

WOMEN IN GOVERNMENTAL DECISION-MAKING IN THE EARLY 21ST CENTURY

What has – and has not – been
achieved in the post-Beijing period



SALZBURG SEMINAR



Working for Women's
Empowerment and
Gender Equality



Report by John Mathiason
with the assistance of Loveena Dookhony

Supported by the Salzburg Seminar

GENESIS OF THIS STUDY

The Salzburg Seminar undertook a program in September 2006 on the topic ‘**Women, Political Power and Next Generation Leadership**’. The session was undertaken in partnership with the United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM), Vital Voices Global Partnership, and the National Democratic Institute. The session received financial support from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

In preparation for the program, the Salzburg Seminar noted that there had not been a recent updating of the original analysis undertaken by the United Nations Division for the Advancement of Women (DAW) on women in governmental decision-making positions that was prepared for the Fourth World Conference on Women in 1995 in Beijing, China. DAW did collaborate with the Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) on a study of Women in Politics in 2005 that included statistics on women in parliament and women in ministerial positions. However, a broader look at women in government that included sub-ministerial positions and additional governmental decision-making bodies was lacking.

Dr. John Mathiason, who was the Deputy Director of DAW at the time of the Beijing Conference and oversaw the original study, agreed to undertake a comparative study using the same methodology and data source (updated and released in 2006). A note on methodology and data is included as Annex 2. The purpose was to provide a more direct comparative study to the 1995 DAW report to understand what progress had been achieved – or not - on women in governmental decision-making positions in the decade following the Beijing Conference. There is little tracking done by intergovernmental institutions or governments themselves of this information yet it is a critical indicator of whether governments are meeting the commitments they made in Beijing.

We applaud the work of the IPU on tracking women in parliaments. Similarly, the efforts of DAW to track and report on women in ministerial level posts is critical. However, we urge governments and other institutions to more accurately and transparently collect and report on their efforts to increase women’s representation in all levels of decision-making and provide accurate data on their results. A primary goal in sponsoring this study is to spur governments, intergovernmental organizations, NGOs and others to press for increased attention “**to substantially increase the number of women with a view to achieving equal representation of women and men, if necessary through positive action, in all governmental and public administration positions.**”

For more information about the program *Women, Political Power and Next Generation Leadership*, please visit: <http://www.salzburgseminar.org/2007/feature433.cfm>

ABOUT THE AUTHORS:

John R. Mathiason is adjunct professor of international relations at the Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs at Syracuse University, New York (www.maxwell.syr.edu). For more than twenty-five years, Dr. Mathiason worked for the United Nations Secretariat in New York. From 1987 to 1996, he served as deputy director of the Division for the Advancement of Women. In this capacity, he managed support to the Fourth World Conference on Women in Beijing, including the drafting of the World Survey on the Role of Women in Development, 1989 and 1994, and numerous reports to the UN Commission on the Status of Women. A specialist in management of international organizations, he has published studies on results-based management, international action on ageing, and Internet governance. He received a B.A. from St. Olaf College, Northfield, Minnesota, and a Ph.D. in political science from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge.

Loveera Dookhony is a graduate student at the Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs at Syracuse University, New York. She is pursuing a Master in Public Administration and Master of Arts in International Relations. Ms. Dookhony is originally from Mauritius and she is currently working with John Mathiason and Catherine Bertini on women's participation in politics and girls' education in developing countries. She received her B.A in Economics from Lake Forest College, IL.

SPONSORING AND PARTNER INSTITUTIONS:

The **Salzburg Seminar** (www.salzburgseminar.org) is an international organization focused on global change, a place where innovative ideas lead to practical solutions. As an independent, neutral forum, the Salzburg Seminar engages current and future leaders in candid discussion to inspire new thinking and to pioneer strategies for change.

UNIFEM (www.unifem.org) is the women's fund at the United Nations. It provides financial and technical assistance to innovative programmes and strategies to foster women's empowerment and gender equality.

Vital Voices Global Partnership (www.vitalvoices.org) believes in the transformative value of women's participation in society. We invest in emerging women leaders - pioneers of economic development, political participation, and human rights in their countries - and we help them build the capabilities, connections, and credibility they need to unlock their potential as catalysts of global progress.

The **National Democratic Institute** for International Affairs (www.ndi.org) is a nonprofit organization working to strengthen and expand democracy worldwide. Calling on a global network of volunteer experts, NDI provides practical assistance to civic and political leaders advancing democratic values, practices and institutions.

The **W.K. Kellogg Foundation** (www.wkcf.org) is a nonprofit organization, based in Battle Creek, Michigan, whose mission is to help people help themselves through the practical application of knowledge and resources to improve their quality of life and that of future generations.

Women in governmental decision-making in the early 21st Century

The Beijing Platform for Action adopted by the Fourth World Conference on Women in 1995 sets ambitious targets for increasing the proportion of women involved in governmental decision-making. Ten years later there has been some progress, but not enough to really celebrate because it does not materially affect decision-making in most countries. Clearly much more must be done in policies and practice to achieve the goals and we can fairly ask the question, why is progress so slow.

In 1992 the United Nations published a study entitled *Women in Politics and Decision - Making in the Late Twentieth Century* that showed the extent to which women were represented in governmental decision-making, its causes and consequences. In 2006, 14 years later in preparation for its September 2006 seminar on Women, Political Power, and Next Generation Leadership, the Salzburg Seminar updated the study using the same methodology to acquire and analyze the data. It finds that progress remains slow and the same factors that explained participation before Beijing explain it today, but with an increased importance to the growth of women in elective office.

While the Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) has regularly provided statistics on women in elected positions, the Salzburg Seminar has focused more broadly on women in governmental decision-making, including appointed and career officials who run governments. Thus, this gives the broadest indication of how well women have advanced toward the goal of equal access to decision-making where governments indeed have the power to achieve this through their processes that they control themselves.

What the Platform promised

The Beijing Platform called on governments to¹

- a. Commit themselves to establishing the goal of gender balance in governmental bodies and committees, as well as in public administrative entities, and in the judiciary, including, inter alia, setting specific targets and implementing measures to substantially increase the number of women with a view to achieving equal representation of women and men, if necessary through positive action, in all governmental and public administration positions;
- e. Monitor and evaluate progress in the representation of women through the regular collection, analysis and dissemination of quantitative and qualitative data on women and men at all levels in various decision-making positions in the public and private sectors, and disseminate data

¹ Beijing Platform for Action, para. 190.

on the number of women and men employed at various levels in Governments on a yearly basis; ensure that women and men have equal access to the full range of public appointments and set up mechanisms within governmental structures for monitoring progress in this field;

It also called on Governments, national bodies, the private sector, political parties, trade unions, employers' organizations, research and academic institutions, subregional and regional bodies and non-governmental and international organizations to²

- a. Take positive action to build a critical mass of women leaders, executives and managers in strategic decision-making positions;
- b. Create or strengthen, as appropriate, mechanisms to monitor women's access to senior levels of decision-making;

Unlike elective office where the results are determined by the voters, whether women will be equally represented in government decision-making can be determined by government policies regarding appointment and career.

Do we know what Governments and international organizations have done?

Governments and international organizations have not made serious efforts to monitor whether their activities have had a result. In establishing the commitments, governments have made use of the United Nations statistics. The United Nations prepared *The World's Women 1995: Trends and Statistics* for the Beijing Conference, a publication that included information on the percentage of women holding decision-making positions in governments in almost all Members States of the United Nations. This updated statistics on women in decision-making in 1990.³ These were further updated in 1998 for *The World's Women 2000*.⁴ The statistics had been developed by the United Nations Division for the Advancement of Women, based on an analysis of a world directory of government officials in which the gender of occupants of the top-level positions was classified. After 1998, however, the Division stopped producing these statistics. Other than information on women in parliaments and ministerial positions tabulated by the Inter-Parliamentary Union, statistics on women in governmental decision-making were not included in the Beijing Plus Ten review and appraisal.

Because political decision-making is shared between parliaments (who make laws) and government executives (who implement laws), having information on the proportion of women in government decision-making is critical. High level government officials can

² *Ibid.*, para. 191

³ *The World's Women: Trends and Statistics*, United Nations Sales Publication E.90.XVII.3.

⁴ *The World's Women 2000: Trends and Statistics*, United Nations Sales Publication E.00.XVII.14.

achieve their positions by careers, can be influenced by affirmative action policies, and often become political candidates based on their experience in government. For these reasons, the Salzburg Seminar requested us to prepare an update of the data to see what had happened over the ten years since the Beijing Conference in preparation for the September 2006 Seminar on Women, Political Power, and Next Generation Leadership.

While we did not have the coded World-wide Government Directories from which the 1995 data were extracted, we did have the raw data produced by the Division. We used the same methodology, however, to code the information in the 2006 Edition of the *Worldwide Government Directory* (compiled by CQ Press) which provided information on decision-makers in 2005.⁵

How much progress?

The data show that there has been some progress, but not that much. On average only 10.6 percent of government decision-makers were women in 2005, compared with 6.8 percent in 1994. Table 1 shows the comparison between 1994 and 2005. The change is less than that for women in parliaments where the proportion in lower or single houses went from 11.6 percent in 1995⁶ to 17.1 percent in 2007.⁷

	1994	2005	Change
Ministerial Level	6.2%	6.8%	0.6%
Sub-ministerial	7.1%	14.7%	7.6%
President/PrimeMinster	4.3%	5.4%	1.1%
Economic	5.1%	9.8%	4.8%
Social	11.5%	17.9%	6.3%
Law and Justice	6.9%	8.8%	1.9%
Political	5.3%	10.3%	5.1%
Defense		3.6%	3.6%

⁵ John Mathiason, as Deputy Director of the UN Division for the Advancement of Women directed the compilation of the 1990 and 1995 data, as well as the 1991 study and knows the methodology well. The same methodology was used by the Division for the 1998 data. The only difference was that in 1995 four decision-making levels were used, while in 2005 only three levels were coded. This was because in many smaller countries, there were only three equivalent levels. The effect of this might be to understate results in 2005 compared with 1995.

⁶ Inter-Parliamentary Union, *Women in National Parliaments: 50 Years of History at a Glance*, <http://www.ipu.org/wmn-e/history.htm>

⁷ Inter-Parliamentary Union, *Women in National Parliaments: Situation as of 31 January 2007*. <http://www.ipu.org/wmn-e/world.htm>

At the ministerial level there has been almost no progress. The Inter-Parliamentary Union found the same result from its data. However, at sub-ministerial levels, the percentage has doubled.⁸ In terms of substantive areas, the greatest growth is in the political area, (which includes “flag ministries” like foreign affairs, interior, security and defense), followed by social ministries.

In developing targets, the United Nations had set 30-35 percent women as the “critical mass” necessary to ensure that women did not function as a minority.⁹ Clearly, the averages are well below this figure. However, some countries have achieved these proportions, although again, the progress is not strong. Table 2 shows the top 20 countries in terms of proportion of women among government decision-makers and at the ministerial level in 1994 and 2005. As can be seen, the number of countries with 30 percent or more women in top levels of government has increased from three to five. However, the number of countries with that proportion in ministerial positions has declined. The most significant decline is Norway, which fell from first to eleventh in the total indicator.

Table 2. Top 20 countries in percentage of women in government decision-making

1994				2005			
<i>By all levels</i>		<i>By ministerial</i>		<i>By all levels</i>		<i>By ministerial</i>	
Norway	45.2%	Finland	38.9%	Sweden	38.5%	Colombia	38.1%
Bahamas	32.4%	Norway	36.8%	Colombia	36.9%	Sweden	28.6%
Dominica	31.3%	Seychelles	35.7%	Bahamas	36.6%	Canada	25.0%
Finland	26.8%	Sweden	35.3%	Canada	31.0%	Austria	25.0%
San Marino	26.3%	Netherlands	29.4%	Barbados	30.9%	Barbados	23.8%
Antigua & Barbuda	25.9%	Denmark	29.2%	South Africa	29.1%	Norway	23.1%
United States	25.2%	Bahamas	23.1%	Croatia	27.7%	Sao Tome Prn	23.1%
Seychelles	23.9%	Haiti	20.0%	United States	27.3%	Benin	21.7%
Australia	20.2%	Samoa	20.0%	Grenada	26.5%	Burundi	20.0%
Canada	18.9%	Guatemala	18.8%	New Zealand	26.1%	Gabon	19.4%
Guyana	18.0%	Trinidad and Tobago	18.5%	Norway	25.5%	Saint Lucia	19.0%
Sweden	17.5%	San Marino	16.7%	Costa Rica	25.0%	Cuba	19.0%
Honduras	16.7%	Switzerland	16.7%	Rwanda	25%	Bangladesh	18.4%
Netherlands	16.1%	Liechtenstein	16.7%	Dominican Rep	24.3%	Israel	18.2%

⁸ In determining sub-ministerial positions, job titles were used. Thus, a second-level position would be a deputy minister or minister of state. A third-level position would be an assistant minister or an under-secretary. The terms vary by political system.

⁹ See, *Women in Politics and Decision-making in the Late Twentieth Century: A United Nations Study*, Dordrecht: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 1992, p. 107.

Trinidad and Tobago	15.3%	Germany	16.0%	Bulgaria	24.2%	Gambia	18.2%
Lesotho	15.2%	Austria	15.8%	Seychelles	24.2%	Dominican Rep	17.6%
Zimbabwe	14.9%	Iceland	15.4%	Trinidad & Tobago	23.6%	Rwanda	16.7%
Denmark	14.8%	Estonia	15.0%	Denmark	23.3%	Malawi	16.7%
New Zealand	14.8%	Andorra	14.3%	Finland	23.3%	Burkina Faso	16.7%
Andorra	14.3%	Benin	14.3%	Mauritius	23.2%	Germany	16.7%

In 1994, there were clear regional differences, showing progress since initial data from 1987. These differences have persisted in 2005, as can be seen in Table 3¹⁰. This yields heterogeneous groups, but each region has shown an increase although the percentages are very small, especially in Asia and the Pacific and Western Europe and Other Countries.

Total by Region	1994	2005	Change
Africa	6.3%	10.7%	4.5%
Latin America	10.4%	15.7%	5.3%
Asia and Pacific	2.9%	4.4%	1.5%
Western Europe and Other	13.0%	13.8%	0.8%
Eastern Europe	5.0%	10.8%	5.8%

What explains the differences?

The 1992 United Nations study found that the strongest predictor of high percentages was the extent to which women had access to higher levels of education. It compared country data on the percentage of women in secondary and tertiary levels of education with country data on percentage of women in decision-making. It found a strong correlation, which was stronger if 1987 decision-making levels were correlated with percentage of women in tertiary education in 1970, when women who reached decision-making positions in 1987 were studying at universities.

For 2005, the correlations continue between the percentage of women in decision-making positions and the percentage of women in secondary and tertiary education and other indicators in 2000. The strongest correlation is with tertiary education in 2000 in terms of sub-ministerial levels (0.31), but not with ministerial level (0.04 or no correlations). Clearly the matter is more complex, however. The next strongest correlation is with the

¹⁰ The analysis uses the five regions on the basis of which elections are held within the United Nations.

ratio of women to men in third level education in 1980, the point at which most government decision-makers were in the university. In no year is there a correlation between education access and women in ministerial positions. This is not surprising. Elite women obtain education even in societies where equal access is not likely, and elections are not won due to education.

	1970	1980	1990	2000
Ministerial level	-0.10	0.05	0.00	0.04
Sub-ministerial level	0.18	0.15	0.07	0.31
Total	0.19	0.26	0.17	0.26

Other factors showing high correlations with percentage of women in government decision-making positions include percentage of women in the adult labor force in 2000 (0.33), and the percentage of women in administrative and managerial occupations (0.48). These indicators describe the extent to which, overall, women have advanced in their societies. We will explore them further, to identify lagged effects.

The strongest factor, however, is political. We compared countries in terms of women in government decision-making in 2005 with the percentage of parliamentary seats held by women in 1995, 1999 and 2004. The strongest correlation was the total percentage of women in government decision-making with women in parliament in 2003 (0.51), probably reflecting women's political power when government decision-makers were appointed or promoted. While there is an element of double-counting here, because in parliamentary system, ministers are usually drawn from among members of parliament, the evidence shows that the effect is on all top levels of decision-making. The correlation between women in parliament and women in ministerial level appointments (0.35) is lower than that when all levels of decision-making are used. This suggests that when there are more women in parliament, there are not necessarily more women ministers, but there is greater access by women to second and third level decision-making positions.

	1995	1999	2003	2006
Ministerial	0.40	0.38	0.35	0.38
Sub-ministerial	0.36	0.39	0.43	0.33
Total	0.35	0.47	0.51	0.48

The connection between women in government decision-making is long-term, but as Table 5 shows, the closest correlations are with the most recent parliaments. There were no correlations between women in government in 2005 with women in parliaments in the years preceding Beijing. This suggests that change can happen quickly, but may not last. It certainly shows that the Beijing Conference had an effect in propelling women into

decision-making. If women are represented in elective office, there will be an increase in women in all government decision-making positions.

In every period, there is a relationship between women in parliaments and women in government decision-making, as can be seen in Table 6. The most interesting correlation, however, is in 2004, where there is a clear effect of women in parliament on levels of government decision-making that are not filled by parliamentarians. This gives some hope for the future since, as noted previously, the proportion of women in parliaments has been growing in recent years.

	1990	1998	2004
Ministerial	0.53	0.48	0.35
Sub-ministerial	0.30	0.15	0.46
Total	0.47	0.29	0.50

Conclusions

The analysis shows that while general advancement of women is related to increasing the proportion of women in governmental decision-making, especially at the sub-ministerial level, the main driver is political. When women are elected to parliament, women in government decision-making follows quickly. Some of this is undoubtedly because running for office increases the supply of women with leadership experience. Most, however, is because it shows that women, as a matter of routine, can and should occupy decision-making positions.

If this is the case, then progress towards equality can be achieved rapidly. In every country in which both men and women vote, there are more women voters. If, at the margin, women voted for women, change would be very rapid indeed. This would require, however, that women had a fair chance of becoming candidates and successfully attracted votes from both women and men.

Annex 1: Government Listings

Data based on the 2006 Edition of the *Worldwide Government Directory*

Country	Total positions	Percentage of women in these positions
1. Sweden	39	38.5%
2. Colombia	65	36.9%
3. Bahamas	41	36.6%
4. Canada	87	31.0%
5. Barbados	55	30.9%
6. South Africa	86	29.1%
7. Croatia	83	27.7%
8. United States	205	27.3%
9. Grenada	34	26.5%
10. New Zealand	161	26.1%
11. Norway	94	25.5%
12. Costa Rica	52	25.0%
Rwanda	32	25.0%
14. Dominican Republic	37	24.3%
15. Bulgaria	99	24.2%
Seychelles	33	24.2%
17. Denmark	72	23.6%
Trinidad and Tobago	55	23.6%
19. Finland	73	23.3%
20. Mauritius	99	23.2%
21. Chile	49	22.4%
22. Malawi	36	22.2%
23. Austria	81	21.0%
24. Honduras	43	20.9%
25. Gabon	48	20.8%
26. Saint Kitts and Nevis	34	20.6%
27. Saint Lucia	44	20.5%
28. Fiji	60	20.0%
Sao Tome Prn	15	20.0%
Burkina Faso	30	20.0%
31. Israel	51	19.6%
32. East Timor	31	19.4%
33. Latvia	83	19.3%
34. Burundi	22	18.2%
35. Slovenia	56	17.9%
Cuba	67	17.9%
37. El Salvador	45	17.8%
38. Gambia	23	17.4%
Botswana	46	17.4%
40. Luxembourg	58	17.2%
41. Philippines	146	17.1%
42. Estonia	56	16.1%
43. Netherlands	38	15.8%
44. Switzerland	33	15.2%
45. United Kingdom	119	15.1%

46. Mali	34	14.7%
47. Tunisia	41	14.6%
48. Kazakhstan	56	14.3%
Jamaica	49	14.3%
50. Belgium	57	14.0%
51. Lesotho	52	13.5%
52. Australia	60	13.3%
San Marino	15	13.3%
Tanzania	30	13.3%
55. Poland	114	13.2%
Chad	38	13.2%
57. Guatemala	46	13.0%
Benin	46	13.0%
Guinea Bissau	23	13.0%
60. Spain	78	12.8%
Pakistan	109	12.8%
Eq Guinea	47	12.8%
63. Peru	55	12.7%
64. Kiribati	16	12.5%
65. Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	32	12.5%
66. Bosnia and Herzegovina	173	12.1%
67. Bolivia	33	12.1%
68. Togo	25	12.0%
69. Germany	76	11.8%
Haiti	17	11.8%
Nigeria	51	11.8%
72. Dominica	26	11.5%
73. Brazil	70	11.4%
74. Argentina	55	10.9%
75. Macedonia, Former Yugoslavian Republic	37	10.8%
76. Antigua and Barbuda	19	10.5%
77. Uganda	69	10.1%
78. Cape Verde	10	10.0%
79. Namibia	51	9.8%
80. Ghana	63	9.5%
81. Georgia	64	9.4%
82. Guyana	43	9.3%
Algeria	54	9.3%
84. Liechtenstein	44	9.1%
France	66	9.1%
86. Ireland	67	9.0%
87. Maldives	34	8.8%
Turkmenistan	34	8.8%
Cote d'Ivoire	34	8.8%
90. Belarus	115	8.7%
91. Senegal	47	8.5%
92. India	169	8.3%
Belize	36	8.3%
Paraguay	36	8.3%
95. Kenya	97	8.2%
96. Niger	37	8.1%
97. Slovak Rep	50	8.0%

98. Moldova	42	7.1%
Palau	14	7.1%
100. Samoa	29	6.9%
101. Lithuania	60	6.7%
102. Russia	151	6.6%
Bangladesh	106	6.6%
Congo, DR	61	6.6%
105. Malta	46	6.5%
Uruguay	31	6.5%
107. Romania	128	6.3%
108. Sri Lanka	97	6.2%
109. Serbia and Montenegro	83	6.0%
Mexico	149	6.0%
111. Palestinian National Authority	34	5.9%
Mongolia	34	5.9%
Central African Republic	34	5.9%
Madagascar	34	5.9%
Sierra Leone	34	5.9%
116. Uzbekistan	69	5.8%
117. Nicaragua	36	5.6%
118. China	165	5.5%
119. Armenia	76	5.3%
Andorra	19	5.3%
Singapore	57	5.3%
Panama	38	5.3%
Morocco	38	5.3%
124. Czech Rep	153	5.2%
125. Venezuela	59	5.1%
Swaziland	39	5.1%
127. Iceland	40	5.0%
Ecuador	60	5.0%
Liberia	20	5.0%
130. Afghanistan	61	4.9%
131. Greece	62	4.8%
Congo, Rep	42	4.8%
133. Syria	45	4.4%
134. Ukraine	69	4.3%
135. Albania	48	4.2%
Nepal	48	4.2%
Kyrgyzstan	24	4.2%
138. Monaco	25	4.0%
Mauritania	25	4.0%
140. Hungary	55	3.6%
141. Korea (Republic of)	57	3.5%
142. Malaysia	87	3.4%
Laos	29	3.4%
Sudan	58	3.4%
Mozambique	29	3.4%
146. Angola	91	3.3%
147. Tonga	32	3.1%
Guinea	32	3.1%
149. Thailand	69	2.9%

150. Italy	80	2.5%
151. Jordan	45	2.2%
152. Untd Arab Em	48	2.1%
153. Yemen	49	2.0%
154. Bhutan	56	1.8%
Egypt	56	1.8%
156. Portugal	60	1.7%
Indonesia	60	1.7%
158. Cameroon	64	1.6%
159. Oman	71	1.4%
Vietnam	143	1.4%
Saudi Arabia	72	1.4%
Azerbaijan	44	0.0%
Cyprus	28	0.0%
Holy See	9	0.0%
Turkey	60	0.0%
Bahrain	43	0.0%
Brunei	38	0.0%
Cambodia	159	0.0%
Iran	44	0.0%
Iraq	30	0.0%
Japan	60	0.0%
Korea (Peoples Democratic Republic of)	170	0.0%
Kuwait	33	0.0%
Lebanon	33	0.0%
Marshall Islds	16	0.0%
Micronesia	13	0.0%
Myanmar	45	0.0%
Nauru	20	0.0%
Papua N Guin	30	0.0%
Qatar	48	0.0%
Solomon Isls	29	0.0%
Tajikistan	26	0.0%
Tuvalu	13	0.0%
Vanuatu	20	0.0%
Suriname	20	0.0%
Comoros	20	0.0%
Djibouti	20	0.0%
Eritrea	22	0.0%
Ethiopia	55	0.0%
Libya	25	0.0%
Somalia	7	0.0%
Zambia	21	0.0%
Zimbabwe	49	0.0%

Annex 2: Methodology and Data

The statistics on women in government decision-making were obtained by analyzing the content of the 2006 World-wide Government Directory. The same directory had been used by the Division for the Advancement of Women in compiling its statistics for 1987, 1994 and 1998. The Directory contains information on the persons occupying senior positions as reported by governments or available to the publishers of the Directory from publicly available sources. As such the information represents what governments define as positions and people who merit inclusion in the Directory. The Directory was issued in early 2006 and therefore includes names from 2005 through January 2006. For consistency, the data are considered as being accurate for 2005.

For each country in the Directory, three types of codes were used: the level of the position, the sex of the listed incumbent and the type of government activity covered by the position.

Positions chosen for coding consisted of cabinet ministries, supreme courts, central banks and the military. Top level officials in the legislature, such as speakers, were included. Public enterprises like telephone companies, railways or state shipping lines were not included. The coverage of positions is broader than that used by the Inter-Parliamentary Union, which focuses on cabinet-level and within that only the top level.

Job titles vary by country according to its traditions and history. To deal with this, in each country, three levels of positions were determined. This was largely on the basis of the hierarchy of job titles. A usual example would be for a cabinet minister to be classified as level one, a vice-minister as level two and a director-general as level three. In some countries, the levels were different. In the United Kingdom, for example, a cabinet minister would be level one, a secretary of state would be level two and a permanent secretary would be level three. In some cases, the determination of whether a post was to be included and its level depended on whether it involved policy decision-making. For example, in the United States the head of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is a cabinet-level appointment and was given level one and subsidiary officials were also coded. The head of intelligence currently is also a cabinet level appointment and was given level one, but the director of the Central Intelligence Agency, reporting to the head of intelligence was classified as level two.

Whenever there was doubt about a classification, someone knowledgeable about the classifications used in the country concerned was consulted. In the analysis, the main distinction was between level one positions and lower-level positions that were aggregated as a single category.

The sex of the incumbent was usually easy to determine based on titles and names. In those cases, like China, where it was not obvious from either, students from those countries were consulted.

The government departments in which the positions were located were classified between head of state or government, political (foreign affairs, interior or defence), economic

(finance, planning), social (health, social affairs, labor) or judicial (justice, attorneys-general, police, courts).

Reliability checks were made. While only one person did the coding, these were reviewed by a second coder to see if there was agreement. If not, the codes were reviewed jointly. Second, the results for 2005 were compared with those for 1994. If the difference was very large, the coding was reviewed to ensure that the differences were real. Ideally, it would have been useful to compare the coded directory from which the 2005 data were obtained with that of the 1994 data. Unfortunately, the earlier directory was not available. Since the coding procedure used was consistent, the data are comparable with the earlier series done by the Division for the Advancement of Women.