiscrimination Laws

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Women in the Legislature (%)</th>
<th>No Nondiscrimination Law</th>
<th>Nondiscrimination Law</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.22 Descriptive Statistics Between Female Legislative Representatives and Equal Pay Laws

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Women in the Legislature (%)</th>
<th>No Equal Pay Law</th>
<th>Equal Pay Law</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen in this cross-tabulation of legislative representation and maternity leave policies, OECD countries reported a similarly mixed relationship between the two variables. Of the nations with the highest percentage of women in the legislature, an equal number had maternity leave programs above average (> 54) and below 27 days. Nonetheless, when looking at the mid- to high- range states, such as those with 20 to 40% representation, the majority of these countries required longer maternity leave schemes. Almost 73% of these nations had more than 27 days of maternity leave. This analysis suggests that states mandating at least half the OECD average maternity leave allowances tend to have near or above average female parliamentary participation.

Regarding the relationship between nondiscrimination laws and women’s representation, our research found that three quarters of OECD countries with above average legislative participation (greater than 30%) had anti-discrimination laws. Moreover, almost all mid-range nations legally mandated nondiscrimination, while the majority of lower-range states (less than 20% female legislatures) did not implement these measures. Similarly, 75% of countries with above average women’s parliamentary representation legally compelled equal pay. More than
90% of mid-range nations also required equal pay. These results suggest a relationship between policies addressing gender discrimination or equality and higher rates of female legislative participation.

Our analysis did not yield any statistically significant results between the length of maternity leave policies (P=0.297, R2=0.034), requiring equal pay (P=0.470, R2=0.016) and nondiscrimination laws (P=0.271, R2=0.037). Yet the way these policies interact within a broader framework of laws and social norms must be considered.

Overall, female legislative leadership was rising within our case study countries, as well across the OECD nations in general. These increases took place in a variety of political, social and policy environments, but common themes emerged in relation to quotas and gender-based policies. Although difficult to statistically correlate with such a small sample size, cross-tabular analysis showed voluntary party quotas, longer maternity leave initiatives, and gender-based equality mandates to be related to female parliamentary representation.

8.2.3 Civil Service Women’s Political and Policy Leadership

Using data from UNDP’s GEPA project, we compiled a general picture of women’s civil service leadership within OECD countries. The average rate of female representation in the OECD public sector was 54.5% in 2015, which could be attributed to policies and legal frameworks aimed at addressing gender gaps in these nations. The mean proportion of women leaders in all decision-making positions in OECD states, however, was 31.5%. These statistics reflected a schism between women’s participation and female empowerment (UNDP GEPA). Generally, women’s share of leadership opportunities was lower than female involvement in the government workforces, with the exception of Greece and Austria. Interestingly, higher participation of women in the civil service did not necessarily result in a higher percentage of female leaders. For example, women represented more than 65% of the public service in Denmark and the UK, but held only 22% of the decision-making roles. Female leadership and representation varied significantly between countries. Poland was the leader among all the nations with available data, with 53% of its civil service decision-making positions occupied by women. On the other side, Turkey emerged as a laggard, with no female leaders, even though 23% of its public workforce was female.
Figure 8.3 Percentage of Women Civil Service Leaders by Country

Our analysis looked for factors that could potentially explain women’s leadership in the civil service. Based on the literature and available data, frequently suggested indicators associated with women’s political and policy leadership include gender quotas, discrimination laws, female leaders elected in the executive pillar (cabinet members) and public sector recruitment systems.
8.2.3.1 Gender Quotas

According to the UNDP, comprehensive legal and policy frameworks — such as quotas or initiatives to combat sexual harassment — are important facilitators to increase women's leadership in the civil service (UNDP 2014). Our dataset included a binary variable to measure female quotas in national elections and descriptive statistics revealed a different story: the average percentage of women in decision-making positions was higher in countries without quotas than it was in nations with them. Our analysis also found a weak difference in means using both a T- and rank-sum test, indicating that there was no statistical significance between female leadership in the public sector and quotas. This result may possibly be attributed to the fact that the binary variable missed variation in the states’ quotas, including reserved seats, party quotas and legislative quotas. These quotas vary in terms of their basic characteristics, the countries in which they appear, and the timing of their adoption (Krook 2007).

Table 8.23 Descriptive Statistics Between Women Civil Service Leaders and Quotas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Countries</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum Value</th>
<th>Maximum Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Without Quota</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.309</td>
<td>0.148</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Quota</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.289</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-Test P-Value/Rank-Sum Z-Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.761/0.745</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.2.3.2 Nondiscrimination Law Mandate

The literature indicates that nondiscrimination laws could be connected with women's representation and leadership in the civil service field (Adusah-Karikari and Ohemeng 2014). Although our analysis of descriptive statistics did show that countries with anti-discrimination laws tend to have higher female public sector participation, as well as a higher share of women in top and middle management roles, the correlation was still too weak to establish such a relationship.

Table 8.24 Descriptive Statistics Between Women Civil Service Leaders and Nondiscrimination Law Mandates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Countries</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum Value</th>
<th>Maximum Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Without Mandate</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.287</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Mandate</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.2.3.3 Women Cabinet Members

Researchers suggest that women are more likely to be leaders when a female had an elected leadership position above them (Smith 2015; Smith and Monaghan 2013). Yet our analysis reported an insignificant coefficient of correlation (0.031). A detailed look at the percentage of women leaders in the civil service and the percentage of female cabinet members in OECD countries also showed that this correlation required more evidence. Finland was the leader for supporting the largest share of female cabinet officials, but women were represented in only 33% of bureaucratic decision-making positions.

Figure 8.4 Percentage of Women Civil Service Leaders and Female Cabinet Members by Country

Sources: UNDP GEPA (2014); OECD (2015). Note: Most UNDP data was from 2016; * indicates data from 2015, ** indicates data from 2012.
8.2.3.4 Recruitment System

The literature also found that various recruitment systems could be associated with women’s leadership in the civil service. More specifically, a position-based recruitment mechanism was preferred to a career-based one. The difference between these two systems is that position-based schemes have competitive recruitment process for each position, which are not transferable, while a career-based approach has less stringent and less transparent mobility processes (OECD 2017). Our analysis showed that position-based recruitment systems did have a higher percentage of female leaders in public sector. Nevertheless, both the T- and rank-sum tests revealed there might not be a significant correlation between the two variables.

Table 8.25 Descriptive Statistics Between Women Civil Service Leaders and Recruitment System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Countries</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum Value</th>
<th>Maximum Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career-Based Recruitment System</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.253</td>
<td>0.181</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position-Based Recruitment System</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-Test P-Value/Rank-Sum Z-Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.206/0.263</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among the variables discussed above, the nondiscrimination law mandate had the highest P-value from the rank-sum test with respect to women’s political and policy leadership. Regardless, the sample was too small to produce a statistically significant conclusion on indicators impacting women’s empowerment in the civil service pillar.

8.2.4 Judicial Women’s Political and Policy Leadership

Based on our literature review, three factors are commonly cited as influencing women’s political and policy leadership on the bench: a civil or common law legal system, court size, and an election or nomination judicial selection process. We explored these potential correlations using female supreme court justice data from the US, Canada, the UK, Germany and Sweden in 2006, 2011 and 2016. However, given data availability and the small sample size, results based on our dataset were limited in their broad applicability to women’s judicial representation.

Looking at trends across our case study countries over 10 years, we found that overall women’s participation in the judicial pillar on average increased — the mean went from 22.88% in 2006 to 30.78% in 2016. On a country-to-country basis, the percentage of female supreme court justices in individual countries grew, except for Sweden, where actually decreased, and the UK, where it remained the same.
Concerning legal systems, there was an even divide among our case study countries: Germany and Sweden have civil law systems, the US and Canada have common law structures, while the UK’s legal system is a mix of both. For the purposes of clear comparisons, we did not analyze data from the UK in the below table, which contrasts women’s judicial representation between the two structures based on data from the four nations across a decade. From Table 8.26, no clear leader in female judicial participation emerged from the two systems. However, in 2011 and 2016, common law states seemed to outperform their civil law counterparts. Nevertheless, as aforementioned, the data set was too small to produce a statistically significant conclusion on which legal system was more conducive to women’s empowerment in the judiciary.

Table 8.26 Descriptive Statistics Between Women Supreme Court Justices and Legal System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Legal System</th>
<th>Women Supreme Court Justices (2006) (%)</th>
<th>Women Supreme Court Justices (2011) (%)</th>
<th>Women Supreme Court Justices in (2016) (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civil Law (Germany and Sweden)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Law (the US and Canada)</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>40.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: European Commission (2016); official Supreme Court websites (2016).
8.2.4.2 Court Size

The literature suggests that court size is an important indicator for female judicial representation — the larger the court size, the more chances women have to be awarded a judgeship. To examine this hypothesis, we produced Table 8.27 and found that court size did not appear to have a convincing impact on the percentage of female judges. For countries with similar court sizes, such as the US and Canada (nine seats) as well as Germany and Sweden (16 seats), the gaps in their respective women supreme court justice percentage were rather large. Moreover, nations with larger supreme courts and therefore extra seats for women did not necessarily result in more female judges on the bench, as suggested by the literature. This point is illustrated by comparing Germany with Canada.

Table 8.27 Descriptive Statistics Between Women Supreme Court Justices and Court Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Court Size</th>
<th>Women Supreme Court Justices (2016) (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States (9)</td>
<td>27.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada (9)</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom (12)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany (16)</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden (16)</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: European Commission (2016); official Supreme Court websites (2016).

Regarding judicial selection methods, unlike the first two factors, our dataset did not see an even spread across the spectrum. Germany was the only country among the case study nations to have supreme court justices elected by parliament, while the other four jurisdictions all use appointment or nomination as their main selection method. Germany was not a clear outlier in terms of female judicial representation and, thus, we could not conclude whether selection methods affect women’s empowerment in the judiciary.

8.2.5 Security Women’s Political and Policy Leadership

From our review of previous research, three potential explanatory variables emerged as possible facilitators of women’s representation in military forces and law enforcement. These factors include the underrepresentation of women at the top of the security sector; entry point and diversity challenges, such as job application restrictions; and retention issues. We analyzed these indicators using the most recent data we could find pertaining to the US, Canada, the UK, Germany and Sweden. However, our survey of the security pillar faced many hurdles. Information was deficient in a number of years, so data was sourced from different time periods.
While the lack of information limited our quantitative analysis, we were still able to identify some patterns. For example, with respect to our case study countries, Sweden was the most willing to support female participation in both military and police forces. This occurred against a broader trend of fewer women in active duty personnel roles in comparison to men, with the percentage lower than 20% across the case study nations. In addition, the number of female defense ministers in the case study states appeared to coincide with the rate of military jobs open to women. The UK, for instance, has not had any female defense ministers and had the lowest rate of job available to women. Lastly, female representation in the military was lower than their participation in policing.

8.2.4.1 Women at the Top of the Security Pillar

Table 8.28 Percentage of Women Military Leaders by Country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>0 (0/26)</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>3.2 (1/31)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>0 (0/34)</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>5.6 (1/18)</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>21 (4/19)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Study Country Mean</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Titles may differ; excludes acting Ministers of Defense; percentages were derived by dividing female ministers of defense by the total number of ministers since World War II.

Table 8.29 Percentage of Women Law Enforcement Leaders by Country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Women Heads of Federal Law Enforcement (%)</th>
<th>Women in State-Level Police Forces (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>2.4 (Attorneys General)</td>
<td>13 (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>5.9 (Ministers of Justice)</td>
<td>20 (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>1.1 (Attorneys General)</td>
<td>28 (2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Officers</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>0 (Ministers of the Interior)</td>
<td>19 (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>8 (Ministers of Justice)</td>
<td>29 (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Study Country Mean</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The literature suggests that women are more likely to be leaders when a woman has an elected leadership position above them (Smith and Monaghan 2013). It is surprising then that only 10.9% of Germany’s military forces were women in 2015, since 5.6% of the country’s defense ministers since World War II have been female. While a woman has never been a Secretary of Defense in the US, almost 21% of Sweden’s defense ministers have been female. This can be compared to Canada, where 3.2% of the nation’s defense ministers have been women. Average female participation in state-level police forces was higher than in the military at about 21.8%. Yet women did typically not fill top positions in law enforcement, such as Attorneys General. In our country case states, no more than 3.48% of law enforcement leaders were female. Nevertheless, as mentioned before, our dataset was too small to produce a statistically significant conclusion on whether the presentation of women at the top of the security sector increased female empowerment below them.

8.2.4.2 Entry-Point and Diversity Challenges

Based on our review of prior work, there seems to be discrimination against women trying to access certain entry points and positions in the military. This is known in the literature as a “brass” ceiling because equal ability often does not equate to equal opportunities in the security field. For example, although women were permitted to enter the service academies in the US from 1976, they encountered fierce resistance from Congress, the Department of Defense, and other cadets and midshipmen. Similar controversy surrounded the decision to end the combat exclusion policy in 2013, which had previously barred women from serving (Kidder 2017).

To examine this hypothesis, we produced Figure 8.6 and Table 8.30:
Figure 8.6 Distribution of Women in Security by Service and Country

Source: NATO (2017). Note: Figure excludes Sweden.

Table 8.30 Descriptive Statistics Between Women in Security and Job Availability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Women Active Duty Military Personnel (2015) (%)</th>
<th>Jobs in the Military Open to Women (2016) (%)</th>
<th>Year All Combat Units were Open to Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Study Country Mean</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>90.8</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


From the above, we found that the percentage of jobs open to women in the military did not
seem to have an impact on their participation rates. That being said, we could not conclude that female leadership in the security pillar was related with the year combat units were opened to women because for countries with similar opening rates, such as the US and Sweden, gaps with representation still occurred. Moreover, we did not find any evidence that indicates the diversity of categories that accept women in the military could increase the female participation rate. Germany is a good example since it is the most diverse nation, but it performs poorly in terms of women’s representation.

9 Conclusion

In conclusion to this project, our analysis suggests that men and women do not have the same opportunities to participate in the political and policymaking process across the executive, legislative, civil service, judicial and security pillars. Although the US, Canada, the UK, Germany and Sweden have tried to forge equal access to all leaderships positions for both genders, female underrepresentation continues to occur in politics and public administration in our case study nations and other states. While most countries have recorded some progress towards gender parity during the times analyzed, advancements are still necessary for women to achieve equal representation in elected and appointed political and policy leadership roles by 2050.

In order to address these disparities, our analysis has identified several effective methods for promoting women in public life. In the executive, women seemed to increase their chances of success by running for lower level positions first. As a result, the legislatures should be treated as a recruitment tool for higher office, with training programs to invest in current and prospective candidates. For the legislative pillar, countries should adopt voluntary party quotas and enhance gender-based policies such as maternity leave, equal pay, and nondiscrimination mandates. In the civil service, initiatives to raise gender awareness and motivation for career development among women should close the gap between participation and leadership. For judicial representation, women were awarded more judgeships in less hierarchical systems where there was a female presence in the executive and legislative branches. With respect to the security pillar, women were more likely to be elevated through military and police ranks when there was less discrimination, especially in relation to combat roles.

Throughout our analysis, we have identified current challenges and potential avenues for future research. Moving forward, we recommend further data collection and research in regard to women in politics and policy:

9.1 Data

One of the biggest challenges to our project was data availability. Different collection methods, definitions, time frames and locations complicate the issue of creating a cohesive database.
Future researchers must keep these issues in mind and create concrete definitions and bounds for their data collection. Moreover, more data collection needs to be conducted at the national, state and local levels for all countries in regard to factors affecting women’s leadership.

9.2 Future Research

• **Expanding to state and local levels**
  This project focused on five pillars at the national level, with a small portion of analysis dedicated to state-level police forces. Future studies could extend this analysis to the state and local levels and establish connections between all three levels of leadership or whether pathways are formed between the national, state and local levels.

• **Cross-pillar analysis**
  This project could be extended to include further analysis of the relationship between all five pillars. For example, national parliaments have been identified as candidate pools for cabinets in the executive – more analysis could be undertaken to see how representation in one pillar can feed into participation in another.

• **Public-private sector relationships**
  While our analysis focused on public leadership in politics and policymaking, further analysis could be done into women in the private sector. Additionally, the relationship between women’s empowerment in the private and public sectors could be explored. For instance, is there a link between opportunities for women in these sectors? Is public leadership drawn from the private sector?

This project, combined with future efforts, all contribute to a better understanding of female leadership for gender equality.
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## Appendix B  Case Studies and Recommendations

### 1  United States

After the presidential defeat of Hillary Clinton in November 2016, the United States missed its closest opportunity yet to send its first woman head of government to the White House. With no female presidents, low representation in the US Congress, and inequality across the civil service, judiciary and security sectors, the US consistently lags behind other countries in terms of women’s political and policy leadership.

The status quo of national women’s leadership in American politics and public administration is as follows:

- The US has elected no female heads of government;
- Its cabinet was made up of 26.1% women in 2015;
- Congress was only 19% female in 2016;
- 34.4% of decision-makers in the civil service were women in 2015;
- Only 4 out of 112 supreme court judges have been women; and
- Women comprised just 15% of active military personnel in 2015.

The below analysis explains these facts and figures according to five pillars: the executive, the legislature, the civil service, the judiciary and security.

### 1.1 Analysis by Political and Policy Structure

#### Executive

With the defeat of Clinton in 2016, the US has never had a female head of government. However, in relation to women’s cabinet representation, the US was the most improved among the case study countries, increasing by 11.8 percentage points between 2005 and 2015 (14.3% in 2005 to 26.1% in 2015). This fell in line with research pointing towards a correlation between cabinet and legislative participation, with American women experiencing a 4-percentage point enhancement in parliamentary representation during the same period. Yet, despite making the largest gains, the US was still second-to-last among the case study nations in cabinet participation in 2015.
The US is the only country among the case study states to have a presidential political system through which women are required to face the general electorate to end up in the Oval Office. The adversarial nature of the scheme is exacerbated by the fact that the US has just two dominant political parties. In terms of its electoral system, the US does not have proportional representation or a candidate list initiative, which have been used to augment female political and policy leadership in other contexts. Nevertheless, the US does provide public financing for campaigns, boosting — at the very least — establishment candidates.

Regarding cabinets, the US has a specialist recruitment system but the smallest body among the case study nations, with only 17 cabinet members and, therefore, fewer opportunities for women (CIA 2017). While the party ideology of the executive changed from conservative to progressive during the years analyzed, interestingly, the US was the only case study state where the executive’s party also dominated the legislature in both 2005 and 2015 (DPI 2015). This removed the possibility of a party gaining a competitive advantage by promoting female leaders.

**Legislature**

The US has a bicameral parliament, separated into the House of Representatives and the Senate. In 2016, women made up 19% of the American legislature, which was lower than both the case study country average of 31.3% and the OECD mean of 28.77%. Female parliamentary representation had risen since 2006, nonetheless, with an increase of 4 percentage points during the last decade. With respect to legislative leadership, both houses of Congress demonstrated low levels of female committee heads. Women chaired only 4.55% of House committees, 5.88% of Senate committees and led zero joint committees.

The US does not have a voluntary party or legal quota, and has not implemented a quota for national candidate lists. Furthermore, the US underperforms in terms of gender-based policies. While mandating nondiscrimination, the US does not require equal pay or maternity leave. In our study of OECD nations, greater maternity leave allowances appeared to be correlated with higher female legislative representation. Furthermore, states with anti-discrimination and equal pay laws seemed to have higher female parliamentary participation.

**Civil Service**

Women’s representation in public employment in the US was behind the OECD average. In 2015, female participation in the American civil service workforce was 43.2%. At higher leadership levels, women held 34.4% of the decision-making positions, according to the UNDP GEPA Report. This was above the OECD average of 31.5%. US federal government employment is regulated by several laws, including the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978, codified in Title 5 of the US Code. This Act, as amended, protects public sector applicants and employees from discrimination in personnel actions based on sex.

Additionally, several federal departments have rules to ensure diversity among staff. For
example, before posting job announcements, the Department of Education and the Environmental Protection Agency compel their hiring offices to create recruitment plans detailing how they will generate a diverse pool of applicants. The Department of Agriculture, by comparison, has signed memorandums of understanding with more than 15 affinity groups, most of them composed of minorities and women in the civil service. When the department recruits for a candidate development program or senior executive position, it sends the groups a link to the application and encourages their members to apply (McKinsey 2015).

**Judiciary**

Although women’s judicial representation saw major progress during the Obama administration, with the number of female judges on the supreme court reaching its highest point of three in the country’s history, there is still a long way to go before the US achieves gender parity in its judicial system. From a historic standpoint, only four out of the 112 justices who have ever served on the supreme court have been women. Gains in female supreme court judges have been slow, with an approximate 10% increase over the last two decades (National Women’s Law Center 2016).

**Security**

According to statistics from NATO reports, 15.5% of active duty military personnel were female in 2015. While women are underrepresented at the top, they are present. As of 2017, 7.1% of US military generals and admirals are women (Kidder 2017). In 2015, two of the five Under Secretaries of Defense, one of the five Principal Deputy Under Secretaries of Defense, and two of the 14 Assistant Secretaries of Defense were women. In the State Department, one of the two Deputy Secretaries of State, four of the six Under Secretaries of State, and 11 of the 26 Assistant Secretaries of State were also women at the same time. The US claims to have opened all military and other security forces positions to female candidates, yet it still performed poorly in women’s leadership, especially within state-level policing, which had only 13% female participation in 2013.

**1.2 Lessons Learned**

- **Gender-based policies** such as equal pay and maternity leave are linked to higher legislative representation. The US does not employ either and should consider these efforts to improve its parliamentary inclusion.
- **Voluntary party quotas**, which the US currently does not offer, should be implemented to increase female legislative participation.
- **Diversity programs** should be implemented within political parties to mirror the success the US has recorded with those used in federal public employment.
2 Canada

Canada is a model for women's political and policy leadership within the civil service and judiciary. Yet statistics on female empowerment within other government institutions and structures are concerning. Thus, Canada has more progress to make in order to achieve gender equality in politics and public administration by 2050.

The status quo of national women's leadership in Canada is as follows:
- Canada has had one female head of government, as of 2017;
- The Canadian cabinet was comprised of 30.8% women in 2015;
- Canada’s legislature was 26% female in 2016;
- 46.4% of Canadian civil service leadership positions were held by women in 2015;
- Female judges constituted 44.4% of Canada's Supreme Court bench in 2016; and
- 15% of active duty military personnel were women in 2015.

The below analysis looks at these facts and figures against the backdrop of five pillars: the executive, the legislature, the civil service, the judiciary and security.

2.1 Analysis by Political and Policy Structure

Executive

In its executive history, Canada boasts one elected woman head of government, though it has supported numerous appointed female head of states in the role of governor-general. However, the impact of Kim Campbell, who was Canadian prime minister from June 25 to November 4, 1993, may be questioned considering the brevity of her term. A lesson from Campbell's tenure is that, similarly to the UK’s Theresa May, she ascended to her power through internal party politics rather than an external popular vote. Canada did not experience any change in terms of elected female heads of government in the 50 years prior 2005 or 2015, but it did experience gains with its cabinets. Women comprised 23.1% of Canada's cabinet in 2005 and 30.8% in 2015, a 7.7-percentage point increase; this followed upward trends in female legislative representation in Canada. Despite the movement, Canada was still third among the case study
countries for cabinet participation.

Canada’s status quo could be attributed to its parliamentary political system, which protects women from directly facing the electorate to seize power. Instead, they rely on the aggregate performance of their party. Like the US, Canada does not have proportional representation or a candidate list initiative, but it does offer public financing for campaigns. With respect to cabinets, Canada has a general recruitment mechanism, which the literature suggests should work against women seeking a ministerial portfolio. What could explain the difference between the US and Canada is how the Canadian cabinet ballooned from 28 members in 2005 to 46 officials in 2015. While the ideology of the executive’s party changed from progressive to conservative in the decade examined, another explanatory variable discussed by academics, neither the 2005 nor the 2015 executive also controlled the legislature.

Kim Campbell
Campbell became Canada’s first female prime minister at 46 at the Progressive Conservative Party leadership convention in 1993. During her tenure at the helm of the center-right party, the former lawyer consolidated departments and created three new ministries in line with her policy priorities: Health, Canadian Heritage and Public Security. Campbell’s popularity, nonetheless, declined over the course of her campaign and she did not win the 1993 election. Prior to becoming prime minister, Campbell served in provincial politics from 1986 to 1988 and transitioned to federal politics in 1988. At various times between 1990 and 1993, she served as Minister of Justice, Minister Responsible for Federal-Provincial Relations, Minister of Veterans Affairs and Minister of National Defense. These represent portfolios that cannot be categorized as “feminine”, bucking the trend identified by the literature. In addition, as a conservative politician, she did not fit the progressive mold cast by previous academic work. Campbell, thrice married, has no children.

Legislature

Canada has a bicameral parliamentary system, separated into the House of Commons and the Senate. The Canadian legislature was 26% female in 2016, which is lower than the OECD average of 28.77%. However, women’s parliamentary representation had increased by 5 percentage points since 2006. In terms of leadership, women headed 25% of Canada’s lower house committees and 27.8% of upper house committees had female chairs. Joint committees presented the highest share of female leaders, with 67% chaired by women. Canada has a voluntary party quota for its national elections, but does not require a base number of women on national candidate lists. Regarding gender-based laws, Canada has equal pay legislation, but does not enforce a nondiscrimination measure. Canada requires 52 days of maternity leave, about the same as the OECD average of 54 days. In a study of OECD countries, greater maternity leave allowances, anti-discrimination laws, and equal pay all appeared to be correlated with higher female legislative representation.
Civil Service

According to UNDP’s GEPA Report, the percentage of women in Canada’s civil service in 2015 was 55%, which was near the OECD average of 54.5%. At the leadership level, women held 46.4% of decision-making positions in the field in 2015, which was well above the mean of 31.5%. Employment in the core public administration and separate agencies of the Canadian public workforce — as defined by Schedules I, IV and V of the Financial Administration Act (1985) (FAA) — is governed by the FAA, the Public Service Employment Act (2003) (PSEA), agency legislation and others. In 2009, the PSEA re-affirmed the Canadian federal government’s commitment to the principle of equal pay for work of equal value. The Act seeks to ensure that employers and bargaining agents addressed potential gender discrimination in compensation in a proactive and timely manner (OECD 2012).

Judiciary

In relation to judicial representation, Canada is the closest among the case study countries to reaching gender parity, with female judges taking up 44.4% of the seats on its supreme court in 2016. Canada, nevertheless, was the first nation in the world to realize a gender-balanced national court, setting a remarkable example in achieving gender equality in its judiciary. Uniquely, the higher the court in the Canadian judicial system, the greater the percentage of women on the bench, which is contrary to most states where the more prestigious courts have fewer female judges. In addition, federal courts have slightly higher women participation than regional courts.

Security

In the security pillar, Canada has worked to increase female participation in both military and police forces over the last decade. According to NATO, women represent 15% of all active duty military personnel, which is higher than the average presentation in the other case study countries. From aerospace engineering to submarine maintenance to health care administration, hundreds of jobs are open to women, including front-line combat roles. Within law enforcement, Canada’s national police service is also a leader in employment equity. Canada has seen several female Ministers of Justice and, since 1974, women have made significant contributions as Royal Canadian Mounted Police officers. However, female participation in state-level policing is below the average of the case study nations.

2.2 Lessons Learned

Compared to the case study countries, Canada could improve its gender parity standing via the following policy reforms:

- Canada has equal pay and maternity leave mandates and should consider enforcing a nondiscrimination gender law as well.
• Canada should seek to understand its success in judicial leadership and emulate these efforts in other pillars.
3 United Kingdom

Thanks to British Prime Ministers Margaret Thatcher and Theresa May, the United Kingdom is perceived as an exemplar for women’s empowerment. Data, however, reveals a disappointing truth: that Britain falls behind similarly developed countries in some fields of female elected and appointed political and policy leadership. The UK may have elevated women to top levels of politics and public administration, but the Commonwealth nation still lags behind comparable states in terms of female representation in its national cabinet, in its national bureaucracy, on its Supreme Court and within its armed forces.

The status quo of women’s leadership in the UK is as follows:

- The UK has elected two female heads of government, as of 2017;
- The British cabinet was comprised of 22.7% women in 2015;
- Women made up 30% of the UK’s legislature in 2016;
- 22% of civil service leadership positions were filled by women in 2015;
- Only one woman has been a Supreme Court judge, up to and including 2017;
- No woman has acted as Secretary of State for Defense during the same timeframe; and
- 10.1% of active duty military personnel were women in 2015.

The below analysis contextualizes these facts and figures according to five pillars: the executive, the legislature, the civil service, the judiciary and security.

3.1 Analysis by Political and Policy Structure

Executive

The UK is a leader within the executive pillar, both in terms of the number of women elected as head of government but also for the length of time in which they served. When compared to the US, Canada, Germany and Sweden, British female heads of government enjoyed the longest time in office as a percentage of the past 50 years (23%). Margaret Thatcher — who was prime minister for 11.5 years between May 4, 1979 and November 28, 1990 — drove this statistic.
Length of time in office is an important consideration because intuitively the longer a leader’s tenure, the more potential they have to make an impact while in public service. Arguably, female monarchs who had lengthy reigns paved the way for Thatcher’s success at Number 10 Downing Street.

It is interesting to contrast Theresa May’s ascension to prime minister on July 13, 2016 to that of Thatcher. First, May rose to the role via internal party politics like Canada’s first woman prime minister Kim Campbell. Like Campbell, May and Thatcher were also members of a conservative party. This supports academic arguments that female leaders are more likely to be elected to positions of power when they do not have to face the suspected biases of the general electorate as they do in presidential systems. Yet this conflicts with research that finds progressive women succeed more frequently in politics and policy. In the British context, this could perhaps be attributed to the fact that conservative women are perceived as more serious and financially savvy and, therefore, more palatable to voters.

The UK, nonetheless, lost its footing when it came to cabinet representation in the decade between 2005 and 2015. Female cabinet participation was 28.6% in 2005 and 22.7% in 2015 — a 5.9-percentage point decrease. These numbers denote Britain as the laggard among the case study countries in which about 32.3% of cabinet officials were women in 2005 in relation to 33% in 2015. The OECD average was 21.6% in 2005 and 29.2% in 2015. However, these numbers do not coincide with an increase in legislative representation during the same period. This is notable because in a parliamentary system, cabinet officials are drawn from the legislature through a general recruitment scheme. Difficulties with executing a work-life balance, as well as sexism, may contribute to the low participation rate.

**Margaret Thatcher**
Thatcher, a research chemist and barrister before she became a politician, was elected to a safe conservative seat in the UK’s House of Commons in 1959 after several attempts to win federal office. Thatcher was promoted to the Conservative Party’s “frontbench”, a colloquialism for party leaders, as Undersecretary of Pensions and National Insurance, a role she held until the “Tories” lost the 1964 election. When the Tories clinched power in 1970, she was appointed Secretary of Education and Science and served until the Tories’ defeat in 1974. Thatcher became Leader of the Opposition in 1975 and, against the backdrop of a weakening British economy, was elected prime minister in 1979 at the age of 54. Dubbed the “Iron Lady” by the Russian press, her economic policies — known as “Thatcherism” — were deeply unpopular, but she enjoyed high approval ratings for her leadership during the Falklands War in 1982. Flagging poll numbers in 1990 triggered an internal leadership challenge and John Major unceremoniously replaced her, though she remained a Member of Parliament (MP) until 1992. She and husband Denis Thatcher had two children together.

**Theresa May**
The UK’s second female prime minister is also a conservative politician. May, a former financial and international affairs adviser, worked in local politics from 1986 to 1994. After unsuccessful efforts to join the House of Commons, she was elected as a MP in 1997. May became a
frontbench lawmaker as part of the Opposition in 1998 and a member of the Shadow Cabinet in 1999, first as Shadow Education and Employment Secretary, then Shadow Transport Secretary, Shadow Family Secretary, Shadow Culture, Media and Sport Secretary, Shadow Work and Pensions Secretary, and Shadow Leader of the House of Commons. After the Tories gained power in 2010, Prime Minister David Cameron appointed May as Home Secretary, one of the UK’s “Great Offices of State”. As Home Secretary, she pursued police, crime, justice and immigration reforms. May became prime minister at the age of 60 after Cameron announced his resignation following the European Union referendum. Her primary focus has been on withdrawing the UK from the EU. She and husband Philip May have no children.

Legislature

The UK has a bicameral legislature, which is separated into the House of Commons and the House of Lords. Compared to the other case study countries, Britain experienced the largest increase in women's parliamentary representation, rising by 10 percentage points to 30% in 2016. This was more than the case study average increase of 4.2 percentage points and above the OECD mean of 3.77 percentage points. In terms of female leadership, women chaired 21% of lower house committees in 2016, while 28% of upper house committees had female leaders. Moreover, women headed 57% of joint committees. British parties may employ a voluntary party quota for national elections, but thus far only the Labour Party does so. In regard to gender-based policies, Britain mandates both equal pay and nondiscrimination but has a below-average maternity leave allowance of 39 days, in contrast to the OECD mean of 54 days. However, MPs have no right to maternity leave.

Civil Service

Women are well represented in the UK’s civil service, but tend to populate positions lower in the bureaucracy’s hierarchy. The representation of women in British public employment was relatively high at 65.9% in 2015, in contrast to the OECD average of 54.5%. Nevertheless, women only accounted for 22% of senior civil servants, suggesting a possible promotion ceiling within the institution referred to as Whitehall. The British Government implemented its Talent Action Plan in 2016, through which single-gender panels in recruitment are now only convened when necessary (British Government Home Office 2016). The government also introduced unconscious bias training for its managers. Given the contemporaneous nature of these reforms, the UK should be patient and permit the scheme time to have an effect. Additionally, career development programs should be the focus of future initiatives.

Judiciary

The UK’s marked gender imbalance in its judicial system, especially on its highest court, has been widely publicized. Only one female judge has sat on Britain’s Supreme Court, despite 62.8% of newly qualified lawyers in 2015 being female (The Law Society 2017). The low representation of women in the judiciary could be a residual result of British female aristocratic priorities, as the court system was intrinsically linked with the House of Lords through the Lords of Appeal in
Ordinary. Although the only female supreme court judge, Brenda Marjorie Hale, Baroness Hale of Richmond, has repeatedly advocated for greater gender equality in the judicial selection process, opponents contend that the legal profession is too demanding for women and that progress may be made as the UK’s judicial system continues to adapt to 2009 structural reforms (The Guardian 2015). These include a new independent mechanism called the Judicial Appointments Commission.

Security

Women face institutional discrimination in the British Armed Forces, while enjoying greater success within the country’s law enforcement agencies. Traditionally, women in the UK have supported war efforts in auxiliary roles. This perception persisted as recently as 2007 as evidenced by the controversy that surrounded the Iranian Revolutionary Guard seizure of Royal Navy sailor Faye Turney, with the incident leading to questions about mothers in the military. British women have served on the front lines of several conflicts, but until 2016 were banned from close combat positions. For example, only 67% of military openings were available to female candidates in 2016 and they represented just 10.1% of active duty personnel in 2015. This close combat ban may be one of the reasons the UK has had no female Secretary of Defence. Turning to law enforcement, British police forces were comprised of 28% women in 2015, which is high in comparison to the other case study countries.

3.2 Lessons Learned

Taking lessons learned from the US, Canada, Germany and Sweden, the UK should empower women in politics and policy by investing in the following reforms. Britain should consider:

- **Formal recruitment and training programs** to encourage and equip women to run for public office. Increasing the number of women in the UK’s legislature would in turn create a larger pool of female candidates for positions within the government’s cabinet, even prime minister.
- **Diversity hiring and professional development initiatives** within the British civil service, legal profession and armed forces that specifically target and are tailored to women. Research demonstrates that showcasing the jobs available to women often lead to them pursuing opportunities they would not have contemplated (Campbell and Wolbrecht 2006). This would boost the number of UK female civil servants in decision-making positions, women in the judiciary and those joining the military.
- **Longer, more generous maternity leave laws and other family-friendly policies.** From Queen Victoria to Prime Minister Thatcher, data shows that Britain has a history of supporting female leaders. Gender-based policies, nevertheless, would make it easier for more British women to be promoted to more prestigious roles rather than just a select few.
4 Germany

Germany has witnessed the rise of Angela Merkel as the country’s second woman head of government. Merkel is now one of the most powerful people in the world and her ascension exemplifies both her personal strengths and Germany’s favorable environment for female political and policy leaders.

With a history of active movements to promote women in politics and public administration, Germany has institutionalized equal rights for men and women in its Constitution and taken effective action to eradicate gender discrimination. Achieving gender parity in public office has been seen as the responsibility of political parties, and major progressive parties — such as the Green Party — have managed to fulfill promises of gender balance. More recently, gender equality in decision-making processes has been a national strategy in Germany and a series of initiatives were implemented to guarantee equal access for women to leadership positions in both the public and private sector.

The status quo of national women’s leadership in Germany is as follows:
- There have been two female heads of government in Germany, as of 2017;
- 33.3% of cabinet members in 2015 were women;
- The German legislature was made up of 37% women in 2016;
- Female employees made up approximately 51.5% of Germany’s total public administration in 2015;
- 31% of Federal Constitutional Court justices were women in 2016; and
- There has been only one female defense minister thus far and 10.9% of active duty military roles personnel were women in 2015.

The below analysis examines these facts and figures according to five pillars: the executive, the legislature, the civil service, the judiciary and security.

4.1 Analysis by Political and Policy Structure

Executive

Among the case study countries, Germany experienced the most momentum in terms of women
heads of state or government in the 50 years prior to 2005 and 2015, with the largest increase at 18 percentage points from 2% in 2005 to 20% in 2015. In relation to cabinets, there was 42.9% female representation in 2005 but only 33.3% in 2015, a 9.6-percentage point decrease; the opposite of their experience in the legislature. Among the case study nations, however, Germany was still the second best performer in this area of women’s participation and empowerment.

Germany has a parliamentary political system buttressed by a mixed proportional representation and plurality electoral scheme. Supplementing these structures, women candidates seeking public office are supported in Germany through a list system that allows them to be placed on the ballot and voted into power with their fellow party members. Candidates are also bolstered through a public finance scheme that supplies money outside of campaign seasons. Concerning cabinets, Germany used a specialist recruitment system to fill 16 seats in 2005 and 19 in 2015. Party ideology transitioned from progressive to conservative, with neither executive party controlling the legislature in either time period.

**Angela Merkel**
Born on July 17, 1954, in Hamburg, Germany, Angela Dorothea Kasner, who would be later known as Angela Merkel, is the daughter of a Lutheran pastor and grew up in a rural area of then East Germany. She majored in physics at the University of Leipzig, earning a doctorate in 1978, and worked as a chemist at the Central Institute for Physical Chemistry, Academy of Sciences for 12 years. After the end of the Cold War, Merkel joined the Christian Democratic Union (CDU) party and was soon appointed as minister for women and youth. Following the defeat of Helmut Kohl in the 1998 general election, she rose to the position of secretary-general of the CDU and was subsequently chosen as party leader in 2000. In the 2005 election, she narrowly defeated Chancellor Gerhard Schröder and became Germany’s first female chancellor. She has been in the position for almost 14 years to date.

* Germany’s first female head of state was doctor and politician Sabine Bergmann-Pohl. Also a member of the CDU, Bergmann-Pohl was president of the People's Chamber of East Germany from April to October 1990. In this capacity, she served as the acting head of state of East Germany until the reunification of Germany that October.

**Legislative**
Germany has a bicameral legislature made up of the Bundestag and Bundesrat. The Bundestag and Bundesrat were comprised of 37% women in 2016, which marked a 5-percentage point increase since 2006. This change was slightly higher than the case study country average of 4.2 percentage points and the OECD mean increase of 3.77 percentage points. Both houses of parliament had a relatively high proportion of female committee leadership, with 43.48% of Bundestag committees and 31.25% of Bundesrat committees chaired by women. Germany utilizes a voluntary party quota, but does not employ a national candidate list quota. Germany also lacks equal pay or nondiscrimination laws, but does have a maternity leave scheme of 58 days that is four days more generous than the OECD average. In a study of all OECD nations, these gender-based policies appeared to be correlated to higher legislative representation.
Civil Service

Female employees made up approximately 51.5% of Germany’s total public administration in 2015, which was slightly below the OECD average of 54.5%. Nonetheless, women’s leadership in Germany’s civil service field was far behind the OECD mean of 31.5% at 23%. This may be related to a promotion ceiling, as well as the aforementioned fact that Germany does not have a legal mandate or policy regarding employment discrimination or equal pay within its central bureaucracy.

Judiciary

The percentage of female judges on Germany’s Federal Constitutional Court, the highest national court in Germany, has steadily increased over the years, from 18% in 2006 to 31% in 2016. In part, this could be due to growing momentum to encourage women’s political and policy participation in decision-making processes, institutionalized by a quota system introduced by major parties that requires almost equal gender representation.

Security

Germany was a laggard in terms of women’s leadership in both military and police forces. As of 2017, there has only been one female defense minister and just 10.9% of active duty military personnel were women in 2015. At the same time, Germany’s Armed Forces has not opened all of the positions within its ranks to female candidates, with women not allowed to join German combat units until 2001. The law was changed after a female electronics technician, Tanja Kreil, brought a case to the European Court of Justice following the 1996 rejection of her application to join the German Armed Forces’ Maintenance-Recovery Service (Electronics) technical unit. The court found that preventing women from taking up combat roles disregarded sexual equality principles. The majority of the first female service members who signed up after the reform joined the army or air force. Other security forces like state-level police forces exhibited only 19% women’s participation in 2012.

4.2 Lessons Learned

Germany has demonstrated impressive progress in promoting equal access and participation for men and women in the political and policy process. Germany’s record in achieving gender balance in almost all five pillars sets an example for the other four case study countries, providing valuable lessons for policymakers hoping to advance women’s representation in politics and public administration:

- There are few methods more effective than institutionalizing the guarantee of equal access for women in political and policy decision-making. Governments should actively seek to legislate for more even gender representation, such as establishing a quota system.
● Other empowerment initiatives, including **training programs for women in public service and a supportive social welfare system**, help women balance work and family and are important in supplementing institutional policies.
Sweden

Sweden ranks highly when it comes to quality of life indicators, including health, education, welfare, human development and equality. Unsurprisingly, Sweden is seen as a champion of women’s political and policy leadership, despite the fact that it has never had a female head of state. Data analysis supports this notion: key factors suggest that Sweden is a paragon across executive, legislative, civil service, judicial and security structures that shape politics and public administration.

The status quo of national women’s leadership in Sweden is as follows:
- Sweden’s cabinet was comprised of 52.4% women in 2005 and 52.2% in 2015 — about 19 percentage points ahead of second-placed Germany;
- Women made up 44% of the legislature in 2016, the highest of the case study countries and 15% higher than the OECD average for the same year;
- Women accounted for 71.8% of civil servants and 42% of management staff in 2015, compared to the OECD average of 54.5% and 31.5% respectively;
- Sweden had the highest representation of women on its supreme court among the case study nations in 2016 at 31.25%; and
- Sweden exhibited relatively high female participation in its military and police forces in 2015 at 16%.

The below analysis explores these facts and figures according to the five structures or “pillars”.

5.1 Analysis by Political and Policy Structure

Executive

Sweden has never had a woman head of government, despite changing its Act of Succession in 1980 to have a female head of state, in this case allowing Crown Princess Victoria to become heir apparent and ascend to the throne (Nordstjernan 2017). In regard to cabinets, Sweden’s body was comprised of 52.4% women in 2005 and 52.2% in 2015, a slight decrease of 0.2 percentage points. Despite the decrease, Sweden was the clear leader among the case study countries — about 19 percentage points ahead of second-placed Germany. The decrease fell in line with the possible correlation between cabinets and legislatures identified by academic
literature, with Sweden losing ground in terms of female parliamentary representation during the same decade. Sweden’s advances towards gender parity in most spheres contradicts with the fact that it was the second last case study nation in which women earned the right to vote, this time in 1919.

Sweden has a parliamentary system that depends on proportional representation, candidate lists and regular public financing outside of campaign seasons. With respect to cabinets, 23 seats in 2005 and 26 seats in 2015 were filled via a specialist recruitment mechanism. According to previous research, these explanatory factors primed the political, economic and social landscape for women to succeed in politics and policy. This, however, can be contrasted with the fact that between 2005 and 2015 the ideology of the executive switched from progressive to conservative. What does coincide with the literature, and thus with expectations, is how the political party in power controlled the executive and the legislature in 2005, but did not in 2015.

Legislature

Sweden has a unicameral legislative body, the Riksdag. The Riksdag was 44% female in 2016, the highest of the case study countries and 15.23 percentage points higher than the OECD average at the same time. Sweden remained a frontrunner in terms of women’s parliamentary representation, even though female participation in the Riksdag had actually decreased by 3% since 2006. Sweden uses a voluntary party quota in national elections, but does not require a quota for national candidate lists. Concerning gender-based policies, Sweden does not stipulate equal pay but mandates nondiscrimination. Nevertheless, the nation is a leader in terms of maternity leave, with a 60-day scheme compared to the case study state average of 41.8 and OECD mean of 54 days. These positive gender-based policy factors are in line with an analysis of OECD gender-based initiatives, which appear to be related to higher female legislative representation.

Civil Service

Sweden emerged as a leader in female civil service leadership among the case study countries. Women accounted for 71.8% of civil servants and 42% of management staff in 2015, compared to the OECD average of 54.5% and 31.5% respectively. In 2009, Sweden launched a career development program for women called Staten Leder Jämt (“The State Leads Equally”), with a focus on raising gender awareness among managers. The overall aim of the three-year program was to increase the percentage of women in management and expert roles in Sweden’s central administration (20 government agencies participated in the training), as well as to help reduce the leadership and payment gap between women and men.

Judiciary

As a long-time frontrunner in gender equality and female political rights, Sweden had the highest representation of women on its supreme court among the case study countries in 2016.
at 31.25%. Given that the government appoints supreme court judges in Sweden, the high percentage of women supreme court justices was likely a by-product of high female representation in the legislature. This was combined with other favorable factors including a women-friendly welfare system, high rates of female mobilization in politics, as well as a high level of responsiveness of political parties to women’s demands.

**Security**

Sweden is also a leader in women’s empowerment in the military and police forces, with the highest percentage of female representation among the case study countries in 2015 at 16%. All jobs in Sweden’s military are open to women candidates and there have been four female defense ministers, as of 2017 — the highest number of female heads in contrast to the other case study nations. Not surprisingly, Sweden was also a leader among comparative police forces, with 29% women’s participation in state-level police forces in 2012. These figures may have increased in recent years.

### 5.2 Lessons Learned

Sweden has come a long way in terms of women’s political and policy leadership, and demonstrates how gender equality requires a combined effort in the executive, legislative, civil service, judicial and security fields to create an equitable working environment. Several lessons that could enlighten policymakers in other countries include:

- **Motivation and gender awareness initiatives in the public sector.** Nations with poor female representation in decision-making positions should consider following Sweden’s practice of increasing motivation and gender awareness to encourage women to pursue leadership roles.
- **Positive gender-based policies** can promote higher female legislative and judicial representation. Party quotas, longer maternity leave and nondiscrimination laws are all potential drivers for Sweden’s strong female empowerment.
- **Sweden should consider an equal pay mandate for its public sector.** Despite Sweden’s remarkable parity achievements, its leaders could learn from other states. For example, policymakers in Sweden should consider implementing an equal pay mandate.