"Gender Mainstreaming in Governance: Evaluating Public Policy Effectiveness in Promoting Women's Empowerment "

Fidelis A. E. Paki (PhD) [1], Charles Pere Okoro (MSc)[2]
Department of Political Science,
Niger Delta University, P.M.B. 071,
Wilberforce Island 560001, Nigeria
Email: paki_fae@yahoo.com;
GSM: +2348034281438
Email: perecharles87@gmail.com;
perecharles@ndu.edu.ng; GSM: +2348060554252
https://doi.org/10.56201/jpslr.vol.12.no10.2026.pg1.21

Abstract
Gender mainstreaming has emerged as a central strategy in global governance for advancing women's empowerment and promoting gender equality in public policymaking. Despite widespread adoption across national and international institutions, the effectiveness of gender mainstreaming policies remains uneven across governance contexts. This article examines how institutional structures and governance processes shape the implementation and outcomes of gender-sensitive public policies. Drawing on insights from feminist institutionalism and feminist political economy, the study evaluates the relationship between governance institutions and gender equality outcomes. Methodologically, the article adopts a qualitative interpretive approach based on the synthesis of scholarly literature and policy reports from international organizations, including UN Women, the Inter-Parliamentary Union, and the World Economic Forum. The analysis demonstrates that while many governments have adopted formal gender mainstreaming frameworks, their effectiveness is frequently constrained by weak institutional capacity, limited accountability mechanisms, and persistent socio-economic inequalities. Institutional design, political representation, fiscal governance, and civil society engagement emerge as critical factors shaping gender-responsive policymaking. The findings suggest that successful gender mainstreaming requires more than formal policy commitments; it depends on the integration of gender considerations into institutional decision-making processes and governance structures. The article contributes to debates on gender and governance by highlighting the institutional conditions necessary for translating gender equality commitments into substantive policy outcomes.

Keywords: *Gender Mainstreaming, Governance Institutions, Women's Empowerment, Gender Equality Policy, Feminist Institutionalism, Gender-Responsive Governance, Public Policy Implementation.*

1. Introduction

Gender equality has emerged as a central normative and policy objective within contemporary governance systems. International organizations, national governments, and civil society actors increasingly recognize that inclusive governance institutions are essential for achieving sustainable development, democratic legitimacy, and social justice. Within this policy landscape, gender mainstreaming has become one of the most widely adopted strategies for integrating gender considerations into public policymaking (True, 2010; Walby, 2011). First institutionalized through global frameworks such as the Beijing Platform for

Action, gender mainstreaming seeks to ensure that policy design, implementation, and evaluation systematically address the differentiated impacts of governance decisions on women and men (UN Women, 2020). The underlying premise is that equality cannot be achieved through isolated programs alone but must be embedded across the full spectrum of governance processes (Moser & Moser, 2005; True, 2010).

Despite the widespread adoption of gender mainstreaming frameworks, significant disparities remain in the extent to which governance institutions effectively promote women's empowerment. While many states have introduced gender equality legislation, representation quotas, and policy coordination mechanisms, implementation outcomes vary considerably across political and administrative contexts (Htun & Weldon, 2012; Krook & Norris, 2014). In some cases, institutional reforms have contributed to measurable improvements in women's political participation, access to public services, and socio-economic opportunities (Hughes, 2019). In others, gender policies remain largely symbolic, constrained by weak enforcement mechanisms, insufficient institutional capacity, and entrenched socio-cultural norms that limit women's substantive participation in decision-making processes (Goetz, 2010; Childs & Krook, 2018). These disparities highlight a persistent gap between formal policy commitments and actual governance outcomes, raising important questions about the structural conditions under which gender-responsive governance can succeed.

Scholars of governance and public policy increasingly emphasize that gender inequality is embedded not only in social practices but also in the institutional architecture of states. Governance institutions shape the distribution of authority, resources, and policy priorities, thereby influencing whose interests are represented in public decision-making processes (Acker, 1992; Waylen, 2014). Formal rules, bureaucratic routines, and fiscal policy frameworks can either facilitate or constrain gender-responsive reforms within governance systems (Bierschenk & Olivier de Sardan, 2014). Consequently, evaluating the effectiveness of gender mainstreaming requires careful examination of the institutional environments within which policies are formulated and implemented. This perspective shifts analytical attention from policy declarations alone to the broader governance systems that structure political participation, policy agendas, and resource allocation (Mackay, Kenny, & Chappell, 2010). This article examines the relationship between gender mainstreaming and governance effectiveness by analysing how institutional arrangements influence the implementation and outcomes of gender-sensitive public policies. Drawing on insights from feminist governance scholarship, the study explores how institutional design, political representation, accountability mechanisms, and fiscal governance shape the capacity of states to promote women's empowerment (Celis et al., 2014; Goetz & Jenkins, 2005). By synthesizing interdisciplinary research from political science, public administration, and gender studies, the article seeks to clarify the mechanisms through which governance institutions reproduce or challenge gender inequalities within policy processes.

The analysis is guided by theoretical insights from feminist institutionalism and feminist political economy, which together provide a framework for understanding how formal rules, informal norms, and economic governance structures influence gendered power relations within the state. Feminist institutionalism highlights how institutional rules and organizational cultures can reinforce historically gendered hierarchies of authority, even when formal equality provisions exist (Mackay et al., 2010; Waylen, 2014). Feminist political economy, in turn, emphasizes the distributive dimensions of governance by examining how fiscal policies, labour markets, and public spending priorities shape women's socio-economic opportunities (Elson, 2017; Rai & Waylen, 2014). Integrating these perspectives allows the study to examine gender mainstreaming not merely as an administrative technique but as a broader transformation of governance systems.

The objective of this study is therefore to evaluate the effectiveness of gender mainstreaming within governance institutions and identify the structural factors that facilitate or constrain gender-responsive policymaking. In doing so, the article contributes to ongoing debates about the role of governance institutions in advancing gender equality by bridging theoretical insights from feminist scholarship with empirical discussions of policy implementation. Rather than focusing exclusively on representation metrics or policy rhetoric, the study emphasizes the institutional and political conditions necessary for translating gender equality commitments into substantive governance outcomes.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Gendered Institutions and Governance Structures

A substantial body of scholarship demonstrates that governance institutions are not neutral arenas of technocratic problem-solving but historically constituted structures embedded in gendered power relations. Early feminist critiques challenged conventional public administration and political science assumptions that institutions operate through objective, rational-legal principles detached from social hierarchies. Acker (1992) introduced the influential concept of "gendered institutions," arguing that organizational logics, recruitment patterns, leadership norms, and informal practices systematically privilege masculine-coded behaviors and authority structures. Subsequent research in feminist institutionalism expanded this insight by demonstrating that both formal rules and informal norms reinforce gender hierarchies in legislatures, bureaucracies, and executive institutions (Waylen, 2014; Lowndes, 2020). Informal practices such as patronage networks, seniority systems, and adversarial political cultures often undermine formal equality provisions, thereby limiting women's substantive access to decision-making power even where constitutional guarantees exist.

Comparative governance studies further reveal that regime type and institutional design significantly shape gender policy trajectories. Democracies are frequently associated with higher levels of women's political representation and more progressive equality legislation, yet cross-national evidence suggests that electoral competition alone does not ensure redistributive reform (Paxton, Hughes, & Barnes, 2020). Htun and Weldon (2018) demonstrate that durable gender policy change is most likely where strong, autonomous women's movements intersect with responsive state institutions and programmatic party systems. In contexts characterized by clientelism, executive dominance, or weak institutionalization, gender reforms may be selectively implemented or symbolically adopted to enhance international legitimacy without altering domestic power structures. These findings underscore the need to examine governance capacity, party dynamics, and institutional enforcement mechanisms rather than relying solely on formal democratic indicators. State capacity also plays a decisive role in determining whether gender-responsive commitments translate into policy outcomes. Grindle (2012) emphasizes that institutional effectiveness depends on bureaucratic coherence, resource allocation, and administrative professionalism. Ministries responsible for gender affairs often operate with limited fiscal authority and marginal cabinet influence, reducing their ability to shape cross-sectoral policy priorities. Moreover, technocratic policy domains such as finance, infrastructure, and security tend to be insulated from gender analysis, reinforcing sectoral fragmentation and diminishing policy coherence (Rai, 2011). Consequently, governance structures shape not only who participates in decision-making but also which policy domains are prioritized and how distributive choices are framed. The literature thus establishes institutional design as a central determinant of gender-equitable governance outcomes.

2.2 Gender Mainstreaming and Implementation Challenges

Gender mainstreaming emerged as a global governance strategy following the 1995 Beijing Platform for Action, with the objective of integrating gender perspectives across all stages of public policy processes (Walby, 2005). Rather than confining gender issues to specialized agencies, mainstreaming seeks to embed gender analysis into agenda-setting, legislative drafting, budgeting, implementation, and evaluation (True & Mintrom, 2001). Proponents argue that this integrative approach enhances accountability and prevents the marginalization of women's issues within siloed bureaucratic structures. By institutionalizing gender impact assessments and performance indicators, mainstreaming aspires to normalize equality considerations within routine governance procedures. Despite its normative appeal, empirical scholarship reveals persistent implementation gaps. Lombardo and Meier (2006) argue that mainstreaming often becomes depoliticized within administrative settings, transformed into procedural exercises devoid of redistributive intent. Mukhopadhyay (2004) describes how feminist reform agendas may be diluted within bureaucratic routines, where compliance with reporting requirements substitutes for structural reform. True (2003) similarly observes that without political leadership and enforceable accountability mechanisms, mainstreaming risks becoming symbolic rather than transformative. These critiques highlight the tension between rhetorical commitments and operational effectiveness, raising questions about whether mainstreaming constitutes genuine institutional change or managerial adaptation.

Fiscal governance illustrates the challenges of mainstreaming in practice. Gender-responsive budgeting (GRB) initiatives aim to align fiscal policy with equality objectives by incorporating gender-disaggregated data into revenue and expenditure frameworks (Sharp & Sweetman, 2012). However, Stotsky (2016) finds that many GRB initiatives remain peripheral to core macroeconomic planning processes. Without integration into central finance ministries and binding expenditure ceilings, gender considerations are frequently subordinated to broader fiscal consolidation priorities. The literature therefore suggests that mainstreaming effectiveness depends not only on procedural adoption but also on fiscal alignment, administrative capacity, and sustained political commitment.

2.3 Political Representation and Substantive Policy Influence

The relationship between women's political representation and substantive policy outcomes remains a central debate in governance scholarship. Descriptive representation theory posits that increasing the number of women in legislative and executive positions enhances the likelihood that gender-sensitive issues will enter policy agendas. Empirical evidence supports this correlation: Wängnerud (2009) demonstrates that legislatures with higher proportions of women are more likely to prioritize social welfare spending, childcare provision, and anti-violence legislation. Similarly, Swers (2013) shows that female legislators often sponsor and advocate for equality-focused reforms, particularly in areas of health, family policy, and labour protections. These findings reinforce the argument that representation matters for agenda-setting and issue prioritization. However, scholars caution against deterministic assumptions linking numerical presence to structural transformation. Childs and Krook (2009) introduce the concept of "critical actors," emphasizing that institutional context, party discipline, and leadership hierarchies shape whether women can exercise meaningful policy influence. In party-centered political systems, legislative autonomy may be constrained, limiting the capacity of female representatives to alter fiscal priorities or committee assignments. Furthermore, Krook and O'Brien (2012) note that executive appointments often reflect strategic calculations by party leaders rather than gender equity commitments, thereby affecting cabinet-level influence. Representation is therefore mediated by institutional power configurations and partisan dynamics.

Intersectional considerations further complicate the representation policy nexus. Celis and Erzeel (2015) demonstrate that women from elite socio-economic backgrounds may not necessarily advance redistributive policies benefiting marginalized groups. Socio-economic status, ethnicity, and geographic origin influence policy priorities and coalition-building strategies within legislatures. As a result, substantive representation depends not only on gender identity but also on broader social positioning and institutional opportunity structures. The literature thus underscores that while political inclusion is a necessary precondition for reform, it must be accompanied by institutional empowerment and agenda-setting authority to generate transformative governance outcomes.

2.4 Gendered Political Economy and Resource Allocation

Feminist political economy scholarship situates gender inequality within macroeconomic governance structures. Bakker (2007) argues that fiscal regimes and labor market institutions are structured around androcentric assumptions that prioritize market production while marginalizing social reproduction. Rai (2011) extends this critique by demonstrating how global economic governance frameworks often neglect unpaid care labor, thereby obscuring its contribution to economic sustainability. This epistemic bias shapes budgetary allocations and macroeconomic planning, reinforcing gendered divisions of labour.

Empirical evidence confirms that fiscal policy choices have distinctly gendered consequences. Austerity measures and reductions in public social expenditure disproportionately increase unpaid care burdens borne by women (Elson, 2017; Razavi, 2016). Seguino (2010) shows that gender wage gaps and occupational segregation constrain aggregate economic growth, while investment in social infrastructure particularly healthcare, childcare, and education enhance female labour force participation and poverty reduction. These findings demonstrate that economic governance is a central arena in which gender disparities are reproduced or mitigated. Moreover, national accounting systems typically exclude unpaid care work from GDP calculations, limiting its visibility within macroeconomic debates (Folbre, 2006). This exclusion distorts policy evaluation metrics and perpetuates underinvestment in social infrastructure. Integrating care-sensitive indicators and gender-disaggregated fiscal data into governance frameworks could recalibrate distributive priorities. The literature thus establishes fiscal governance and macroeconomic policy as foundational determinants of women's socio-economic empowerment.

3. Theoretical Framework

3.1 Feminist Institutionalism

Feminist Institutionalism (FI) extends historical and sociological institutionalism by interrogating how political and administrative institutions are constituted through gendered power relations. While mainstream institutional theories emphasize path dependency, rule-bound behavior, and organizational routines, FI foregrounds the insight that institutions are not neutral architectures of governance but socially constructed systems embedded in historically masculine norms (Mackay, Kenny, & Chappell, 2010). Institutions shape political outcomes not only through formal rules constitutions, electoral systems, budgetary procedures but also through informal conventions such as patronage networks, norms of leadership, expectations of political comportment, and hierarchies of expertise. These informal rules frequently privilege masculine-coded attributes such as adversarial debate, uninterrupted career trajectories, and technocratic authority, while marginalizing relational leadership styles and care-centered policy agendas (Waylen, 2014). Thus, governance effectiveness in promoting gender equality cannot be evaluated solely by examining formal statutes; it requires analysis of how institutional logics structure access to power, define legitimate knowledge, and constrain reform trajectories.

A central contribution of Feminist Institutionalism lies in its attention to the interaction between formal and informal institutions. Formal equality provisions gender quotas, anti-discrimination laws, constitutional guarantees may coexist with informal practices that dilute their transformative potential. Lowndes (2020) argues that informal norms can "layer" or "convert" formal reforms in ways that preserve existing power hierarchies. For example, gender quotas may increase descriptive representation, yet party leadership structures, committee assignments, and executive dominance can restrict substantive policy influence. FI therefore conceptualizes institutional change as a contested and incremental process shaped by resistance, adaptation, and strategic negotiation. This perspective broadens analysis beyond representation metrics to examine institutional veto points, agenda-setting rules, and bureaucratic incentive systems. In the context of gender mainstreaming, FI enables scrutiny of whether equality mechanisms are embedded within core decision-making arenas such as finance ministries and cabinet committees or relegated to peripheral advisory units with limited authority. Moreover, Feminist Institutionalism provides a dynamic understanding of institutional transformation by emphasizing the role of actors, ideas, and critical junctures. Institutions are durable but not immutable; they can be reshaped through coalition-building, normative reframing, and strategic mobilization during moments of political opportunity. Htun and Weldon (2018) demonstrate that women's movements, when aligned with receptive state actors, can leverage institutional openings to enact durable policy change. FI therefore integrates agency into structural analysis, recognizing that empowerment outcomes depend on both institutional design and political contestation. Applied to this study, the framework facilitates evaluation of governance systems along three dimensions: (1) the gendered configuration of formal and informal rules; (2) the alignment between equality mandates and institutional enforcement capacity; and (3) the degree to which institutional arrangements enable sustained redistributive reform. Through this multidimensional lens, Feminist Institutionalism offers a comprehensive tool for assessing whether governance reforms constitute incremental accommodation or genuine structural transformation.

3.2 Feminist Political Economy

Feminist Political Economy (FPE) broadens conventional political economy by situating gender relations at the center of macroeconomic governance analysis. Traditional political economy frameworks often prioritize markets, production, and state capital relations while treating households and care work as peripheral domains. FPE challenges this dichotomy by conceptualizing the economy as encompassing both productive and reproductive spheres, emphasizing that unpaid care labor and social reproduction are foundational to economic sustainability (Bakker, 2007; Rai, 2011). By revealing how macroeconomic models implicitly assume gendered divisions of labor, FPE exposes the androcentric bias embedded in fiscal policy, taxation systems, and labor market regulation. This theoretical orientation expands the analytical terrain of governance evaluation, demonstrating that women's empowerment cannot be assessed solely through political inclusion; it must also be examined through distributive outcomes and material resource allocation.

A core insight of Feminist Political Economy is that fiscal regimes are inherently gendered in both design and consequence. Public expenditure priorities, revenue generation mechanisms, and austerity policy's structure access to social infrastructure such as healthcare, education, childcare, and social protection. Elson (2017) argues that austerity measures frequently externalize the costs of fiscal consolidation onto households, disproportionately increasing women's unpaid care burdens. Similarly, Seguino (2010) demonstrates that gender wage gaps and occupational segregation constrain aggregate economic growth by limiting productivity and human capital development. FPE thus reframes gender equality not as a social welfare issue but as integral to macroeconomic performance and distributive justice. In governance

analysis, this perspective necessitates scrutiny of budgetary allocations, tax incidence, labor protections, and investment in care infrastructure as central indicators of empowerment outcomes. Beyond fiscal policy, FPE interrogates the epistemic foundations of economic governance. National accounting systems typically exclude unpaid care work from GDP calculations, rendering essential reproductive labor statistically invisible (Folbre, 2006). This measurement bias shapes policy priorities, privileging infrastructure and capital-intensive projects over social investment. Furthermore, global economic governance institutions often promote market liberalization and fiscal discipline without incorporating gender-disaggregated impact assessments (Razavi, 2016). By integrating gender analysis into macroeconomic modeling and budgetary evaluation, FPE advocates for a reconfiguration of economic governance paradigms. Applied to this study, Feminist Political Economy provides a framework for evaluating whether public policy aligns fiscal resources with equality objectives, whether taxation and labor policies reduce structural disparities, and whether governance systems recognize care work as a critical component of economic development. Through this expansive lens, empowerment is understood not merely as political voice but as material capacity shaped by distributive structures embedded within economic governance.

4. Methodology

This study adopts a qualitative research design based on comparative secondary data analysis rather than primary case studies. The analysis draws on cross-national governance indicators and policy reports from international organizations, including the Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU), UN Women, and the World Economic Forum. These datasets provide comparable measures of women's political representation, cabinet participation, gender-responsive budgeting, and institutional gender equality frameworks across regions. The comparative approach allows the study to identify patterns and structural relationships between governance institutions and gender policy outcomes without limiting the analysis to a small number of country cases. Data for the study are derived primarily from secondary sources, including peer-reviewed journal articles, policy documents, government reports, budget statements, and publications from international organizations such as UN Women, the World Bank, and the OECD. Documentary analysis is particularly suitable for examining policy frameworks, legislative texts, and institutional guidelines, as it enables systematic interrogation of formal commitments and implementation strategies (Bowen, 2009). To ensure credibility and scholarly rigor, sources were selected based on relevance, recency, and citation impact within the fields of governance studies, feminist political theory, and public administration. Triangulation of multiple data sources strengthens the reliability of findings by cross-verifying claims across academic and policy literature (Denzin, 2012). Emphasis was placed on contemporary scholarship to reflect evolving debates around gender mainstreaming, intersectionality, and governance reform.

The analytical strategy is informed by feminist institutionalism and intersectionality theory, which guide the coding and thematic interpretation of data. A structured thematic analysis was conducted to identify recurring patterns related to institutional norms, representation, budgeting practices, and policy outcomes (Braun & Clarke, 2006). This process involved categorizing findings under key analytical dimensions: institutional design, political will, accountability mechanisms, fiscal policy structures, and socio-cultural constraints. Intersectional analysis was incorporated to assess how governance processes affect diverse groups differently across axes of class, race, ethnicity, and socio-economic status. By integrating theoretical constructs directly into the coding framework, the study ensures coherence between conceptual foundations and empirical interpretation.

To enhance validity, the research applies criteria of analytical transparency, theoretical consistency, and reflexivity. Transparency is ensured through explicit articulation of case

selection rationale and analytical categories. Theoretical consistency is maintained by systematically linking empirical observations to established frameworks within feminist governance scholarship. Reflexivity is incorporated by acknowledging the normative orientation of gender research and the potential influence of interpretive bias in policy analysis (Schwartz-Shea & Yanow, 2012). While the study does not rely on primary fieldwork data, its strength lies in synthesizing interdisciplinary scholarship to generate a comprehensive understanding of how gendered power structures shape governance outcomes. This methodological approach provides a robust foundation for evaluating the effectiveness and limitations of gender-responsive public policy reforms across diverse political contexts.

5. Results and Discussion

5.1 Institutional Design and Gendered Power Structures

The findings indicate that institutional design plays a critical role in shaping whether governance systems facilitate or constrain gender-equitable public policy outcomes. Across multiple governance contexts, formal constitutional guarantees of gender equality frequently coexist with informal institutional norms that reproduce patriarchal authority within executive, legislative, and bureaucratic structures. Feminist institutionalist scholarship highlights that informal rules such as patronage networks, hierarchical seniority structures, and masculinized leadership norms often exert greater influence over decision-making processes than formal equality provisions (Lowndes, 2020). As a result, institutions that appear formally gender-neutral can reproduce structural biases that limit women's substantive participation in policy formulation and governance processes. These dynamics reinforce the study's central premise that examining gender equality in governance requires moving beyond descriptive representation to assess the deeper institutional mechanisms shaping policy outcomes.

The analysis further demonstrates that bureaucratic and advisory structures frequently privilege technocratic expertise associated with traditionally male-dominated policy sectors such as finance, defense, and infrastructure. This privileging of particular forms of expertise can marginalize social policy domains including care work, reproductive health, and gender-based violence prevention that disproportionately affect women and are often perceived as peripheral within macroeconomic policy debates (Rai, 2011). In practice, this institutional hierarchy of policy priorities influences the allocation of administrative authority and public resources, thereby shaping which policy agendas receive sustained governmental attention. Evidence from several governance systems shows that ministries or agencies responsible for gender affairs often operate with limited institutional authority, insufficient budgetary resources, and weak coordination capacity across government departments (Franceschet, Krook, & Piscopo, 2012). Such institutional fragmentation constrains the ability of gender-focused institutions to influence broader policy agendas, resulting in uneven integration of gender considerations across governance sectors.

At the same time, the findings reveal that institutional reforms can reshape governance outcomes when embedded within comprehensive accountability and monitoring frameworks. Policy mechanisms such as gender quotas, parity legislation, and institutionalized oversight bodies have the potential to expand women's presence in decision-making institutions and strengthen the visibility of gender concerns within policy debates. However, their effectiveness depends heavily on the broader institutional environment in which they operate. Evidence suggests that where gender equality reforms are supported by robust monitoring systems, performance indicators, and institutionalized policy evaluation processes, gender analysis becomes more consistently integrated into policy cycles and administrative practices (Krook, 2010). In contrast, reforms introduced without adequate enforcement mechanisms or political support may produce limited substantive change despite formal compliance with gender equality norms.

In sum, the results demonstrate that institutional design functions not merely as a structural backdrop but as a central determinant of gendered public policy outcomes. Governance institutions influence who participates in policymaking, which forms of expertise are recognized as authoritative, and how policy priorities are framed within the state apparatus. Consequently, addressing gender inequality in governance requires more than formal policy commitments; it demands institutional environments capable of integrating gender perspectives into decision-making processes, administrative routines, and resource allocation systems. These findings reinforce the study's broader argument that effective gender mainstreaming depends on the interaction between formal institutional reforms and the transformation of informal power relations embedded within governance structures.

Table 1: Women's Representation in National Parliaments (Global & RegionalAverages, 2025)

Region	Percentage of Women in Lower/Unicameral Parliaments (%)
Global Total	27.2%
Americas	35.8%
Europe	31.9%
Sub-Saharan Africa	27.1%
West Africa	18.9%
Asia	22.0%
South Asia	13.1%
Australia & New Zealand	48.1%

Source: *Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) December 2025*

This table empirically demonstrates the global and regional distribution of women's political representation, underscoring persistent disparities that shape governance outcomes and policy priorities. The data directly supports analysis of how institutional settings affect gendered access to decision-making.

5.2 Gender Mainstreaming and Policy Implementation Gaps

The analysis indicates that although gender mainstreaming has become a widely adopted governance strategy, significant implementation gaps persist across many policy environments. In numerous jurisdictions, policy documents formally commit governments to integrating gender perspectives across sectors, yet the operationalization of these commitments remains inconsistent. In practice, gender mainstreaming frequently becomes a procedural exercise rather than a transformative governance mechanism. Studies show that gender impact assessments are often conducted in a routine or symbolic manner without substantially shaping policy design or implementation (True, 2003). This disconnect between policy rhetoric and administrative practice illustrates the limitations of technocratic mainstreaming approaches that are not supported by sustained political commitment and institutional incentives. Fiscal governance processes provide a particularly revealing illustration of these implementation challenges. Gender-responsive budgeting initiatives are designed to align public expenditure with gender equality objectives, yet many governments treat them as supplementary exercises rather than integral components of fiscal planning (Budlender & Hewitt, 2003). The findings reveal that in several policy contexts gender-disaggregated data remain either unavailable or insufficiently utilized in budgetary decision-making. Without reliable data systems and institutionalized monitoring frameworks, gender analysis struggles to influence the allocation of resources across policy sectors. Consequently,

mainstreaming initiatives risk reinforcing symbolic compliance rather than producing meaningful changes in program delivery and public spending priorities.

Institutional capacity within bureaucratic systems further shapes the effectiveness of gender mainstreaming efforts. Effective implementation requires civil servants who possess both technical expertise in gender analysis and the administrative authority to incorporate gender perspectives into policy processes. Where bureaucratic personnel lack such expertise, policy interventions often fail to account for differentiated impacts on men and women (Mukhopadhyay, 2004). The organizational environment of public administration also plays an important role. Research on governance institutions shows that administrative capacity is influenced not only by technical knowledge but also by institutional culture, professional incentives, and the broader norms guiding bureaucratic decision-making (Goetz, 2010). In contexts where gender equality is not embedded within institutional priorities, mainstreaming initiatives may be treated as peripheral administrative requirements rather than substantive policy commitments. Coordination across government institutions also presents significant challenges. Gender mainstreaming requires collaboration among multiple ministries and administrative levels, yet fragmented governance structures often produce uneven implementation outcomes. Decentralization reforms, while intended to improve administrative responsiveness, can sometimes exacerbate disparities in gender policy implementation when subnational governments lack the expertise, resources, or institutional guidance necessary to apply gender analysis consistently. Studies of bureaucratic governance further suggest that administrative effectiveness depends heavily on the competence, training, and professional networks of civil servants responsible for policy implementation (Bierschenk & Olivier de Sardan, 2014). Where such capacities are limited, gender mainstreaming frameworks may exist formally without significantly altering policy outcomes.

Despite these constraints, the findings also highlight cases where gender mainstreaming has generated more substantive policy impact. Jurisdictions that institutionalize gender audits, participatory budgeting mechanisms, and integrated monitoring indicators tend to demonstrate stronger alignment between equality commitments and policy implementation. In such contexts, gender analysis becomes embedded within administrative routines and policy evaluation frameworks rather than remaining a peripheral compliance requirement. These examples suggest that gender mainstreaming can contribute to meaningful governance reform when supported by adequate institutional resources, specialized administrative expertise, and clearly defined accountability mechanisms.

Overall, the results demonstrate that the effectiveness of gender mainstreaming depends not simply on the adoption of equality policies but on the institutional environments in which those policies are implemented. Governance systems that combine political commitment, bureaucratic capacity, and systematic monitoring mechanisms are more likely to translate gender equality goals into concrete policy outcomes. Conversely, where institutional support structures remain weak, mainstreaming initiatives risk remaining largely symbolic. These findings reinforce the study's broader argument that gender-responsive governance requires sustained institutional investment and administrative transformation rather than isolated policy declarations

5.3 Political Representation and Substantive Policy Outcomes

The findings reveal a significant relationship between women's political representation and the prioritization of gender-sensitive policy agendas, although the strength of this relationship is mediated by broader institutional and political contexts. Legislatures with higher proportions of female representatives tend to introduce and support legislation addressing issues such as social welfare provision, childcare policy, and legal protections against gender-based violence. Empirical research in comparative politics similarly indicates that increased

descriptive representation can influence policy agendas by bringing previously marginalized concerns into legislative debates (Wängnerud, 2009). In this study, the presence of women in legislative bodies contributed to greater visibility of gender-related policy issues, thereby reinforcing arguments within representative bureaucracy and substantive representation scholarship that demographic inclusion can shape policy priorities when institutional conditions allow meaningful participation. However, the analysis also demonstrates that numerical representation alone does not automatically translate into substantive policy influence. In several cases examined, female legislators operated within party structures that limited their capacity to shape legislative agendas independently. Party discipline, centralized leadership hierarchies, and electoral system dynamics often constrained the policy autonomy of individual legislators, reducing their ability to influence budgetary allocations or secure strategic committee assignments. These institutional constraints are widely documented in research on legislative politics, which shows that party organizations frequently determine agenda-setting authority and legislative outcomes regardless of the gender composition of parliaments (Childs & Krook, 2009). Consequently, while increased female representation enhances descriptive inclusion, its transformative policy impact depends on the degree of institutional openness and the capacity of female legislators to build coalitions within and across party lines. The findings further emphasize the importance of considering intersectional dimensions of political representation. Women from marginalized ethnic, socio-economic, or regional backgrounds often face additional barriers to political influence even when they achieve formal representation within governance institutions. In several contexts analysed in this study, female legislators from minority or rural constituencies had limited access to leadership roles, influential committees, or party leadership structures. This dynamic reduced their capacity to shape policy priorities in ways that reflect the experiences of diverse groups of women. Research on gender and political representation similarly highlights that descriptive representation may benefit certain segments of the female population more than others when institutional structures privilege elite political actors (Celis & Erzeel, 2015). As a result, policies promoted under the banner of gender equality may disproportionately address the needs of urban or professional women while overlooking the socio-economic realities of rural populations or informal-sector workers.

These patterns suggest that the policy impact of women's political participation depends on a broader configuration of institutional, organizational, and socio-political factors. Legislative influence is shaped not only by the number of women in political office but also by their access to strategic positions, their capacity to mobilize cross-party alliances, and the institutional rules governing agenda-setting and resource allocation. Where female legislators possess both numerical presence and institutional authority, gender-sensitive policy initiatives are more likely to advance within legislative processes. Conversely, where representation remains largely symbolic or constrained by rigid party hierarchies, the substantive effects on policy outcomes tend to be limited. Overall, the results indicate that enhancing gender-equitable governance requires moving beyond a narrow focus on numerical inclusion toward a more comprehensive understanding of political empowerment. Descriptive representation can open important pathways for addressing gender inequality within policymaking institutions, but its effectiveness ultimately depends on the institutional environments in which representatives operate. Strengthening women's political influence therefore involves not only increasing representation but also ensuring access to decision-making resources, leadership opportunities, and institutional mechanisms that allow diverse voices to shape policy priorities. These findings directly support the study's objective of examining how gendered identities and institutional dynamics interact to influence governance processes and policy outcomes.

Table 2: Women's Share of Cabinet Positions and Parliamentary Seats (2024)

Indicator	Global Average / Count
% of Women in Cabinet Positions Worldwide	23.3%
Countries with Gender-Parity Cabinets	15
Countries with <10% Women Cabinet Ministers	31
Women's Share of Parliamentary Seats (Global Indicator)	27.2%

Source: World Economic Forum. (2024). Global Gender Gap Report 2024.

This table complements political representation analysis by juxtaposing women's presence in both executive and legislative branches, reinforcing findings on descriptive representation and substantive policy influence.

5.4 Gendered Political Economy and Resource Allocation

The findings indicate that civil society organizations (CSOs) play a critical role in advancing gender-responsive governance by strengthening accountability and amplifying marginalized voices within policymaking processes. Across the cases examined, CSOs functioned as important intermediaries between citizens and state institutions, particularly in contexts where formal governance mechanisms failed to adequately address gender inequalities. Through advocacy campaigns, policy monitoring, and public awareness initiatives, civil society actors were able to influence legislative debates and draw attention to issues such as gender-based violence, reproductive rights, and access to social services. Empirical research on governance and participatory politics similarly suggests that civil society engagement expands the policy agenda by introducing perspectives that are often excluded from formal political institutions (Htun & Weldon, 2012). In this study, advocacy networks and grassroots organizations played a significant role in sustaining pressure on governments to adopt and implement gender-sensitive policies. However, the effectiveness of civil society engagement varies considerably depending on the broader political and institutional environment. In contexts characterized by open political systems and institutionalized consultation mechanisms, civil society actors were able to participate meaningfully in policy formulation and monitoring processes. For instance, participatory policy forums and consultative committees enabled advocacy groups to contribute policy expertise and provide feedback on proposed reforms. These institutional arrangements enhanced transparency and strengthened the responsiveness of governance institutions to gender equality concerns. Conversely, in more restrictive political contexts, civil society organizations often faced regulatory barriers, limited access to policymakers, and resource constraints that reduced their ability to influence policy outcomes. Such challenges are widely documented in governance scholarship, which highlights that the impact of civil society on public policy depends heavily on the degree of political openness and state receptiveness to non-state actors (Keck & Sikkink, 1998).

The findings also demonstrate that collaboration between civil society organizations and state institutions can generate more sustainable policy outcomes when supported by structured accountability mechanisms. Partnerships between government agencies and advocacy groups contributed to the development of monitoring frameworks, public reporting mechanisms, and policy evaluation processes aimed at tracking progress on gender equality commitments. In several cases, civil society participation in oversight committees and independent monitoring bodies helped ensure that gender policies moved beyond symbolic commitments toward practical implementation. These collaborative arrangements illustrate how non-state actors can strengthen governance capacity by providing technical expertise, facilitating community participation, and monitoring government performance.

At the same time, the research highlights important limitations in civil society engagement. Many organizations operate with limited financial resources and rely heavily on donor funding, which can affect their long-term sustainability and strategic autonomy. Additionally, fragmentation within the civil society sector sometimes weakens collective advocacy efforts, as organizations pursue overlapping agendas without coordinated strategies. Where advocacy networks lack cohesion, their influence over policy processes can become diluted, reducing the effectiveness of public pressure on government institutions.

Overall, the results demonstrate that civil society engagement constitutes an essential component of gender-responsive governance. Civil society actors expand policy debates, hold governments accountable for equality commitments, and facilitate citizen participation in governance processes. Nevertheless, the effectiveness of these contributions depends on institutional openness, resource availability, and the existence of formal mechanisms that enable sustained interaction between state institutions and societal actors. Strengthening gender-responsive governance therefore requires not only supportive public policies but also institutional environments that enable civil society organizations to participate meaningfully in policy formulation, monitoring, and evaluation processes.

Table 3. Gender Equality Indicators Selected SDG/Governance Data (2023–2025)

Indicator	Most Recent Value	Data Source
% Women in National Parliaments (Global)	27.2%	UN Women / IPU (UN Women Knowledge hub)
% Women in Local Government Leaders	35.5%	UN Women (UN Women Knowledge hub)
Number of Countries with National Action Plans on Women, Peace & Security	96%	UN Women Indicator Dashboard (Home UN Women Transparency Portal)
Gender-Disaggregated Senior Public Service Representation	30%	UN Women Global Snapshot ([UN Women Knowledge hub 3)

Source: UN Women. (2023). Gender Snapshot 2023.

This table brings together multiple gender governance indicators, including decision-making power, planning frameworks, and representation in public service. These data points empirically clarify multi-dimensional aspects of gender equality relevant to policy design and institutional performance.

5.5 Accountability, Civil Society, and Transformative Governance

The findings indicate that civil society organizations (CSOs) play a critical role in advancing gender-responsive governance by strengthening accountability and amplifying marginalized voices within policymaking processes. Across the cases examined, CSOs functioned as important intermediaries between citizens and state institutions, particularly in contexts where formal governance mechanisms failed to adequately address gender inequalities. Through advocacy campaigns, policy monitoring, and public awareness initiatives, civil society actors were able to influence legislative debates and draw attention to issues such as gender-based violence, reproductive rights, and access to social services. Empirical research on governance and participatory politics similarly suggests that civil society engagement expands the policy agenda by introducing perspectives that are often excluded from formal political institutions (Htun & Weldon, 2012). In this study, advocacy networks and grassroots organizations played a significant role in sustaining pressure on governments to adopt and implement gender-sensitive policies.

However, the effectiveness of civil society engagement varies considerably depending on the broader political and institutional environment. In contexts characterized by open political systems and institutionalized consultation mechanisms, civil society actors were able to participate meaningfully in policy formulation and monitoring processes. For instance, participatory policy forums and consultative committees enabled advocacy groups to contribute policy expertise and provide feedback on proposed reforms. These institutional arrangements enhanced transparency and strengthened the responsiveness of governance institutions to gender equality concerns. Conversely, in more restrictive political contexts, civil society organizations often faced regulatory barriers, limited access to policymakers, and resource constraints that reduced their ability to influence policy outcomes. Such challenges are widely documented in governance scholarship, which highlights that the impact of civil society on public policy depends heavily on the degree of political openness and state receptiveness to non-state actors (Keck & Sikkink, 1998).

The findings also demonstrate that collaboration between civil society organizations and state institutions can generate more sustainable policy outcomes when supported by structured accountability mechanisms. Partnerships between government agencies and advocacy groups contributed to the development of monitoring frameworks, public reporting mechanisms, and policy evaluation processes aimed at tracking progress on gender equality commitments. In several cases, civil society participation in oversight committees and independent monitoring bodies helped ensure that gender policies moved beyond symbolic commitments toward practical implementation. These collaborative arrangements illustrate how non-state actors can strengthen governance capacity by providing technical expertise, facilitating community participation, and monitoring government performance.

At the same time, the research highlights important limitations in civil society engagement. Many organizations operate with limited financial resources and rely heavily on donor funding, which can affect their long-term sustainability and strategic autonomy. Additionally, fragmentation within the civil society sector sometimes weakens collective advocacy efforts, as organizations pursue overlapping agendas without coordinated strategies. Where advocacy networks lack cohesion, their influence over policy processes can become diluted, reducing the effectiveness of public pressure on government institutions.

Overall, the results demonstrate that civil society engagement constitutes an essential component of gender-responsive governance. Civil society actors expand policy debates, hold governments accountable for equality commitments, and facilitate citizen participation in governance processes. Nevertheless, the effectiveness of these contributions depends on institutional openness, resource availability, and the existence of formal mechanisms that enable sustained interaction between state institutions and societal actors. Strengthening gender-responsive governance therefore requires not only supportive public policies but also institutional environments that enable civil society organizations to participate meaningfully in policy formulation, monitoring, and evaluation processes.

6. Concluding Remarks

This study examined how institutional structures, political representation, policy implementation mechanisms, civil society engagement, and accountability frameworks shape the effectiveness of gender-responsive governance. The findings demonstrate that meaningful progress toward gender equality in governance requires more than formal policy commitments or symbolic inclusion. Institutional environments strongly influence whether gender equality initiatives translate into substantive policy outcomes. While many governance systems formally adopt equality frameworks, informal institutional norms, bureaucratic hierarchies, and uneven distribution of administrative authority often shape policy priorities in ways that continue to marginalize gender perspectives. Consequently,

effective gender-responsive governance depends on institutional arrangements that align formal equality commitments with inclusive decision-making structures and administrative practices capable of integrating gender considerations into policymaking processes.

The study also highlights the importance of political representation in shaping gender-sensitive policy agendas. Increased representation of women in political institutions can broaden legislative priorities and elevate issues related to social welfare, gender-based violence, and access to public services. However, the findings reveal that numerical inclusion alone does not automatically translate into substantive policy influence. Institutional factors such as party structures, legislative procedures, and access to leadership positions significantly affect the ability of female policymakers to shape legislative outcomes. Strengthening gender-responsive governance therefore requires not only expanding women's representation but also ensuring that political institutions provide meaningful opportunities for participation in agenda-setting, coalition-building, and resource allocation processes.

Another important insight from the analysis concerns the role of administrative capacity and policy implementation mechanisms. Gender mainstreaming strategies, gender-responsive budgeting frameworks, and related policy tools are increasingly adopted by governments, yet their effectiveness varies considerably depending on the institutional context in which they are implemented. Where bureaucratic expertise, gender-disaggregated data systems, and monitoring mechanisms are weak, these initiatives often remain procedural rather than transformative. Conversely, governance systems that integrate gender analysis into routine administrative functions such as policy evaluation, budgeting processes, and performance management frameworks are more likely to produce measurable outcomes. These findings emphasize that strengthening public sector capacity and institutional coordination is essential for translating gender equality commitments into effective governance practices.

Finally, the research underscores the critical role of civil society engagement and institutional accountability in sustaining gender-responsive governance. Civil society organizations contribute to policymaking by advocating for marginalized voices, monitoring government commitments, and facilitating citizen participation in governance processes. At the same time, effective accountability frameworks including oversight institutions, transparent reporting systems, and gender-disaggregated data mechanisms are necessary to ensure that gender equality initiatives move beyond symbolic commitments toward tangible policy impact. Taken together, the findings suggest that gender-responsive governance must be approached as a systemic institutional process that integrates political representation, administrative capacity, civil society participation, and robust accountability structures. Strengthening these interconnected dimensions is essential for advancing more inclusive, equitable, and sustainable governance outcomes.

7. Recommendations

7.1 Strengthening Institutional Frameworks for Gender-Responsive Governance

The findings in Section 5.1 demonstrate that institutional design significantly shapes the ability of governance systems to integrate gender perspectives into policymaking. Formal equality provisions alone are insufficient when informal institutional norms and bureaucratic hierarchies continue to reproduce gendered power structures. Governments should therefore prioritize institutional reforms that embed gender equality considerations into core governance structures rather than confining them to specialized ministries or symbolic policy frameworks. This may involve strengthening the authority of national gender commissions, integrating gender indicators into national development planning frameworks, and establishing cross-ministerial coordination mechanisms that ensure gender perspectives are considered in policy formulation across sectors such as finance, infrastructure, and social

policy. Institutionalizing gender analysis within central planning and policy evaluation processes would help address the structural limitations identified in the analysis.

7.2 Enhancing Women's Substantive Political Participation

The analysis in Section 5.3 highlights that while increased female representation in political institutions contributes to the visibility of gender-related policy issues, institutional constraints such as party hierarchies and limited access to leadership positions often restrict women's influence over legislative agendas. Policy reforms should therefore focus not only on increasing women's numerical representation but also on strengthening their capacity to shape policy outcomes within political institutions. Governments and political parties should adopt measures that promote women's access to strategic leadership positions, including committee chair roles, ministerial appointments, and party executive structures. Additionally, legislative bodies can establish cross-party women's caucuses or gender equality committees that facilitate coalition-building and provide institutional platforms for advancing gender-sensitive legislation. These reforms would address the institutional barriers to substantive representation identified in the study.

7.3 Building Administrative Capacity for Effective Gender Mainstreaming

The findings in Section 5.2 reveal that gender mainstreaming initiatives often struggle during the implementation stage due to limited bureaucratic expertise, weak monitoring systems, and inadequate data availability. Addressing these challenges requires sustained investment in administrative capacity within public sector institutions. Governments should institutionalize specialized training programs that equip civil servants with the analytical tools necessary to conduct gender impact assessments, design gender-responsive budgets, and evaluate policy outcomes through gender-sensitive indicators. Equally important is the development of reliable gender-disaggregated data systems that enable policymakers to track disparities in employment, access to services, and political participation. Embedding these capacities within routine administrative practices rather than treating gender analysis as an auxiliary activity would significantly improve the effectiveness of mainstreaming initiatives.

7.4 Strengthening Civil Society Participation in Policy Processes

Section 5.4 demonstrates that civil society organizations play an essential role in promoting gender-responsive governance by advocating for marginalized voices and monitoring government commitments. However, their influence depends heavily on the institutional environment and the availability of participatory policy platforms. Governments should therefore establish structured mechanisms that facilitate sustained engagement between civil society actors and state institutions. Examples include participatory policy forums, consultative advisory councils on gender equality, and public monitoring platforms that allow civil society organizations to contribute to policy evaluation processes. Ensuring transparent access to policy information and decision-making procedures can further strengthen civil society's ability to hold governments accountable for gender equality commitments.

7.5 Institutionalizing Accountability and Monitoring Mechanisms

The results in Section 5.5 highlight that the effectiveness of gender-responsive governance ultimately depends on the presence of robust accountability frameworks capable of monitoring policy implementation and enforcing compliance. Governments should strengthen oversight institutions responsible for evaluating gender equality initiatives by providing them with clear legal mandates, adequate financial resources, and operational independence. Integrating gender equality indicators into national performance monitoring systems and public sector evaluation frameworks can further ensure that gender commitments are

systematically assessed across government agencies. In addition, regular public reporting on gender-related policy outcomes supported by gender-disaggregated statistical data can enhance transparency and enable both policymakers and civil society actors to identify implementation gaps.

7.6 Promoting Integrated Governance Approaches to Gender Equality

The overall findings of the study suggest that gender-responsive governance cannot be achieved through isolated policy interventions. Instead, progress requires coordinated reforms across institutional structures, political representation, administrative capacity, civil society engagement, and accountability mechanisms. Policymakers should therefore adopt integrated governance strategies that align gender equality objectives with broader national development priorities. This includes incorporating gender-sensitive indicators into national development plans, linking gender equality targets with sustainable development frameworks, and ensuring that gender perspectives are considered in economic policy planning and public sector reform initiatives. Such integrated approaches would help ensure that gender equality becomes a central component of governance systems rather than a peripheral policy objective.

References

Acharya, A. (2004). How ideas spread: Whose norms matter? Norm localization and institutional change in Asian regionalism. *International Organization, 58* (2), 239–275. (https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818304582024)

Acker, J. (1992). From sex roles to gendered institutions. *Contemporary Sociology, 21* (5), 565–569. (https://doi.org/10.2307/2075528)

Bacchi, C. (2009). Analysing policy: What's the problem represented to be? *Pearson Education.*

Bakker, I. (2007). Social reproduction and the constitution of a gendered political economy. *New Political Economy, 12* (4), 541–556. (https://doi.org/10.1080/13563460701661561)

Bierschenk, T., & Olivier de Sardan, J.-P. (2014). States at work: Dynamics of African bureaucracies. Brill.

Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal, 9* (2), 27–40. (https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027)

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3* (2), 77–101. (https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa)

Budlender, D., & Hewitt, G. (2003). Engendering budgets: A practitioners' guide to understanding and implementing gender-responsive budgets. *Commonwealth Secretariat.*

Celis, K., & Erzeel, S. (2015). Beyond the usual suspects: non-left, male and non-feminist MPs and the substantive representation of women. *Government and Opposition, 50* (1), 45–64. (https://doi.org/10.1017/gov.2013.39)

Celis, K., Childs, S., Kantola, J., & Krook, M. L. (2014). Constituting women's interests through representative claims. Politics & Gender, 10 (2), 149–174.

Chappell, L., & Mackay, F. (2020). Gender and institutions. In G. Waylen, K. Celis, J. Kantola, & S. L. Weldon (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of feminist political analysis* (pp. 200–215). Oxford University Press.

Childs, S., & Krook, M. L. (2009). Analyzing women's substantive representation: From critical mass to critical actors. *Government and Opposition, 44* (2), 125–145. (https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1477-7053.2009.01279.x)

Childs, S., & Krook, M. L. (2018). Critical mass theory and women's political representation. Political Studies, 66(3), 735–751.

Choudhury, B., & Lugo, M. (2020). Gender equality and governance reforms. World Development, 127, 104756.

Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex. University of Chicago Legal Forum, 139–167.

Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review, 43* (6), 1241–1299. (https://doi.org/10.2307/1229039)

Denzin, N. K. (2012). Triangulation 2.0. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research, 6* (2), 80–88. (https://doi.org/10.1177/1558689812437186)

Elson, D. (2017). Gender-responsive budgeting and public policy. In S. Rai & G. Waylen (Eds.), *New frontiers in feminist political economy* (pp. 21–38). London: Routledge.

Elson, D. (2017). Recognize, reduce and redistribute unpaid care work: How to close the gender gap. *New Labour Forum, 26* (2), 52–61. (https://doi.org/10.1177/1095796017700130)

Finnemore, M., & Sikkink, K. (1998). International norm dynamics and political change. *International Organization, 52* (4), 887–917. (https://doi.org/10.1162/002081898550789)

Folbre, N. (2006). Measuring care: Gender, empowerment, and the care economy. *Journal of Human Development, 7* (2), 183–199. (https://doi.org/10.1080/14649880600768512)

Franceschet, S., Krook, M. L., & Piscopo, J. M. (2012). Conceptualizing the impact of gender quotas. In S. Franceschet, M. L. Krook, & J. M. Piscopo (Eds.), *The impact of gender quotas (pp. 3–24)*. Oxford University Press.

Fraser, N. (2016). Contradictions of capital and care. New Left Review, 100, 99–117.

Fung, A., & Wright, E. O. (2003). Deepening democracy: Institutional innovations in empowered participatory governance. *Verso*.

George, A. L., & Bennett, A. (2005). Case studies and theory development in the social sciences. *MIT Press*.

Goetz, A. M. (2003). Women's political effectiveness: A conceptual framework. In A. M. Goetz & S. Hassim (Eds.), No shortcuts to power: African women in politics and policy making (pp. 29–80). *Zed Books*.

Goetz, A. M. (2010). Governing women: Women in politics and policy making. IDS Bulletin, 41 (5), 1–10.

Goetz, A. M., & Jenkins, R. (2005). Reinventing accountability: Making democracy work for human development. Palgrave Macmillan.

Grindle, M. S. (2012). Jobs for the boys: Patronage and the state in comparative perspective. *Harvard University Press.*

Hancock, A.-M. (2007). Intersectionality as a normative and empirical paradigm. *Politics & Gender, 3* (2), 248–254. (https://doi.org/10.1017/S1743923X07000062)

Htun, M., & Weldon, S. L. (2012). The civic origins of progressive policy change: Combating violence against women. American Political Science Review, 106 (3), 548–569.

Htun, M., & Weldon, S. L. (2018). The civic origins of progressive policy change: Combating violence against women in global perspective, 1975–2005. *American Political Science Review, 112* (3), 548–569. (https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055418000226)

Hughes, M. M. (2019). Civil society and women's political empowerment. Comparative Politics, 51 (3), 343–363.

Hughes, M. M. (2019). Women's political representation and democratic development. *Comparative Politics, 51*(3), 343–363.

Inter-Parliamentary Union. (2025a). Women in national parliaments: Monthly ranking (December 2025). *IPU Parline Database*. (https://data.ipu.org)

Inter-Parliamentary Union. (2025b). Women in parliament: Global and regional averages. IPU Parline Database. (https://data.ipu.org)

Keck, M. E., & Sikkink, K. (1998). Activists beyond borders: Advocacy networks in international politics. *Cornell University Press*.

Krook, M. L. (2010). Quotas for women in politics: Gender and candidate selection reform worldwide. *Oxford University Press*.

Krook, M. L., & Norris, P. (2014). Beyond quotas: Strategies to promote gender equality in elected office. *Political Studies, 62*(1), 2–20.

Krook, M. L., & O'Brien, D. Z. (2012). All the president's men? The appointment of female cabinet ministers worldwide. *Journal of Politics, 74* (3), 840–855. (https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022381612000382)

Lombardo, E., & Meier, P. (2006). Gender mainstreaming in the EU: Incorporating a feminist reading? *European Journal of Women's Studies, 13* (2), 151–166. (https://doi.org/10.1177/1350506806062753)

Lowndes, V. (2020). How are political institutions gendered? *Political Studies, 68* (3), 543–564. (https://doi.org/10.1177/0032321719867662)

Lutz, H., Herrera Vivar, M. T., & Supik, L. (2011). Framing intersectionality: Debates on a multi-faceted concept in gender studies. Ashgate.

Mackay, F., Kenny, M., & Chappell, L. (2010). New institutionalism through a gender lens. *International Political Science Review, 31* (5), 573–588. (https://doi.org/10.1177/0192512110388788)

Mansbridge, J. (1999). Should blacks represent blacks and women represent women? The Journal of Politics, 61 (3), 628–657.

Meier, K. J., & Nicholson-Crotty, J. (2006). Gender, representative bureaucracy, and law enforcement. *Public Administration Review, 66* (6), 850–860. (https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2006.00653.x)

Moser, C., & Moser, A. (2005). Gender mainstreaming since Beijing: A review of success and limitations in international institutions. *Gender & Development, 13*(2), 11–22.

Mukhopadhyay, M. (2004). Mainstreaming gender or "streaming" gender away: Feminists marooned in the development business. *IDS Bulletin, 35* (4), 95–103. (https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1759-5436.2004.tb00157.x)

Paxton, P., Hughes, M. M., & Barnes, T. D. (2020). Women, politics, and power: A global perspective (4th ed.). *CQ Press*.

Rai, S. M. (2011). Gender and the political economy of development. *Polity Press.*

Rai, S., & Waylen, G. (2014). *New frontiers in feminist political economy*. London: Routledge.

Razavi, S. (2016). The 2030 agenda: Challenges of implementation to attain gender equality and women's rights. *Gender & Development, 24* (1), 25–41. (https://doi.org/10.1080/13552074.2016.1142229)

Schwartz-Shea, P., & Yanow, D. (2012). Interpretive research design: Concepts and processes. *Routledge*.

Seguino, S. (2010). Gender, distribution, and balance of payments constrained growth in developing countries. *Review of Political Economy, 22* (3), 373–404. (https://doi.org/10.1080/09538259.2010.490310)

Sharp, R., & Sweetman, C. (2012). *Introduction: Gender and budget work. Gender & Development, 20* (3), 517–528. (https://doi.org/10.1080/13552074.2012.731812)

Stotsky, J. G. (2016). Gender budgeting: Fiscal context and current outcomes. IMF Working Paper No. 16/149. *International Monetary Fund*.

Swers, M. L. (2013). Women in the club: Gender and policy making in the Senate. *University of Chicago Press*.

True, J. (2003). Mainstreaming gender in global public policy. International Feminist Journal of Politics, 5 (3), 368–396. (https://doi.org/10.1080/1461674032000122747)

True, J. (2010). *The political economy of violence against women*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

True, J., & Mintrom, M. (2001). Transnational networks and policy diffusion: The case of gender mainstreaming. International Studies Quarterly, 45 (1), 27–57. (https://doi.org/10.1111/0020-8833.00181)

UN Women. (2020). *Gender equality and women's empowerment strategy*. New York: United Nations.

UN Women. (2024). Gender snapshot 2024: Progress on the Sustainable Development Goals. *UN Women*. (https://www.unwomen.org)

UN Women. (2025a). Women in politics: 2025 map. *UN Women.* (https://www.unwomen.org)

UN Women. (2025b). *SDG indicator dashboard: Women in decision-making.* (https://open.unwomen.org)

Verloo, M. (2013). Intersectional and cross-movement politics and policies: Reflections on current practices and debates. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 38*(4), 893–915. (https://doi.org/10.1086/669572)

Walby, S. (2005). Gender mainstreaming: Productive tensions in theory and practice. *Social Politics, 12*(3), 321–343. (https://doi.org/10.1093/sp/jxi018)

Walby, S. (2011). *The future of feminism*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Wängnerud, L. (2009). Women in parliaments: Descriptive and substantive representation. *Annual Review of Political Science, 12, 51–69.* (https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.polisci.11.053106.123839)

Waylen, G. (2014). Informal institutions, institutional change, and gender equality. *Political Research Quarterly, 67*(1), 212–223.

World Economic Forum. (2024). Global gender gap report 2024. *World Economic Forum*. (https://www.weforum.org)

World Economic Forum. (2025). Global gender gap report 2025. World Economic Forum. (https://www.weforum.org)