## RNGS MODEL

***Unit of Analysis: Policy Debate***

## INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

Women's Movement Actor Characteristics: Stage; Closeness to Left; Issue priority; Cohesion; Location; Feminist Activism

Policy Environment:
Policy Subsystem: Structure; Issue Frame Fit:
Party/coalition in power; Counter movement
INTERVENING VARIABLE
Women's Policy Agency Characteristics: Scope; Type; Proximity; Administrative Capacity; Leadership; Policy Mandate

Women's Policy Agency Activities: (Insider, Marginal, Non-feminist, Symbolic) DEPENDENT VARIABLE

Women's Movement Impact/State Response: (Dual Response, Co-optation, Pre-emption; No Response)

## Typology for Women's Policy Agency Activities

|  | WPA Advocates Movement Goals? |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| WPA | YES |  | NO |
| Genders   <br> Frame of   <br> Policy Debate? NO YES Insider | Marginal | Nonfeminist |  |

Typology for Women's Movement Impact/State Response
Policy Content Coincides with Movement Goals?

| Women |  | YES | NO <br> Involved |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| YES | Dual Response | Cooptation |  |
| In Policy |  | NO |  |
| Process? | NO | Preemption | No Response |

Stage:

1. Emerging/Re-emerging. Formation of new organizations; re habilitation of older organizations toward new goals.
2.Growth: Expansion in numbers of organizations, activities.
2. Consolidation: organizations have structure, endurance and regular support; institutionalized in community and government arenas.
3. Decline/Abeyance. Decrease in organizations members and activities over the period. Latent organizational activity primarily by individuals.

## Closeness to Left:

1. Very Close: groups formally ally with or work with political parties and/or trade unions of the left. Ideas from the movement are taken up by left-wing parties in party platforms. Activists have internal power positions in the left-wing parties.
2. Close: groups formally ally with or work with political parties and/or trade unions of the left. They do not have internal power positions in the parties or unions and if the left takes up the ideas of movements they do so without stating so and bring these ideas to fit the party line. 3. Not Close: movement and the left are remote or hostile to each other.

## Priority of Issue:

1. High: issue is one of the top priorities of the women's movement activists and serves to forge alliances among the various wings and tendencies.
2. Moderate: not a uniting issue, but is a priority for some activists and organizations.
3. Low: not a priority for any organization, but mentioned by some. Not on the agenda. Not present at all on agendas of individuals and organizations in the movement.

Cohesion:

1. Cohesive: movement organizations active on the issue agree on the frame and/or policy proposals.
2. Divided: movement organizations active on the issue disagree on the frame and/or policy proposals.

## Location:

Yes or no for each dimension
Autonomous
Political Party
Trade Union
Established Interest Organizations
Legislature or Government
Feminist Activism:
Yes or No

## Cluster Two: Policy Environment

## Policy Subsystem Level:

## Structure:

1. Open: organization is amorphous, no common rules or conventions; participation is wide and changing with a variety of interest group representatives and free agents. Power balance shows no clear chain of command.
2. Moderately Closed: organization is more clearly defined but changing over time. Participation shows some regular actors but some free agents around. Power balance shows several actors trying to dominate the group but no single line of command.
3. Closed: codification of system through regular meetings and rules. Participation is limited with few free agents. Power balance shows one major actor controls policy space and parameters of the arena. A single policy community mobilizes around the issue.

Issue Frame Fit: 1Policy Frame Fit: Policy Frame Fit: Policy Frame Fit: Policy Frame Fit:

1. Matching: Issue frame that initially shapes the debate is expressed in terms that are similar to movement goals as expressed by activists
2. Compatible: Issue frame that initially shapes the debate is not expressed in terms that are similar to movement goals as expressed by activists
3. Incompatible: Issue frame that initially shapes the debate is expressed in terms that are in conflict with (oppose) movement goals the debate as expressed by activists.

## Party or Coalition in Power

1. Strong left-wing control: left-wing parties may have majority in popularly elected legislative chambers and the Presidency/executive
2. Moderate left-wing control: left-wing parties may have the popularly elected chambers only and not the president. In the U.S. the left may have majority in only one elected chamber of the legislature.

## Counter-movement:

1. Strong: prevalent and proactive movement aimed at issue or issues taken-up by different parts of the women's movement.
2. Moderate: counter-movement less active against women's movement issues.
3. Weak: nearly moribund or non existent.

## WOMEN'S POLICY AGENCY CHARACTERISTICS FOR QUALITATIVE STUDY

Scope
Single Issue
Cross-Section
Other
Type
Political appointments
Bureaucratic
Lay Panels
Proximity to Power Centers
Near
Distant
Administrative Capacity
High -- Extensive staffs, separate division, field offices, subsidies, significant budget.
Medium-Some staff, separate divisions, or fields offices, moderate budget.
Low-Minimal staff, no separate divisions, no fields offices, minuscule budget.
Leadership
Feminist
Not Feminist
Policy Mandate
Cover Debate Issue
Does not Cover Debate Issue

Pure Successes (Insider/Dual Response) of WPA/WM Across Three Policy Areas

| Policy Debate De | Decision Date | Country | WPA-AC | WM Stage | PS S | PP/C P |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Job Training ( $\mathbf{5} / \mathbf{2 5}=\mathbf{2 0 \%}$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Countries (8): CA, EU, FR, FIN, IRE, IT, SPA, USA |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Labor Shortages | 1971 | FIN | M | E | M | LS |
| State Responsibility for Training | ng 1987 | FIN | L | G | M | LS |
| Vocational Training | 1990 | USA | M | C/D | M | LS |
| Structural Funds Review | 1993 | EU | M | E | M | L |
| Training for Globalization | 1997 | IRE | H | G | M | L |


| Abortion (10/32 = 31\%); Pure Failures (0) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Countries (11): AUT, BEL, CA, FRA, GER, GBR, IRE, IT, NL, SPA, USA |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Social Democratic Party Policy | 1972 | AUT | L | E | C | L |
| People's Initiative (anti-abortion) | 1978 | AUT | L | G | C | L |
| Authorization of Abortion Pill | 1999 | AUT | M | C/D | C | LS |
| Reimbursement of Abortion | 1983 | FRA | H | C/D | M | L |
| Commando-IVG and Loi Neiertz | 1993 | FRA | H | C/D | M | L |
| White Bill and Lane Committee | 1975 | GBR | L | G | O | LO |
| Human Fertilization | 1990 | GBR | L | C/D | M | LO |
| Executive Order to the 1981 Act | 1984 | NL | H | C/D | M | LO |
| Implementation regulations | 1986 | SPA | M | C/D | C | L |
| Partial Birth Abortion Ban Act | 1998 | USA | L | C/D | M | LS |

(Pure Failures -- Symbolic/ No Response(0))
Prostitution (12/33 = 36\%)

| Countries (11): AUS, AUT, GBR, CAN, | FIN, FRA, ITA, | NL, SPA,SW, USA |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Legalization of Street Prostitution | 1979 | AUS | M | G | M | L |
| Social Insurance | 1998 | AUT | M | C/D | M | L |
| Kerb Crawling as an Offense | 1985 | GBR | M | E | C | L |
| Fraser Committee | 1985 | CAN | M | G | O | LO |
| Repeal of Vagrant Act | 1986 | FIN | L | G | M | LS |
| New Sex Crime Act | 1998 | FIN | L | C/D | M | LS |
| Public Health and Regulation | 1990 | FRA | H | C/D | O | L |
| Protection Permits for Trafficking | 1999 | ITA | M | C/D | M | LS |
| Project Financing | 1999 | ITA | M | C/D | O | LS |
| Repeal of Brothel Ban I | 1989 | NL | H | C/D | O | LS |
| Repeal of Brothel Ban II | 2000 | NL | H | C/D | M | LO |
| First Commission on Prostitution | 1982 | SWE | L | C/D | C | LO |

(Pure Failures Symbolic/ No Response(7/34 =21\%))
Total Pure Successes: 27/90 = 30\%
Total Pure Failures: $20 / 90=\mathbf{2 2 \%}$

```
Abbreviations for Variables:
WPA-AC = Administrative Capacity of WPAs: High -H, Medium -M,Low -L
\(\underline{\text { WM Stage }}=\) Stage of Development of Women's Movement - Emergence \(-E\), Growth - G;
```

Consolidation/Decline-C/D
PS S = Policy Subsystem Structure: Open -O, Moderately Closed-M, Closed -C
$\underline{P / C P}=$ Political Party/Coalition in Power: Left in Power -L ; Left Shares Power -- LS, Left out of Power- LO

# KEY TO RNGS INDEPENDENT VARIABLES FOR QCA 

Women's Movement Actor characteristics:
wmstage $=\mathrm{WM}$ in emerging/growth stage or not wmclose $=\mathrm{WMA}$ are Close to the Left parties or Not wmpriority = Issue is top priority for WMA or not wmunity $=$ WMA are cohesive in their position on the issue or not

Policy environment
counter $=$ Counter movement is strong or not sysclosed = Policy subsystem for debate is closed or not left $=$ Left party has executive power or not

Table 1
WMA CHARACTERISTICS PROPERTY SPACE

| Combination | Close to the Left | Priority | Cohesiveness |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Close | Top | Cohesive |
| 2 | Close | Top | Not Cohesive |
| 3 | Close | Not Top | Cohesive |
| 4 | Close | Not Top | Not Cohesive |
| 5 | Not Close | Top | Cohesive |
| 6 | Not Close | Top | Not Cohesive |
| 7 | Not Close | Not Top | Cohesive |
| 8 | Not Close | Not Top | Not Cohesive |

Table 2
PE CHARACTERISTICS PROPERTY SPACE

| Combination | Policy Subsystem | Party in power |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Not Closed | Left in power |
| 2 | Not Closed | Left not in power |
| 3 | Closed | Left in power |
| 4 | Closed | Left not in power |

Table 3
WPA ACTIVITIES PROPERTY SPACE

| Combination | Coincides w/WMA | Genders debate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 Insider | Coincides | Genders |
| 2. Marginal | Coincides | Does not gender |
| 3. Non feminist | Not coincide | Genders |
| 4. Symbolic | Not coincide | Does not gender |

TABLE 4
TRUTH TABLE: PROSTITUTION DEBATES
(Caps mean condition present, lower case means condition not present)
File: A:/ptdebates2.txt
Rows: 10
Cases: 36
Minimum Frequency 0: 1
Minimum Frequency 1: 1
Minimum Frequency -: $\quad 1$

Combination 1: wmstage WMCLOSE wmpriority wmunity
Outcome: C Cases: 8 22.2\% ( $0=7 \quad 1=1 \quad-=0)$
Combination 2: WMSTAGE WMCLOSE wmpriority wmunity
Outcome: C Cases: $7 \quad 19.4 \% \quad(0=5 \quad 1=2 \quad-=0)$

## Combination 3: wmstage WMCLOSE WMPRIORITY WMUNITY

Outcome: 1 Cases: 5 13.9\% $(0=0 \quad 1=5 \quad-=0)$
Combination 4:wmstage WMCLOSE wmpriority WMUNITY
Outcome: C Cases: $5 \quad 13.9 \% \quad(0=1 \quad 1=4 \quad-=0)$
Combination 5:WMSTAGE WMCLOSE wmpriority WMUNITY
Outcome: C Cases: $5 \quad 13.9 \% \quad(0=1 \quad 1=4 \quad-=0)$
Combination 6: wmstage WMCLOSE WMPRIORITY wmunity
Outcome: C Cases: 2 5.6\% ( $0=1 \quad 1=1 \quad-=0)$
Combination 7: wmstage wmclose wmpriority wmunity
Outcome: 1 Cases: $12.8 \% ~(0=0 \quad 1=1 \quad-=0)$

Combination 8: WMSTAGE wmclose wmpriority WMUNITY
Outcome: 0 Cases: $12.8 \% \quad(0=1 \quad 1=0 \quad-=0)$
Combination 9: WMSTAGE wmclose wmpriority wmunity
Outcome: 0 Cases: $12.8 \% ~(0=1 \quad 1=0 \quad-=0)$

## Combination 10: WMSTAGE WMCLOSE WMPRIORITY WMUNITY

Outcome: 1 Cases: $12.8 \% \quad(0=0 \quad 1=1 \quad-=0)$

Table 5: VARIABLES/CODING FOR QCA

| NUMBER | VARIABLE | CODE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Country | AUT, ect |
| 2 | Debate | AB,PT,PR,JT |
| 3 | Number | 1,2,3 |
| 4 | Date | First year 70, 80,90 |
| 5 | wmstage | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Emerging/growth }=1 \\ & \text { Consolidation/other = } 0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| 6 | wmclose | Close/Very Close to Left $=1$ <br> Not Close/very close $=0$ |
| 7 | wmpriority | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { High priority }=1 \\ & \text { Not high priority =0 } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| 8 | wmunity | Cohesive = 1 <br> Not cohesive = 0 |
| 9 | counter | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Strong }=1 \\ & \text { Not strong }=0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| 10 | sysclosed | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { Closed }=1 \\ \text { Not closed }=0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| 11 | left | Left in power $=1$ <br> Left not in power $=0$ |
| 12 | wpagender | $\begin{gathered} \text { Yes }=1 \\ \text { No }=-0 \end{gathered}$ |
| 13 | wpawma | Coincides $=1$ <br> Not coincide $=0$ |
| 14 | polsucc | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yes }=1 \\ & \text { No }=0 \end{aligned}$ |
| 15 | procsucc | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yes }=1 \\ & \text { No }=0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| 16 | insider | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yes }=1 \\ & \text { No }=0 \end{aligned}$ |
| 17 | marginal | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yes }=1 \\ & \text { No }=0 \end{aligned}$ |
| 18 | symbolic | $\begin{gathered} \text { Yes }=1 \\ \text { No }=0 \end{gathered}$ |
| 19 | dual resp | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yes }=1 \\ & \text { No }=0 \end{aligned}$ |
| 20 | coopt | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yes }=1 \\ & \text { No }=0 \end{aligned}$ |
| 21 | prempt | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Yes }=1 \\ & \text { No }=0 \end{aligned}$ |
| 22 | no resp | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yes }=1 \\ & \text { No }=0 \end{aligned}$ |

Table 6
QCA Crisp Set Solutions: Abortion policy debates
DV = Dual response
WM = WMLEFT WMUNITY WMPRIORITY
$P E=S Y S C L O S E D$ LEFT in power

|  | I. WM \& PE variables | II. WM \& PE \& Insider |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | WMLEFT* | WMPRIORITY*WMUNITY*sysclosed |
| Contradictions |  |  |
| Resolved |  |  |$\quad$| WMPRIORITY* |
| :--- |
|  |

In Boolean terms:

* = AND
$+=\mathrm{OR}$
I. $\mathrm{C}=3$ configurations 12 cases
$1=2$ configurations 6 cases
$0=3$ configurations 8 cases
6 cases dropped.
II.
$\mathrm{C}=1$ configuration 2 cases
$0=3$ configurations 8 cases
$1=3$ configurations 9 cases
9 cases dropped

Table 6 Necessary/Sufficient template

| OUTCOME | CAUSE ABSENT | CAUSE PRESENT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PRESENT | 1 no cases <br> (necessary) | 2 cases |
| ABSENT | 3 irrelevant | 4 no cases <br> (sufficient) |

## DISTRIBUTION OF CASES BY CAUSE AND OUTCOME

TABLE 7

ABORTION

| OUTCOME | INSIDER WPA ABSENT | INSIDER WPA <br> PRESENT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| WMA DUAL RESPONSE | 5 | 9 |
| WMA NOT DUAL <br> RESPONSE | 13 | 0 |

TABLE 8
PROSTITUTION

| OUTCOME | INSIDER WPA ABSENT | INSIDER WPA <br> PRESENT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| WMA DUAL RESPONSE | 6 | 13 |
| WMA NOT DUAL <br> RESOPNSE | 15 | 1 |

TABLE 9

## POLITICAL REPRESENTATION

| OUTCOME | INSIDER WPA ABSENT | INSIDER WPA <br> PRESENT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| WMA DUAL RESPONSE | 1 | 12 |
| WMA NOT DUAL <br> RESPONSE | 12 | 3 |

TABLE 10
JOB TRAINING

| OUTCOME | WPA INSIDER ABSENT | WPA INSIDER PRESENT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| WMA DUAL RESPONSE | 1 | 5 |
| WMA NOT DUAL RESONSE | 14 | 2 |

## CROSS ISSUE CHART 1

## PATHS TO DUAL STATE RESPONSE IN ISSUE POLICY DEBATES

WOMEN'S MOVEMENT CHARACTERISTICS (Stage, Closeness to Left, Priority, Unity)

ABORTION<br>WMSTAGE*WMCLOSE*WMPRIORITY + wmstage*wmclose*wmprior*WMUNITY<br>$1=2$ config. (33\%) 4 cases ( $14 \%$ ); C = 3 config. (50\%) $21(75 \%)$ cases; 4 dropped<br>$\underline{\text { JOB TRAINING }}$<br>WMSTAGE*WMCLOSE (wmunity + WMPRIORITY)<br>$1=1$ config. ( $13 \%$ ) 1 case ( $5 \%$ ); $\mathrm{C}=4$ config. ( $50 \%$ ); 13 cases ( $60 \%$ )<br>\section*{PROSTITUTION}<br>wmstage*WMCLOSE<br>$1=1$ config. (17\%) 5 cases ( $16 \%$ ); C = 5 config. ( $83 \%$ ) 27 cases ( $84 \%$ ); 4 dropped

## POLITICAL REPRESENTATION

WMCLOSE*WMPRIORITY
$1=1$ config. ( $17 \%$ ) 3 ( $10 \%$ )cases; $\mathrm{C}=4$ config. ( $67 \%$ ) 20 cases ( $69 \%$ ); 4 dropped

What the symbols mean:

* = AND
$+=$ OR
Some configurations can be factored. Here is an example of factoring:
WMCLOSE*WMUNITY (stage + WMPRIORITY) This represents two configurations which have two conditions in common and vary on the third)
$1=2$ config.: successful outcome, that is, dual response cases produced 2 configurations which were $33 \%$ of the total configurations;
4 cases had these two configurations and they were $14 \%$ of the cases analyzed
$\mathrm{C}=3$ config: 3 configurations produced contradictory outcomes; some successful, some not.
These represented $50 \%$ of the configurations.
21 cases were included in the Contradictory configurations, or $75 \%$ of the cases. 4 were dropped because did not meet the 2 case minimum (single cases for single configurations.

CROSS ISSUE CHART 2 PATHS TO DUAL STATE RESPONSE IN ISSUE POLICY DEBATES WOMEN'S MOVEMENT CHARACTERISTICS AND WOMEN'S POLICY AGENCY ACTIVITIES (INSIDER)

ABORTION<br>WMCLOSE*WMPRIORITY*WMUNITY<br>$1=2$ config. ( $33 \%$ ) 7 cases ( $33 \%$ ); $\mathrm{C}=3$ config ( $50 \%$ ); 11 cases ( $52 \%$ ); 7 dropped 4 cases missing data<br>JOB TRAINING<br>WMSTAGE*WMCLOSE*WMPRIORITY*WMUNITY*INSIDER<br>$1=1$ config. ( $17 \%$ ) 2 cases ( $13 \%$ ); $\mathrm{C}=2$ config. ( $33 \%$ ) 4 cases ( $25 \%$ ); 6 dropped<br>PROSTITUTION<br>wmstage*WMCLOSE*WMUNITY + WMSTAGE*WMCLOSE*wmpriority*INSIDER<br>$1=5$ config. ( $56 \%$ ) 12 cases ( $43 \%$ ); C = 3 config. ( $33 \%$ ) 11 cases ( $39 \%$ ) 7 dropped<br>POLITICAL REPRESENTATION<br>WMCLOSE*WMPRIORITY*WMUNITY*INSIDER<br>$1=2$ config. ( $40 \%$ ) 8 cases ( $40 \%$ ); C $=1$ config. ( $20 \%$ ) 4 cases ( $20 \%$ ); 8 dropped 5 cases missing data

