



Masters Degree in International  
Relations Double Degree with  
Universität Salzburg

Course of Comparative Politics

# Is Foreign Policy a Good Ol' Boys Club? Gendered Networks in the European Parliament

Dr. Andrea Capati

SUPERVISOR

Dr. Thomas Christiansen

CO-SUPERVISOR

Molly Mar Flick- Kaiser 662452

CANDIDATE

Academic Year 2025/2026

## Table of Contents

|                                                                                                   |     |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| 1. Introduction                                                                                   | 7   |
| 1.1 History of Gender Mainstreaming in the European Union                                         | 7   |
| 1.2 Pushback Against Equality                                                                     | 7   |
| 1.3 Policy Development and the Good Old Boys' Club                                                | 8   |
| 1.4 Defining Gender                                                                               | 9   |
| 1.5 Structure                                                                                     | 14  |
| 2. Literature Review                                                                              | 15  |
| 2.1 Literature: Independent Variable, Gender                                                      | 15  |
| 2.2 Literature: Dependent Variable, Dynamics in the European Parliament                           | 19  |
| 3. Theoretical Framework / Hypotheses / Expectations:                                             | 21  |
| 3.1 Determinants of Gender Dynamics: Social Network Theory, Constructivist Feminism, and Tokenism | 23  |
| 3. 2 Justification of Research Areas                                                              | 24  |
| 3.2 A Why International Relations and the European Union?                                         | 24  |
| 3.2 B Why the European Parliament?                                                                | 48  |
| 3.2 C Why does Political Group/ Party matter?                                                     | 51  |
| 3.2 C.1 Political Group Positions on Gender Equality                                              | 55  |
| 3.2 C.2 The Far Right in the European Parliament                                                  | 55  |
| 3.2 D Why does Nationality matter?                                                                | 58  |
| 4. Research Design and Method                                                                     | 64  |
| 4.1 Content Analysis                                                                              | 65  |
| 4.2 Social Network Analysis Approach                                                              | 67  |
| 4.3 Selection of Debates: AFET and DEVE                                                           | 70  |
| 4.4 Selection of Debate Type: Non-legislative Reports (INI)                                       | 72  |
| 4.5 Language of Debates                                                                           | 73  |
| 4.6 Gender Identities of AFET and DEVE MEPs                                                       | 75  |
| 4.7 Challenges                                                                                    | 108 |
| 4.8 Expectations                                                                                  | 111 |
| 5. Results                                                                                        | 112 |
| 5.1 Results Debate 1                                                                              | 113 |
| 5.2 Results Debate 2                                                                              | 116 |
| 5.3 Results Debate 3                                                                              | 117 |
| 5.4 Results Debate 4                                                                              | 119 |
| 5.5 Results Debate 5                                                                              | 121 |
| 5.6 Results Debate 6                                                                              | 124 |
| 5.7 Results Debate 7                                                                              | 126 |
| 5.8 Results Debate 8                                                                              | 129 |

|                                                                    |     |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| 5.9 Results AFET Debates                                           | 132 |
| 5.10 Results DEVE Debates                                          | 135 |
| 5.11 DEVE vs. AFET                                                 | 138 |
| 5.12 Total Results                                                 | 145 |
| 5.13 Control for Member State, Political Group, and National Party | 149 |
| 5.13 A Debate 1 Results                                            | 149 |
| 5.13 B Debate 2 Results                                            | 150 |
| 5.13 C Debate 3 Results                                            | 150 |
| 5.13 D Debate 4 Results                                            | 151 |
| 5.13 E AFET Results                                                | 151 |
| 5.13 F Debate 5 Results                                            | 151 |
| 5.13 G Debate 6 Results                                            | 152 |
| 5.13 H Debate 7 Results                                            | 152 |
| 5.13 I Debate 8 Results                                            | 153 |
| 5.13 J DEVE Results                                                | 153 |
| 5.13 K AFET vs. DEVE and Total Results                             | 153 |
| 5.13 L Share of Speakers by Gender                                 | 154 |
| 5.14 Results Conclusion                                            | 155 |
| 6. Analysis                                                        | 156 |
| 6.1 Overall Interactions                                           | 156 |
| 6.2 Forms of Address used by the Chair                             | 160 |
| 6.3 Non-Chair Interactions                                         | 161 |
| 6.4 Handshakes                                                     | 161 |
| 6.5 Social Network Analysis                                        | 161 |
| 7. Conclusion                                                      | 164 |
| Bibliography                                                       | 168 |

## List of Tables and Figures

|                                                                             |     |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Table 1: European Parliament Committees: Gender Distribution                | 28  |
| Table 2: European Commission Active Staff by Directorate General and Gender | 30  |
| Table 3: Committee on Development (DEVE): Gender Identities                 | 76  |
| Table 4: Committee on Development (DEVE): Substitutes Gender Identities     | 84  |
| Table 5: Committee on Foreign Affairs (AFET): Gender Identities             | 90  |
| Table 6: Committee on Foreign Affairs (AFET): Substitutes Gender Identities | 99  |
| Table 7: Categories of Interactions                                         | 109 |
| Table 8: Codebook: Interactions                                             | 110 |
| Table 9: Debate 1 Number of Interactions                                    | 113 |
| Table 10: Forms of Address Used by the Chair in Debate 1                    | 114 |
| Table 11: Forms of Address Used for the Chair in Debate 1                   | 114 |
| Table 12: Debate 2 Number of Interactions                                   | 116 |
| Table 13: Forms of Address Used by the Chair in Debate 2                    | 116 |
| Table 14: Forms of Address Used for the Chair in Debate 2                   | 116 |
| Table 15: Non-Chair Interactions in Debate 2                                | 116 |
| Table 16: Debate 3 Number of Interactions                                   | 118 |
| Table 17: Forms of Address Used by the Chair in Debate 3                    | 118 |
| Table 18: Forms of Address Used for the Chair in Debate 3                   | 118 |
| Table 19: Debate 4 Number of Interactions                                   | 120 |
| Table 20: Forms of Address Used by the Chair in Debate 4                    | 120 |
| Table 21: Forms of Address Used for the Chair in Debate 4                   | 120 |
| Table 22: Non-Chair Interactions in Debate 4                                | 121 |
| Table 23: Debate 5 Number of Interactions                                   | 121 |
| Table 24: Forms of Address Used by the Chair in Debate 5                    | 122 |
| Table 25: Forms of Address Used for the Chair in Debate 5                   | 122 |
| Table 26: Non-Chair Interactions in Debate 5                                | 122 |
| Table 27: Forms of Address Used in Non-Chair Interactions in Debate 5       | 123 |
| Table 28: Debate 6 Number of Interactions                                   | 124 |
| Table 29: Forms of Address Used by the Chair in Debate 6                    | 125 |
| Table 30: Forms of Address Used for the Chair in Debate 6                   | 125 |
| Table 31: Non-Chair Interactions in Debate 6                                | 125 |
| Table 32: Forms of Address Used in Non-Chair Interactions in Debate 6       | 125 |
| Table 33: Debate 7 Number of Interactions                                   | 126 |
| Table 34: Forms of Address Used by the Chair in Debate 7                    | 127 |
| Table 35: Forms of Address Used for the Chair in Debate 7                   | 127 |
| Table 36: Non-Chair Interactions in Debate 7                                | 127 |
| Table 37: Forms of Address Used in Non-Chair Interactions in Debate 7       | 128 |
| Table 38: Debate 8 Number of Interactions                                   | 129 |
| Table 39: Forms of Address Used by the Chair in Debate 8                    | 129 |
| Table 40: Forms of Address Used for the Chair in Debate 8                   | 130 |
| Table 41: Non-Chair Interactions in Debate 8                                | 130 |
| Table 42: Forms of Address Used in Non-Chair Interactions in Debate 8       | 130 |
| Table 43: AFET Total Interactions                                           | 132 |
| Table 44: Forms of Address Used by the Chair in AFET Debates                | 132 |
| Table 45: Forms of Address Used for the Chair in AFET Debates               | 133 |

|                                                                               |     |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Table 46: Non-Chair Interactions in AFET Debates                              | 133 |
| Table 47: AFET Handshakes                                                     | 133 |
| Table 48: DEVE Total Interactions                                             | 135 |
| Table 49: Forms of Address Used by the Chair in DEVE                          | 135 |
| Table 50: Forms of Address Used for the Chair in DEVE Debates                 | 136 |
| Table 51: Non-Chair Interactions in DEVE Debates                              | 136 |
| Table 52: DEVE vs AFET Total Number of Interactions                           | 138 |
| Table 53: Forms of Address Used by the Chair DEVE vs. AFET                    | 138 |
| Table 54: Mention of Another MEP DEVE vs. AFET                                | 140 |
| Table 55: Forms of Address Used for the Chair DEVE vs. AFET                   | 141 |
| Table 56: Total Results                                                       | 145 |
| Table 57: Forms of Address Used by the Chair Total                            | 146 |
| Table 58: Forms of Address Used for the Chair Total                           | 147 |
| Table 59: Total Non-Chair Interactions                                        | 148 |
| Table 60: Social Network Analysis: Forms of Address Used by the Chair in DEVE | 162 |
| Table 61: Social Network Analysis: Forms of Address Used by the Chair in AFET | 162 |
| Table 62: Social Network Analysis: Forms of Address Used by the Chair Total   | 162 |
| Table 63: DEVE Social Network Analysis Forms of Address Used for the Chair    | 163 |
| Table 64: AFET Social Network Analysis Forms of Address Used for the Chair    | 163 |
| Table 65: Total Social Network Analysis Forms of Address Used for the Chair   | 164 |

**Abstract**

Gender equality and policy initiatives that benefit women's lives cannot occur until there is a greater collective understanding of gender dynamics in the European Parliament. This thesis asks how gender influences collaboration and decision making among women leaders in the European Union. This exploration of gender and politics is executed through a content analysis of European Parliament debates on INI-non-legislative reports from the AFET and DEVE committees. Using heatmaps, a social network analysis is performed based on these results. In terms of increased same-gender interactions, the findings did not meet expectations; the “harder” committee was not more exclusive than the “softer” one. Overall, these findings suggest there is no overt exclusion of women in the European Parliament, but given the limitations of this thesis, further research could explore gender dynamics through different methods: such as interviews, in-person observations of meetings, and using social network analysis software.

## 1. Introduction

This thesis will aim to answer the question: To what extent does gender influence collaboration and decision-making among women leaders in the European Union? It is important to gain an understanding of how gender impacts the collaboration and decision-making of leaders, as this can inform practices and policies to promote gender equality and representation within the EU (Eklund et al., 2017). Studying gender is important because gender is relevant to all social relationships and interactions; gender helps define power, privilege and access or exclusion to opportunities (Council of Europe, 2022). Gender shapes every aspect of human lives through shaping personal and family relations, career paths, religious practices, the structure of the market, and the process of governance. Additionally, both the world and job sphere are still male-dominated today (Celis et al., 2013).

### 1.1 History of Gender Mainstreaming in the European Union

In 1996, the European Union committed to gender mainstreaming (Sawer et al., 2023). The goal of this was to eliminate gender inequalities in policies, services, and public interventions (*Gender Mainstreaming* | *European Institute for Gender Equality*, 2023). The 2000 Charter of Fundamental Rights reinforced the prohibition of discrimination and the obligation of equality between men and women (Sawer et al., 2023). In 2010, the EU adopted the Women's Charter, outlining principles and standards for gender equality (Sawer et al., 2023). In 2016, the Charter of Fundamental Rights guaranteed that equality between women and men must be ensured in all areas, including employment, work, and pay. In 2016, the Gender Action Plan was adopted, and in 2018, the EU launched the Strategic Approach to the Women, Peace and Security Agenda (Sawer et al., 2023). In 2016, a standing rapporteur on Gender Mainstreaming was nominated, and a second network of gender mainstreaming administrators was set up for each committee (Elomäki & Kantola, 2022). In 2020, the EU adopted the Gender Equality strategy 2020-25 and the Gender Action Plan III for 2021-2025 (Sawer et al., 2023).

### 1.2 Pushback Against Equality

Another reason it is important to study this topic is that there is a pushback against gender equality (Berthet et. al, 2025). There is a push to reinforce patriarchal, heteronormative social

structures under the guise of defending traditional values and natural order. During recent election cycles, there has been a rise of harmful ideological rhetoric, lobbying, and street protests, litigation, hate speech, delegitimization of expert knowledge, the introduction of regressive policies, and the persecution of civil society actors and scholars (Berthet et. al, 2025). These anti-gender attacks contribute to the escalation of hate speech, violence, and persecution as well as policy backsliding, stalled legislative progress, cuts to funding, and a hostile climate for advocacy. This demonization of gender reinforces the normalization of sexism, and most parliaments, even the European Parliament, face anti-gender hostilities (Berthet et. al, 2025).

### 1.3 Policy Development and the Good Old Boys' Club

Understanding gender dynamics within the European Parliament can inform more inclusive policies. Beyond institutionally, this understanding can lead to better outcomes for organizations and society as a whole. Stereotypes about women's behavior often leads to them being outcast; a better understanding of this can lead to better policies (Tremmel & Wahl, 2023). There is significant research into gender and leadership, but disparities in leadership representation persist, so there is a need for more research (Eklund et al., 2017). In a key European Parliament document, it is stated that women's inclusion in decision-making strengthens democracy and results in a more efficient use of human resources, thus benefiting society as a whole (Kantola, 2009). It is also important to assess whether implemented policies and practices have been effective in making progress towards gender equality, and to do so, it is important to understand the intersection between leadership and gender (Parejo & Radulović, 2023).

This research seeks to determine whether women interact and collaborate less with male colleagues than with their fellow female colleagues. If it is found that this is true, further research will be needed to determine what the cause is: if it is found that women tend to choose female colleagues due to shared experience and identity, that communicates a vastly different professional landscape than if the cause is due to exclusion by male colleagues (Cullen & Perez-Truglia, 2019).

This exclusion has been referred to as the good old boys' club. The idea of the good old boys' club refers to men having advantages over their female colleagues when they interact with male

employers and superiors. Men may have access to informal networks that women are often excluded from, where political decisions and consensus are achieved (Kantola & Agustín, 2019). Male-dominant social networks often exclude women and allow men to get ahead in their careers through socialization that is not necessarily available to their female colleagues (Deng et al., 2024). Studies have shown that within party meetings, men perform gendered rituals to dominate conversations even within gender balanced bodies (Kantola & Agustín, 2019). Women may also face surveillance and a burden of doubt about their competencies while men can dominate conversations without doubt over their qualifications (Kantola & Agustín, 2019). Women who do not conform to the norm, by being assertive or having political ambitions, may face informal sanctions like being removed from high-ranking office (Kantola & Agustín, 2019). Gender equality is often measured by comparing men and women and treating men's societal activities and behavior as the norm that women need to achieve (Nousiainen et al., 2013). If it is found that women are only interacting with women due to being excluded, this could be evidence that the parliament is a “good old boys’ club” and is barring women from getting ahead. This could then assist in politicians coming up with new laws and methods to prevent gender discrimination.

#### 1.4 Defining Gender

To conduct gender-related research, one must first define what gender is. In this section, I will discuss the definitions of gender that have been put forward in academic literature and by relevant international organizations and national governments. In addition, I will provide the definition to be used in this research.

How should one define a concept specifically for research purposes? According to Goertz and Mazur, it is important to list the dimensions of a concept, and these concepts are usually abstract and should be based on their constitutive dimensions (Goertz & Mazur, 2008). It is important to acknowledge that gender has multiple meanings. It can be analyzed in terms of the production of sexuality, masculinity, and femininity (Celis et al., 2013). In current scholarship, gender is a complex phenomena, one that is socially constructed and processed (Goertz & Mazur, 2008). An important aspect to acknowledge is that gender is also cultural and can work differently in different places. When developing a concept, it is important to consider whether the concept can be applied well to other cultures, countries, and historical periods (Goertz & Mazur, 2008).

Next, it is important to distinguish between sex and gender. The two concepts are often conflated (Lindqvist et al., 2020). When gender was first becoming a concept that was studied, sex and gender were considered as separate concepts (West & Zimmerman, 1987). In English, sex is often considered a physiological body aspect, and gender is a more social aspect with cultural meaning attached to behaviors, personalities, and expressions that are conventionally labeled as either male or masculine. Sex is considered biological, and includes anatomy, hormones, physiology, cultural, and social means. The concept of gender brings the question of what people would be like biologically without cultural ideologies that define and shape gender. (Goertz & Mazur, 2008).

Gender is a social variable that is assigned to individuals; the foundation of many societies is built upon this assignment, one that is often used to disadvantage women (Goertz & Mazur, 2008). Sex and gender are independent of one another. The biological sexes of male and female are culturally constructed to define what it means to be women and men; as a result, women perform femininity, and men perform masculinity (Goertz & Mazur, 2008). Some cultures even recognize three or four genders (Goertz & Mazur, 2008). Some scholars have suggested the two terms should be used together; however, this assumes sex defines gender, which is not always the case, especially since sex is not as objective of a category as was once believed (Lindqvist et al., 2020). It cannot be determined exclusively and essentially, because human bodies do not all fall into two categories (Goertz & Mazur, 2008). Gender has been socially and politically constructed through the definition of femininity and masculinity in institutions. Society even assigns genders to inanimate things, such as the military being seen as masculine and nursing as female, when neither of these things is alive or has a human body. These definitions come from our beliefs about masculinity and femininity, which we may not even know are ingrained in us. Gender can be created through policies and concepts that to us seem to have nothing to do with gender (Goertz & Mazur, 2008). Gender analysis has to battle natural attitudes about gender and what people assume this to mean (Goertz & Mazur, 2008).

It is important to discuss why it is even necessary to define gender. Firstly, one should acknowledge that the gender binary system is problematic (Lindqvist et al., 2020). However, leaving gender as a research variable un-operationalized could lead to error in measurement,

leading to inaccurate findings or misrepresentation of findings, and may discriminate against individuals who identify as something other than male or female, erasing transsexuals and ignoring the gray zone of gender (Lindqvist et al., 2020). However, quantitative research requires researchers to categorize responses.

According to Goertz and Mazur, a good concept for research must have multiple dimensions with a broad scope and an ability to be generalized (Goertz & Mazur, 2008). Therefore, dichotomizing the variable of gender hinders researchers from conducting research that is good and interesting. Lindqvist et al argue that offering women and men instead of male and female should be used as it can be more open to transgender individuals. Non-binary individuals could be considered under the umbrella term of transgender; however, not every individual who identifies as non-binary considers themselves to be transgender, and this is an issue in research (Lindqvist et al., 2020). Thus, the dilemma is how to categorize gender identities without losing diversity, but still being able to conduct statistical analysis. Lindqvist recommends a table with descriptive statistics. However, for some research and measurement purposes it can be necessary to operationalize gender.

The concept of gender was born in the mid-1980s, and according to Goertz and Mazur, academics preferred to use this term because it allowed for the analysis of social construction of women and men in ethnicity/race, caste, and class terms, and power relations between men and women in everyday lives (Goertz & Mazur, 2008). Because many measures in measuring democracy continue to exclude women and the concept falls behind in including women, it is sometimes necessary to look at gender in a more simplified way. Thus, defining gender can at times be simplified to be fifty percent of the population in the definitions of measurement (Goertz & Mazur, 2008).

I will now present four potential ways that gender can be operationalized according to the existing literature: physiological bodily aspects (sex), gender identity (self-defined gender), legal gender, and social gender (related to norm-behavior and gender expression) (Lindqvist et al., 2020).

The first way is to simply use the self-definition of gender. Self-defined gender can be fluid for some, but tends to be stable through life and contexts for most people (Lindqvist et al., 2020). However, for some people, it can change based on the context and throughout times in their lives.

Another way to define gender is through legal gender. In most societies, people are categorized as either male or female when they are born. This is usually done through a visual inspection of a baby's genitals, which is then put on the passport or birth certificate (Lindqvist et al., 2020). This is a convenient method, because it is registered in official public statistics and is easy to measure. However, legal gender is not a very precise measurement of gender because it does not consider gender diversity, and many gender diverse individuals do not change their legal gender (Lindqvist et al., 2020).

Another potential method to define gender, according to Lindqvist, is gender expression. This method is just to ask participants how they see themselves and how others see them, as masculine or feminine. This is connected to social gender as it is tied to appearance and behavioral norms. However, norms vary over time and contexts; thus, it may be difficult to use expression as a measurement in research (Lindqvist et al., 2020).

Gender can also be defined by giving a variety of characteristics, and if one meets all or some characteristics, they can be defined as a certain gender. According to Goertz and Mazur, Collier and Mahone give a variety of definitions to discuss the concept of a mother: female, provides fifty percent of genetic makeup, gives birth to a child, provides nurturance, and is married to another caregiver (Goertz & Mazur, 2008). This encompasses multiple concepts; this definition of mother includes adoptive mothers, stepmothers, and other concepts of a mother that may be excluded if the concept is defined as a genetic relation (Goertz & Mazur, 2008). Additionally, one can consider the aspects to have different weights. This is relevant in the definition of gender, that not all characteristics must be required.

Finally, it is relevant to look at how gender is defined by governments and international organizations, as this research will be mostly political science-based and will focus on

international relations, in particular, the European Union. The United Nations, the United States Government, and the Canadian government provide official definitions written in English. I will provide the definitions from the United Nations, the United States government, and the Canadian government. These cases were selected because the websites were originally written in English and not translated, since sometimes meanings can be lost in translation (Van Nes et al., 2010).

According to the United States government, gender is the cultural roles, behaviors, activities, and attributes expected of people based on their sex (Center for Disease Control and Prevention, 2024). According to the Canadian government, gender is an individual's personal and social identity as either a man, woman, or a non-binary person, which is an individual who is not exclusively a man or woman. They state that gender includes gender identity, gender expression. They explicitly acknowledge that a person's gender can be different from sex and birth and what is on their legal documents (Government of Canada, Statistics Canada, 2024). According to the World Health Organization, sex is biological and physiological, and gender is socially constructed through norms, roles, and relationships between groups of men and women, and varies between societies and can be changed. Gender is relational, hierarchical, historical, contextual, and institutional (Council of Europe, 2025). Most individuals are born either male or female and taught appropriate norms and behaviors for their gender. Individuals who do not conform are stigmatized and discriminated against. According to the Council of Europe, gender is defined as socially constructed roles, behaviors, and activities that a given society decides are appropriate for women and men (Council of Europe, 2025). The European Institute for Gender Equality, an autonomous body of the EU, also distinguished sex as a biological characteristic, and gender as social tributes that are socially constructed and learned through socialization and are context and time-specific, and determine expectations and what individuals are allowed to do (Council of Europe, 2025).

Taking all of these into account, the following is how gender will be defined for the purposes of this thesis. First, the paper will look at gender and not sex. Biological sex and legal gender are irrelevant. Self-defined gender will be used; while this can change, for most, it doesn't, and it is defined as the gender that an individual presents and defines themselves as. This is consistent

with how International Organizations and national governments tend to define gender, and with how most scholars approach gender.

## 1.5 Structure

This thesis is structured into seven chapters with a title page, table of contents, and bibliography. After the title page and table of contents, the introduction chapter will introduce the research question, explain the hypothesis, and what is intended to be shown in the thesis, and introduce the research method. Next, it will include a brief history of gender mainstreaming in the EU and its policies. The next section will discuss the current trend of anti-gender attacks and policy backsliding. Then, the thesis will discuss how understanding gender dynamics can lead to better policies and introduce the concept of the Good Ol' Boys Club. The next section will discuss potential methods for defining gender and provide a definition to be used for the thesis. The final section will lay out the structure of the thesis.

Chapter two will be the Literature Review. This will be divided into two subsections: one for the independent variable: gender, and one for the dependent variable: dynamics in the European Parliament. Each section will summarize the relevant literature available on those topics. For the independent variable, it will include literature about women's representation in the European Union, obstacles in reaching leadership positions, the role of gender in parliamentary attacks, and studies on the European Parliament. The section on dynamics in the European Parliament summarizes relevant literature about collaboration and decision making among women, including literature about communication styles, leadership styles, perceptions of leader effectiveness, and female behavior.

Chapter three will present the theoretical framework. The first section will discuss three relevant theories and concepts, and discuss what is expected to be found based on those theories. The next section will justify the chosen research areas and the choice of International relations and the European Union, and more specifically, the European Parliament. Finally, this chapter will discuss why the political group, party, and nationality of an MEP are relevant for this thesis. Chapter four will discuss the research design and method. First, the content analysis method to

be used for the parliamentary debates will be presented. The next section will discuss the Social Network Analysis approach and how it will be applied to the findings of the content analysis. The next section will discuss the two committees (AFET and DEVE) that were selected for this thesis. The following section will discuss and justify the choice to focus on debates on non-legislative reports. The following section will discuss multilingualism in the EU and how it will affect this study. The next section will discuss how the gender identities of MEPs (Members of the European Parliament) will be determined and provide a table of the identities of each committee member.

Chapter five will be the results section. This section will be the content analysis portion. It will discuss the number of interactions observed and discuss any found patterns. It will discuss the results of each debate as well as the total results. It will then discuss how other factors may have impacted observations, including nationality, political group, and party membership. Any observed differences in the results between the DEVE and the AFET committee will also be discussed. These results will be demonstrated visually in a table. This section will conclude with a statement about the hypothesis, whether the results support the hypothesis or not.

The following chapter will be the analysis chapter, specifically the social network analysis portion. This section will analyze the results in the context of the greater social network and discuss what the results can tell us about the social networks of the European Parliament and the roles of male and female MEPs within them. It will also discuss the results in the context of Social Network theory, Constructivist Feminism, and tokenism.

The final chapter will be the conclusion chapter, which will summarize key findings, answer the research questions, and address limitations and the need for further research.

## 2. Literature Review

### 2.1 Literature: Independent Variable, Gender

There is existing literature that relates to the independent variable in this study: gender. Müller and Tömmel have studied women's representation in the European Union. Artaç and Oğurlu

studied barriers for women to access leadership. Additionally, Poljak studied how gender impacts parliamentary attacks, and Ash et. al. studied how gender affects reactions to speeches from female vs. male parliament members. Finally, Costa has studied the European Parliament specifically.

Relevant literature has focused on leadership in the European Union and the barriers to career progression and promotion involved. Müller and Tömmel in *Women and Leadership in the European Union* investigated how women in leadership positions influence the governance, policies, and institutional culture of the European Union, and the systemic barriers and facilitators to their participation and effectiveness. They developed six hypotheses that increased leadership styles of women have an overall positive effect, and that the impact of leadership styles of women varies in different institutions and member states (Müller and Tömmel, 2022). They used a combined approach of a statistical examination of women's representation in EU institutions over time and how it correlates with policy outcomes. They also conducted a case study, exploring the careers of individual female leaders and their contributions to policies. Additionally, they compared the approaches to gender parity among different EU institutions and member states, highlighting the differences in their approaches to leadership roles (Müller and Tömmel, 2022). The dependent variables in their study include policy outcomes, institutional culture, leadership dynamics, and gender representation. The independent variables are the presence of women in leadership positions, institutional and structural reforms, the national and cultural context, systemic barriers, and support mechanisms. They found an increased representation of women in EU leadership roles over recent decades, but a gap that persists in top executive positions, foreign affairs, and economic policy. They also noted that significant strides have been made in the EU Parliament, but not as many in the Commission and European Council (Müller and Tömmel, 2022). Women have been able to significantly advance policies specifically in gender equality, social justice, family welfare, and in broader social and environmental issues. They found that the inclusion of women in leadership roles leads to a more inclusive and collaborative culture in EU institutions. Finally, they found that the impact and representation of female leaders vary significantly across EU institutions and member states (Müller and Tömmel, 2022).

Artec and Orgulu studied obstacles for women reaching leadership positions. They conducted semi-structured interviews with eleven ministers in the Northern Cyprus Parliament and ten members of the Central Executive Body of the Parties in the national assembly (Artaç & Oğurlu, 2024). They sought to find out the obstacles and determining factors that make it difficult for women to reach leadership positions. Using feminist theory, they hypothesized that attitudes of society and politics determine whether women participate in political leadership positions. They found that women politicians believe gender inequality prevents women from entering politics and seeking leadership positions (Artaç & Oğurlu, 2024). There was no gender discrimination and women had equal rights with men, but they concluded that traditional political culture kept women out of politics (Artaç & Oğurlu, 2024).

Poljak in *The Role of Gender in Parliamentary Attacks and Incivility*, asked what the role of gender is in parliamentary attacks, and hypothesized that men prioritize attacks during campaigns more than women (Poljak, 2022). He used the role congruence theory of prejudice in his analysis. He tested parliamentary questions from the federal parliaments of Belgium, Croatia, and the UK and used logistic regressions (Poljak, 2022). The dependent variables were whether politicians chose to attack, whether they were targets, and whether incivility was a part of an attack. The independent variables were gender and proximity to elections (Poljak, 2022). They found support that both women and men behave in stereotypical gender roles in parliamentary attacks. Women were less likely to be civil in attacks, and when women were receiving attacks, there was a greater chance that the attacks were civil. They found women use incivility less than men (Poljak, 2022).

Elliott Ash, Johann Krümmel, and Jonathan B. Slapin in “Gender and reactions to speeches in German parliamentary debates” asked if nonverbal reactions during parliamentary debates are gendered? Do male and female members of parliament experience applause or jeering differently? Social identity theory and role congruity theory were used as a model to learn gender-topic congruence. They also used linear regression to estimate the statistical effect of gender-incongruent statements on the prevalence of negative feedback (Ash et al., 2024). The dependent variable in their study is reaction counts, the sum of positive and negative reactions, the share of positive reactions, and the presence of any reaction in the female gender. The

independent variable was gender. They found that female Members of Parliament receive slightly more positive reactions and fewer negative reactions than male MPs. Of the reactions female MPs received, more were positive than negative (Ash et al., 2024). Women received more applause but less cheerfulness. Speeches by women were less often interjected and received less laughter, but saw more unrest. They found that gender matters when it comes to reactions to speeches, but there was little evidence that women do not experience more negative reactions than men (Ash et al., 2024).

The final research area focuses specifically on the European Parliament. Costa from Sciences Po identified six main areas and approaches that researchers have used when studying the European Parliament (Costa, 2018). The first is an institutional approach, which focuses on the role, competencies, and where the parliament gets its power from. The second has an organizational focus, looking at the Parliament members, their political groups, and their assistants. A third area focuses on the elections for the European Parliament. Additionally, research on the European Parliament has focused on how the parliament interacts with external actors. Fifthly, research has studied MEP's social biographic history. This research project partially fits in the category as it focuses on gender identity, but it also looks at the second one, looking at how parliament members interact. Finally, the last area looks at the activities of the European Parliament and how the European Parliament uses its power (Costa, 2018).

Michael G. Miller and Sutherland in *The Effect of Gender on Interruptions at Congressional Hearings* asked whether women are interrupted more often during committee hearings in the U.S. Congress (Miller & Sutherland, 2022). They hypothesized that women are more likely to experience interruption in Congressional committees than men. They performed a content analysis of 24,103 congressional hearings from 1994 to 2018, looking at the independent variable of gender and the dependent variable of whether a speaker was interrupted or not (Miller & Sutherland, 2022). They found that women in Congress are significantly more likely to be interrupted and even more so in committee hearings where topics are women's issues. They found that as women gain experience in Congress, they do not become more aggressive like men and do not interrupt other members more (Miller & Sutherland, 2022).

This study builds on the existing literature by not only looking at women's participation but also whether they are able to interact with other members of Parliament and access the same social networks that men can. It also looks at interactions outside of attacks and aggression as Miller and Sutherland, for instance, have done.

## 2.2 Literature: Dependent Variable, Dynamics in the European Parliament

Relevant literature has looked at gender dynamics in politics and international organizations as an independent variable. I divide relevant research in this category into three categories: research surrounding communication styles, leadership styles, and the perception of effectiveness of women compared to men.

Hargrave and Langengen, Romieniecka, and Hargrave and Blumenau have all focused on communication styles. Hargrave and Langengen looked at communication styles in the context of parliamentary speech-making in the U.K. House of Commons (Hargrave & Langengen, 2022). They hypothesized that men are more likely to use adversarial, aggressive, and combative language during debates, while women tend to use more collaborative, inclusive language. Using the Independent Variable of gender and the dependent variable of communication style, they used transcripts of parliamentary debates and examined statistically; word frequency, speech metrics, and interruption rates, and analyzed themes and discourse in content (Hargrave & Langengen, 2022). Romieniecka in “Non-Verbal Cues in Politics: An Analysis of Gestural Signals sent by American and European Politicians”, asked which body signals sent by American and European Politicians were considered positive and to strengthen the verbal message, and which were said to be negative and make the performer look unprofessional and untrustworthy? (Romieniecka, 2008) She hypothesized that nonverbal behaviors influence the way politicians are perceived. She used a survey with fifty participants (37 of whom were female) who were all citizens of Poland and university graduates. They were asked to analyze six photographs with American and European Politicians and complete a survey (Romieniecka, 2008). They were asked about competence, likeability, and trustworthiness. They were asked to guess the meaning of gestural signals and explain whether the speaker looked professional or unprofessional. They found some support that nonverbal behaviour influences the way politicians are perceived and that political gestures are country-specific and do not have a universal meaning (Romieniecka,

2008). They also found that dress is the most persuasive non-verbal cue in deciding the professionalism of a politician (Rominiecka, 2008). Hargrave and Blumenau in “No Longer Conforming to Stereotypes? Gender, Political Style and Parliamentary Debate in the UK”, asked if incentives for politicians to conform to gender stereotypes diminished over time, and used gender role theory in their research. They observed texts of political speeches delivered in the UK Parliament to observe the styles adopted by speakers. They looked at House of Commons Debates from 1997 to 2019 (Hargrave & Blumenau, 2022). They looked at 14,864 debates from 1,422 members of parliament, 370 of which were female, and 418,147 debate observations. They found that, in particular, recently, women have demonstrated less communal and more agentic styles and that the gender gap has decreased (Hargrave & Blumenau, 2022).

Additional literature has focused on leadership styles. Berdecia-Cruz et al in “The gender differences in innovative mentality, leadership styles and organisational innovative behaviour: the case of the '40 Under 40' and their impact on organisational success” asked if men and women have a different or a similar approach to the leadership role? (Berdecia-Cruz et al., 2022). They used a questionnaire of leaders and managers in the UK and asked respondents about their gender and how often they adopted each of the four leadership styles. They found that women indicated that they delegated less than men did, but this study did not reach significance, so overall they found that leadership styles were the same (Berdecia-Cruz et al., 2022). Malihaha et. al. in “How does women’s political skills and leadership styles impact public satisfaction?” hypothesized that political skills and leadership style influence public satisfaction (Malihah et al., 2024). They sampled women politicians from different levels of government and distributed surveys to the politicians and a sample of the public. The dependent variable of the study was public satisfaction, which they determined through public opinion surveys. The independent variable was political skills and leadership styles. They found that political skill influences public satisfaction (Malihah et al., 2024).

Finally, relevant literature has focused on the perception of the effectiveness of female leaders. Krisztina Timko in Gender, Communication Styles, and Leader Effectiveness asked how gender and communication styles influence perceptions of leader effectiveness (Timko, 2017). They hypothesized that male leaders are followed more than female leaders, that male leaders more

often request the highest effort level, and that men are more effective than women. They simulated experimental sessions where participants were put in groups of five and were informed after the session of their earnings and group minimum effort, and played the weak link game once without a leader and once with a leader (Timko, 2017). Overall, they found that men communicate more assertively than women, and if women have an “open door”, they emphasize more often that the leader is an equal member of the group (Timko, 2017). Recent research has focused on the behaviour of women. In “Gender Interactions within Hierarchies: Evidence from the Political Arena” Stefano Gagliarducci and Daniele Paserman asked how gender dynamics affect the interactions and performance of individuals within hierarchical structures, specifically within the context of political institutions? Looking at a data set for all the Italian mayoral terms from 1993 to 2008 with information on gender, age, education level, political affiliation, previous employment, losing candidates, and economic information, they found that the probability of early termination of the legislature's term was between three and five percent higher when the mayor was a woman. They hypothesized that this could be due to female leaders being discriminated against by their mostly male subordinates (Gagliarducci & Paserman, 2009). They found this hypothesis was somewhat supported by the data since when the mayor interacted with an entirely male council, the woman was least likely to survive to the end of the term. They found alternative explanations were less supported by the data (Gagliarducci & Paserman, 2009).

This study builds on the existing literature by combining speaking frequency and social network analysis. This builds on the literature to examine the institutional interactions between members and not just in their positions as leaders. Based on the literature on communication and leadership, in this thesis gender dynamics is the patterns of interaction and communication between MEPs that reflect gendered norms and practices. This is operationalized in this thesis as the verbal and non-verbal interactions between MEPs allowing for observation of gendered structures among MEPs. These are measured through the frequency of interactions between MEPs measured through a content social network analysis.

### 3. Theoretical Framework / Hypotheses / Expectations:

To answer the research question, three main theories and the idea of “tokenism” are relevant. Social network theory says that women and men create different social networks within the same

contexts, such as the workplace (Liu et al., 2017). Social network theory can be used to examine whether women in the European Parliament create different social networks than their male colleagues. According to social network theory, I can hypothesize that female MEPs create different social networks than male MEPS, and this affects their interactions with other MEPs (Liu et al., 2017). Social network theory may be able to explain differences in interactions between men and women during debates.

The second relevant theory is constructivist feminism, which examines how gendered identities and norms influence state behavior, foreign policy, and international organizations (Prins, 1995). Constructivist feminism could be used to investigate how gender roles and norms in the EU shape the behavior and interactions of women leaders. I could use this theory to evaluate how the European Parliament contributes to the construction of gender norms.

Social constructivism is also relevant; it emphasizes the social construction of institutions, processes, and actors, and the effects, especially paying attention to roles, norms, and power between actors (Lombardo and Kantola et al., 2021). However, mainstream social constructivism often ignores gender. According to Lombardo and Kantola, there are three main ideas of social constructivism: integration as social construction, constantly changing based on social interactions, agents and structures are mutually constituted, and ideas, discourses, and meanings are important elements to explain policy change in Europe (Lombardo and Kantola et al., 2021). Europeans are socialized into the EU polity when they become parliament members, and they internalize EU social norms, which influences their identities and formation as actors (Lombardo and Kantola et al., 2021).

While Lombardo and Kantola find value in this approach, they also contend that the EU institutional agents and discourses are gendered (Lombardo and Kantola et al., 2021). Power itself is gendered, and if the social construction of the EU is done without incorporating gender and intersectionality, important analytical insights will be missed (Lombardo and Kantola et al., 2021).

Another relevant idea is the idea of “tokenism.” According to Kanter’s theory, established in 1977, individuals in groups that are limited in their professions, such as women in parliament (women make up 37.5% of the European parliament, and 36.1% of the Austrian parliament), will face pressure to perform well, more boundaries, and role entrapment (European Parliament). Role entrapment is when groups in power define the roles that minority groups are allowed to fill; these can be social and occupational roles and tend to be those that are seen as undesirable. Tokenism will be relevant in this study to determine if women are put into specific roles by their male colleagues in debates.

### 3.1 Determinants of Gender Dynamics: Social Network Theory, Constructivist Feminism, and Tokenism

According to the hypothesis, women are expected to interact more with other women in the European Parliament, and to be excluded from interactions with men, and therefore gender is an important aspect when observing these interactions. There are three relevant theories to guide understanding of the hypothesis: social network theory, constructivist feminism, and tokenism.

According to social network theory, in the context of the European Parliament, it is expected that men will be a part of a “good old boys club” where they communicate with each other, help each other, and provide one another with opportunities. We expect women to be excluded from these “clubs” and thus to form networks and communicate mostly with other women.

Constructivist Feminism looks at how gender identity and norms influence state behavior, foreign policy, and the behavior of international organizations (Prins, 1995). Therefore, we expect that gender roles and norms will influence the communications within the European Parliament. As discussed in the “nationality” section of this document, different countries have different gender norms, expectations, and gender roles, and this will influence how MEPs from different member states interact with men and women in the European Parliament. The cultural background of an MEP can help us hypothesize whether to expect men to be more or less likely to interact with their female colleagues.

Based on tokenism, it can be expected that women in the European Parliament will be pushed and limited into certain roles. We can expect that female MEPs will not be taken seriously on more “masculine” “hard” topics such as foreign policy, or economics, and be pushed into more “feminine” “soft” fields such as employment and women’s rights. It is expected that women will be excluded from top positions and from “hard” committees due to tokenism, and that those who are able to participate in these committees will face significant challenges and exclusion.

### 3. 2 Justification of Research Areas

#### 3.2 A Why International Relations and the European Union?

Foreign Policy is often seen as a “hard policy area,” and therefore, women are often underrepresented; therefore, this thesis will focus on foreign policy. There is an existing research gap into women in the EU, as national female leaders, and as female members of the European Parliament (Aggestam & True, 2020). The importance of this research is reinforced by the existence of the European Union as a male-dominated environment, which leads to numerous disconnects between the EU, leadership studies, and gender studies.

Within the EU and politics more broadly, there is the concept of hard and soft policy areas. Some areas are seen as “hard” and therefore have more barriers for women than “soft”, feminine policy areas such as development or women’s issues (Smith & Kozielska, 2024). The exclusion of women from “hard” areas is often referred to as “glass walls.” These “hard areas” include military and finance fields, while soft fields tend to be linked to the private sphere or women (Aggestam & Towns, 2018). These “hard areas”, such as foreign affairs, are often considered prestigious, while soft fields are often seen as less prestigious. Foreign affairs offers potential for significant control over policy. Within the United Nations, more women work in professional and high-ranking positions in agencies such as UN Women or UNICEF, and make up 50% of these agencies, but less than 30% in organizations for meteorological or international atomic agencies (Smith & Kozielska, 2024). Even as women continue to increase their representation, foreign policy and military policy areas are still viewed as one of the least appropriate areas for women. The diplomatic policy arena has long been seen as a male field, with a public image of the diplomat as male and the continued lack of female representation continues to reinforce this idea

(Smith & Kozielska, 2024). These fields are seen as areas that require strength, power, autonomy, independence, and rationality, which are viewed as male characteristics (Peterson, 1993). Women are often considered weak and too emotional, and in turn, unable to make the difficult decisions required in areas of defense and foreign policy (Peterson, 1993). The areas of defense, foreign affairs, and finance policy have been traditionally considered men's domain, and the significant gender gaps continue to persist.

The foreign policy gap can also be seen in the Council Presidency of the European Union, which has only been held by eight women, as compared to one hundred thirty-six men (Aggestam & True, 2020). There has, additionally, never been a female secretary general of the United Nations or NATO, and only four female presidents of the United Nations General Assembly (Smith & Kozielska, 2024). Within foreign affairs, women in top leadership act as a catch-22 since women are traditionally excluded from the military, and it is important for candidates for foreign/defence/security policy areas to have experience in military service (Aggestam & True, 2020).

In the Commission, women are also notably underrepresented in these “hard” fields. Table 2 demonstrates the gender balance within the different DGs (Directorate-Generals) by gender and classification. In this table, “FG 1” is the highest level of staff in the Function Groups, and “FG 4” is the lowest (European Commission). Interestingly, the “male” policy areas are not as uneven as one might expect, implying progress, however, there are still notable differences between the number of men in the higher staff levels and at the lower staff levels. This progress may be due to Ursula von der Leyen’s push for gender equality within the Commission. Beginning with the traditionally “masculine” policy areas, the budget committee has 33% male staff in function group one (lowest level) compared to 41,3% male staff in the higher level. Then, looking at DEFIS (Defense, Industry, and Space), while function group one is 100% female, function group four is 53,3%. And for TRADE, FG1 is 33% male while FG4 is 46% male. Looking at the traditionally “female” areas in education, function group 1 is 75% male, while function group 4 is 25% male. Similarly, in employment, function group one is 22.2% male, while function group four is 36.2% male. While this does not demonstrate a significant gender gap, it does demonstrate differences in the “male” and “female” subject areas as men are making up close to

50% of the “male” committees in the highest function group level, while in the two examples of “female” committees, they make up less than 40%.

In the 8th European Parliament, twelve committee chairs were men, and eight were women. Women are well represented in this leadership in comparison to their overall representation in the European Parliament (Kantola & Miller, 2022). However, according to Kantola, after the most recent EP elections, men still dominate the economy, foreign affairs, and security-related committees, while women are overrepresented in the social affairs and education committees (Kantola, 2025). This demonstrates that even in 2024, gendered expectations and dominations around career choice still persists. Within the committees on foreign affairs after the recent election, 17.7% are female, and the chair is male (Kantola, 2025). This is one of the lowest shares of women within the committees. In comparison, the women’s rights and gender equality committee has 89.7%, and culture and education has 63.3% women. The other “male” areas, like budgetary control (16.7% female) and security and defense (23.3% women) also have lower female representation. The consequences of this gender divide is that it becomes more difficult for women to be viewed as experts in “hard” fields. When looking at the distribution of women’s leadership over the committee types, the most “influential” committees are disproportionately led by men (Dingler & Fortin-Rittberger, 2022). During the 8th parliamentary term, only one-third of powerful committees were chaired or vice-chaired by women. During the 2014-19 term, more than eighty percent of “female” committees were headed by women, women chaired forty percent of those considered neutral, and only thirty-seven percent of those that were considered masculine (Dingler & Fortin-Rittberger, 2022). According to Kantola and Rolandsen Agustín, this gendered division of labor relates to gendered interactions within the parliament and its groups. These perceptions of the gendered committees are reproduced in the roles and choices that are made within party groups (Kantola & Agustín, 2019). Table 1 lays out the percentage of women in each European Parliament Committee for the current term, and the gender of the chair (Kantola, 2015).

More generally, women in international diplomacy are underrepresented. Bans on women participating in diplomatic services were lifted between the 1920s and 50s, but were often replaced with a ban on married female diplomats, and these began to be lifted in the 1970s

(Smith & Kozielska, 2024). Worldwide, only twenty percent of ambassadors are women. In 2023, this number was specifically 20.54%, and this only rose 5% over the last decade (Smith & Kozielska, 2024). Men are overrepresented and women underrepresented in senior diplomatic positions and negotiation processes (Aggestam & Towns, 2018). While there has been some improvement, gender gaps in foreign affairs persist.

Especially, the military and foreign policy is viewed as a very male domain, and not as a place for women. Women's participation in the military is often seen as a security risk and their traditional role as reproducers is seen as a reason to exclude women from combat. Additionally, women are often viewed as too emotional for foreign policy. For example, according to Blanchard, the media coverage and reactions to Representative Patricia Schroeder's withdrawal from the United States presidential primary race, and her display of emotion, demonstrate this. Her emotional response was criticized and used as an example of a reason women should not be in decision-making (Blanchard, 2003). Additionally, in the military, unit cohesion and physical fitness are often used as reasons for women not belonging in the military (Blanchard, 2003). This demonstrated the barriers that women specifically face in foreign policy, which may not be as strong or present at all in other policy areas.

Additionally, the underrepresentation of women can affect the culture of these areas and further alienate the women within them. Kantola identifies that the ECON committee has a culture of masculinity, competitiveness, combativeness, and a debating culture (Kantola, 2025). In an interview in 2019 with a female MEP in monetary affairs, this MEP states she felt alienated from the "harsh" and arrogant "old men's club" and the inside jokes that made her feel socially left out. She compared this to her more positive experience in the employment committee (a "softer" more "feminine" more gender balanced committee) (Kantola & Waylen, 2024). In other interviews, Kantola and Rolandsen Agustín, noted that interviews discussed that economics and finance was constructed as a masculine field, and female MEPs with expertise were challenged, creating a gendered division of labor (Kantola & Agustín, 2019). This is consistent with Elomäki & Kantola findings that the body performance and debate style associated with hegemonic masculinity includes a loud, adversarial, and aggressive speaking style that tends to reward men

who are hyper-masculine and alienate women, creating a tone that excludes women. They find that this culture is especially present in some economic committees (Elomäki & Kantola, 2022).

The Foreign Policy/International Relations field especially reinforces barriers to women, and therefore, it is important for research to look specifically at foreign affairs and how women are viewed and discriminated against in these areas. There is an emerging field of “feminist foreign policy” which promotes feminist principles within the practice of foreign policy (Sawer et al., 2023).

| Table 1: European Parliament Committees: Gender Distribution <sup>1</sup> |              |              |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Committee                                                                 | % Women MEPs | Chair Gender |
| Foreign Affairs                                                           | 17,7         | Man          |
| Human Rights (Subcommittee)                                               | 33,3         | Man          |
| Security and Defence                                                      | 23,3         | Woman        |
| Development                                                               | 40           | Man          |
| International Trade                                                       | 32,6         | Man          |
| Budgets                                                                   | 20           | Man          |
| Budgetary Control                                                         | 16,7         | Man          |

<sup>1</sup> Statistics from: Kantola, J. (2025, February). *Gender Equality at a Crossroads: Implications of the 2024 European Parliament Elections*. Swedish Institute for European Policy Studies; Swedish Institute for European Policy Studies.  
<https://sieps.se/en/publications/2025/gender-equality-at-a-crossroads-implications-of-the-2024-european-parliament-elections/>  
Author obtained from European Parliament websites; Politico (2024). The table was amended to include the committee upgrades on 23 January 2025, see European Parliament (2025).

Table 1: European Parliament Committees: Gender Distribution<sup>1</sup>

| Committee                               | % Women MEPs | Chair Gender |
|-----------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Foreign Affairs                         | 17,7         | Man          |
| Human Rights (Subcommittee)             | 33,3         | Man          |
| Security and Defence                    | 23,3         | Woman        |
| Development                             | 40           | Man          |
| Economic and Monetary Affairs           | 26,7         | Woman        |
| Tax Matters (Subcommittee)              | 17,2         | Man          |
| Employment and Social Affairs           | 56,9         | Woman        |
| Environment, Climate and Food Safety    | 42,2         | Man          |
| Public Health                           | 37,2         | Man          |
| Industry, Research and Energy           | 35,6         | Man          |
| Internal Market and Consumer Protection | 51,9         | Woman        |
| Transport and Tourism                   | 28,3         | Woman        |
| Regional Development                    | 41,5         | Man          |
| Agriculture and Rural Development       | 34,7         | Woman        |
| Fisheries                               | 44,4         | Woman        |
| Culture and Education                   | 63,3         | Woman        |

Table 1: European Parliament Committees: Gender Distribution<sup>1</sup>

| Committee                                 | % Women MEPs | Chair Gender |
|-------------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Foreign Affairs                           | 17,7         | Man          |
| Human Rights (Subcommittee)               | 33,3         | Man          |
| Security and Defence                      | 23,3         | Woman        |
| Development                               | 40           | Man          |
| Legal Affairs                             | 20           | Man          |
| Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs | 49,3         | Man          |
| Constitutional Affairs                    | 13,3         | Man          |
| Women's Rights and Gender Equality        | 89,7         | Woman        |
| Petitions                                 | 42,9         | Man          |

Table 2: European Commission Active Staff by Directorate General and Gender

| DG   | Staff Category      | Male (Raw) | Male (%) | Female (Raw) | Female (%) | Total | % of Total |
|------|---------------------|------------|----------|--------------|------------|-------|------------|
| AGRI | Administrat or (AD) | 242        | 48.50%   | 257          | 51.50%     | 499   | 58.60%     |
| AGRI | Assistant (AST)     | 48         | 22.20%   | 168          | 77.80%     | 216   | 25.40%     |

Table 2: European Commission Active Staff by Directorate General and Gender

|         |                                |     |        |     |        |     |        |
|---------|--------------------------------|-----|--------|-----|--------|-----|--------|
| AGRI    | Assistant-Secretaries (AST-SC) | 10  | 17.90% | 46  | 82.10% | 56  | 6.60%  |
| BUDG    | AD                             | 165 | 55.60% | 132 | 44.40% | 297 | 51.90% |
| BUDG    | AST                            | 51  | 35.20% | 94  | 64.80% | 145 | 25.30% |
| BUDG    | AST-SC                         | 8   | 22.90% | 27  | 77.10% | 35  | 6.10%  |
| CLIMA   | AD                             | 115 | 57.80% | 84  | 42.20% | 199 | 61.20% |
| CLIMA   | AST                            | 9   | 20.00% | 36  | 80.00% | 45  | 13.80% |
| CLIMA   | AST-SC                         | 3   | 30.00% | 7   | 70.00% | 10  | 3.10%  |
| Connect | AD                             | 245 | 61.70% | 152 | 38.30% | 397 | 43.80% |
| Connect | AST                            | 42  | 23.60% | 136 | 76.40% | 178 | 19.60% |
| Connect | AST-SC                         | 7   | 18.40% | 31  | 81.60% | 38  | 4.20%  |
| COLLÈGE | AD                             | 92  | 43.60% | 119 | 56.40% | 211 | 44.10% |

Table 2: European Commission Active Staff by Directorate General and Gender

|         |        |     |        |     |        |     |        |
|---------|--------|-----|--------|-----|--------|-----|--------|
| COLLÈGE | AST    | 41  | 23.40% | 134 | 76.60% | 175 | 36.50% |
| COLLÈGE | AST-SC | 14  | 20.00% | 56  | 80.00% | 70  | 14.60% |
| COMM    | AD     | 139 | 44.40% | 174 | 55.60% | 313 | 33.10% |
| COMM    | AST    | 61  | 31.90% | 130 | 68.10% | 191 | 20.20% |
| COMM    | AST-SC | 4   | 13.30% | 26  | 86.70% | 30  | 3.20%  |
| COMP    | AD     | 311 | 51.90% | 288 | 48.10% | 599 | 67.80% |
| COMP    | AST    | 32  | 22.50% | 110 | 77.50% | 142 | 16.10% |
| COMP    | AST-SC | 15  | 16.50% | 76  | 83.50% | 91  | 10.30% |
| DEFIS   | AD     | 99  | 66.40% | 50  | 33.60% | 149 | 58.00% |
| DEFIS   | AST    | 12  | 27.90% | 31  | 72.10% | 43  | 16.70% |
| DEFIS   | AST-SC | 3   | 42.90% | 4   | 57.10% | 7   | 2.70%  |

Table 2: European Commission Active Staff by Directorate General and Gender

|       |        |     |        |     |        |      |        |
|-------|--------|-----|--------|-----|--------|------|--------|
| DGT   | AD     | 474 | 34.10% | 916 | 65.90% | 1390 | 72.50% |
| DGT   | AST    | 59  | 23.30% | 194 | 76.70% | 253  | 13.20% |
| DGT   | AST-SC | 24  | 23.80% | 77  | 76.20% | 101  | 5.30%  |
| DIGIT | AD     | 219 | 75.30% | 72  | 24.70% | 291  | 48.60% |
| DIGIT | AST    | 95  | 58.30% | 68  | 41.70% | 163  | 27.20% |
| DIGIT | AST-SC | 2   | 9.10%  | 20  | 90.90% | 22   | 3.70%  |
| EAC   | AD     | 98  | 43.80% | 126 | 56.30% | 224  | 56.90% |
| EAC   | AST    | 23  | 24.00% | 73  | 76.00% | 96   | 24.40% |
| EAC   | AST-SC | 2   | 11.10% | 16  | 88.90% | 18   | 4.60%  |
| ECFIN | AD     | 230 | 60.70% | 149 | 39.30% | 379  | 59.70% |
| ECFIN | AST    | 39  | 45.30% | 47  | 54.70% | 86   | 13.50% |

Table 2: European Commission Active Staff by Directorate General and Gender

|       |        |     |        |     |        |     |        |
|-------|--------|-----|--------|-----|--------|-----|--------|
| ECFIN | AST-SC | 7   | 20.00% | 28  | 80.00% | 35  | 5.50%  |
| ECHO  | AD     | 97  | 48.50% | 103 | 51.50% | 200 | 21.90% |
| ECHO  | AST    | 23  | 24.70% | 70  | 75.30% | 93  | 10.20% |
| ECHO  | AST-SC | 2   | 10.50% | 17  | 89.50% | 19  | 2.10%  |
| EMPL  | AD     | 190 | 49.60% | 193 | 50.40% | 383 | 51.50% |
| EMPL  | AST    | 37  | 26.10% | 105 | 73.90% | 142 | 19.10% |
| EMPL  | AST-SC | 6   | 12.80% | 41  | 87.20% | 47  | 6.30%  |
| ENER  | AD     | 230 | 62.50% | 138 | 37.50% | 368 | 58.20% |
| ENER  | AST    | 71  | 48.60% | 75  | 51.40% | 146 | 23.10% |
| ENER  | AST-SC | 5   | 11.90% | 37  | 88.10% | 42  | 6.60%  |
| MOVE  | AD     | 153 | 55.40% | 123 | 44.60% | 276 | 60.40% |

Table 2: European Commission Active Staff by Directorate General and Gender

|      |        |     |         |    |        |     |        |
|------|--------|-----|---------|----|--------|-----|--------|
| MOVE | AST    | 23  | 26.70%  | 63 | 73.30% | 86  | 18.80% |
| MOVE | AST-SC | 3   | 15.00%  | 17 | 85.00% | 20  | 4.40%  |
| OIB  | AD     | 48  | 52.70%  | 43 | 47.30% | 91  | 7.00%  |
| OIB  | AST    | 90  | 52.90%  | 80 | 47.10% | 170 | 13.00% |
| OIB  | AST-SC | 1   | 100.00% | 0  | 0.00%  | 1   | 0.10%  |
| OIL  | AD     | 16  | 55.20%  | 13 | 44.80% | 29  | 6.80%  |
| OIL  | AST    | 39  | 66.10%  | 20 | 33.90% | 59  | 13.90% |
| OIL  | AST-SC | 4   | 40.00%  | 6  | 60.00% | 10  | 2.40%  |
| OLAF | AD     | 134 | 63.50%  | 77 | 36.50% | 211 | 64.50% |
| OLAF | AST    | 29  | 33.30%  | 58 | 66.70% | 87  | 26.60% |
| OLAF | AST-SC | 2   | 22.20%  | 7  | 77.80% | 9   | 2.80%  |

Table 2: European Commission Active Staff by Directorate General and Gender

|       |        |     |         |     |        |     |        |
|-------|--------|-----|---------|-----|--------|-----|--------|
| OP    | AD     | 84  | 57.10%  | 63  | 42.90% | 147 | 25.10% |
| OP    | AST    | 151 | 38.30%  | 243 | 61.70% | 394 | 67.20% |
| OP    | AST-SC | 4   | 23.50%  | 13  | 76.50% | 17  | 2.90%  |
| PMO   | AD     | 21  | 46.70%  | 24  | 53.30% | 45  | 7.40%  |
| PMO   | AST    | 25  | 25.30%  | 74  | 74.70% | 99  | 16.20% |
| PMO   | AST-SC | 1   | 100.00% | 0   | 0.00%  | 1   | 0.20%  |
| REFOR | AD     | 71  | 45.50%  | 85  | 54.50% | 156 | 58.00% |
| REFOR | AST    | 3   | 10.70%  | 25  | 89.30% | 28  | 10.40% |
| REFOR | AST-SC | 8   | 100.00% | 0   | 0.00%  | 8   | 3.00%  |
| REGIO | AD     | 165 | 45.70%  | 196 | 54.30% | 361 | 53.60% |
| REGIO | AST    | 39  | 28.90%  | 96  | 71.10% | 135 | 20.00% |

Table 2: European Commission Active Staff by Directorate General and Gender

|       |        |     |        |     |        |     |        |
|-------|--------|-----|--------|-----|--------|-----|--------|
| REGIO | AST-SC | 3   | 10.00% | 27  | 90.00% | 30  | 4.50%  |
| RTD   | AD     | 273 | 60.90% | 175 | 39.10% | 448 | 47.20% |
| RTD   | AST    | 60  | 30.90% | 134 | 69.10% | 194 | 20.40% |
| RTD   | AST-SC | 6   | 21.40% | 22  | 78.60% | 28  | 3.00%  |
| SANTE | AD     | 225 | 50.00% | 225 | 50.00% | 450 | 61.10% |
| SANTE | AST    | 27  | 19.60% | 111 | 80.40% | 138 | 18.80% |
| SANTE | AST-SC | 9   | 17.30% | 43  | 82.70% | 52  | 7.10%  |
| SCIC  | AD     | 171 | 31.30% | 376 | 68.70% | 547 | 72.80% |
| SCIC  | AST    | 42  | 47.70% | 46  | 52.30% | 88  | 11.70% |
| SCIC  | AST-SC | 13  | 31.00% | 29  | 69.00% | 42  | 5.60%  |
| SG    | AD     | 179 | 49.60% | 182 | 50.40% | 361 | 56.50% |

Table 2: European Commission Active Staff by Directorate General and Gender

|       |        |     |        |     |        |     |        |
|-------|--------|-----|--------|-----|--------|-----|--------|
| SG    | AST    | 32  | 20.90% | 121 | 79.10% | 153 | 23.90% |
| SG    | AST-SC | 8   | 15.70% | 43  | 84.30% | 51  | 8.00%  |
| SJ    | AD     | 146 | 54.90% | 120 | 45.10% | 266 | 65.70% |
| SJ    | AST    | 17  | 20.20% | 67  | 79.80% | 84  | 20.70% |
| SJ    | AST-SC | 5   | 16.70% | 25  | 83.30% | 30  | 7.40%  |
| TAXUD | AD     | 195 | 58.60% | 138 | 41.40% | 333 | 67.70% |
| TAXUD | AST    | 23  | 25.60% | 67  | 74.40% | 90  | 18.30% |
| TAXUD | AST-SC | 1   | 5.30%  | 18  | 94.70% | 19  | 3.90%  |
| TRADE | AD     | 243 | 57.40% | 180 | 42.60% | 423 | 58.40% |
| TRADE | AST    | 32  | 30.80% | 72  | 69.20% | 104 | 14.40% |
| TRADE | AST-SC | 9   | 22.50% | 31  | 77.50% | 40  | 5.50%  |

Table 2: European Commission Active Staff by Directorate General and Gender

|       |       |     |        |     |        |     |        |
|-------|-------|-----|--------|-----|--------|-----|--------|
| EMPL  | FGIV  | 38  | 36.20% | 67  | 63.80% | 105 | 14.10% |
| EMPL  | GFIII | 7   | 19.40% | 29  | 80.60% | 36  | 4.80%  |
| EMPL  | GFII  | 1   | 4.80%  | 20  | 95.20% | 21  | 2.80%  |
| EER   | FGIV  | 13  | 35.10% | 24  | 64.90% | 37  | 5.90%  |
| EER   | GFIII | 5   | 20.00% | 20  | 80.00% | 25  | 4.00%  |
| EER   | GFII  | 2   | 28.60% | 5   | 71.40% | 7   | 1.10%  |
| ENEST | FGIV  | 153 | 46.90% | 173 | 53.10% | 326 | 28.90% |
| ENEST | GFIII | 33  | 39.80% | 50  | 60.20% | 83  | 7.40%  |
| ENEST | GFII  | 3   | 11.50% | 23  | 88.50% | 26  | 2.30%  |
| ENV   | FGIV  | 9   | 39.10% | 14  | 60.90% | 23  | 5.00%  |
| ENV   | GFIII | 4   | 30.80% | 9   | 69.20% | 13  | 2.80%  |

Table 2: European Commission Active Staff by Directorate General and Gender

|       |       |    |         |    |        |    |        |
|-------|-------|----|---------|----|--------|----|--------|
| ENV   | GFII  | 3  | 27.30%  | 8  | 72.70% | 11 | 2.40%  |
| EPSO  | FGIV  | 1  | 100.00% | 0  | 0.00%  | 1  | 0.80%  |
| EPSO  | GFIII | 1  | 25.00%  | 3  | 75.00% | 4  | 3.30%  |
| EPSO  | GFII  | 6  | 33.30%  | 12 | 66.70% | 18 | 14.60% |
| ESTAT | FGIV  | 17 | 44.70%  | 21 | 55.30% | 38 | 6.10%  |
| ESTAT | GFIII | 6  | 27.30%  | 16 | 72.70% | 22 | 3.50%  |
| ESTAT | GFII  | 5  | 35.70%  | 9  | 64.30% | 14 | 2.20%  |
| FISMA | FGIV  | 5  | 71.40%  | 2  | 28.60% | 7  | 1.90%  |
| FISMA | GFIII | 5  | 38.50%  | 8  | 61.50% | 13 | 3.50%  |
| FISMA | GFII  | 1  | 25.00%  | 3  | 75.00% | 4  | 1.10%  |
| FPI   | FGIV  | 41 | 41.40%  | 58 | 58.60% | 99 | 37.60% |

Table 2: European Commission Active Staff by Directorate General and Gender

|      |       |    |        |    |        |    |        |
|------|-------|----|--------|----|--------|----|--------|
| FPI  | GFIII | 13 | 39.40% | 20 | 60.60% | 33 | 12.50% |
| FPI  | GFII  | 2  | 20.00% | 8  | 80.00% | 10 | 3.80%  |
| GROW | FGIV  | 23 | 42.60% | 31 | 57.40% | 54 | 7.40%  |
| GROW | GFIII | 8  | 42.10% | 11 | 57.90% | 19 | 2.60%  |
| GROW | GFII  | 1  | 9.10%  | 10 | 90.90% | 11 | 1.50%  |
| HERA | FGIV  | 8  | 44.40% | 10 | 55.60% | 18 | 19.60% |
| HERA | GFIII | 2  | 50.00% | 2  | 50.00% | 4  | 4.30%  |
| HERA | GFII  | 1  | 25.00% | 3  | 75.00% | 4  | 4.30%  |
| HOME | FGIV  | 13 | 35.10% | 24 | 64.90% | 37 | 6.80%  |
| HOME | GFIII | 9  | 32.10% | 19 | 67.90% | 28 | 5.10%  |
| HOME | GFII  | 1  | 14.30% | 6  | 85.70% | 7  | 1.30%  |

Table 2: European Commission Active Staff by Directorate General and Gender

|       |       |     |         |     |        |     |        |
|-------|-------|-----|---------|-----|--------|-----|--------|
| HR    | FGIV  | 10  | 34.50%  | 19  | 65.50% | 29  | 2.20%  |
| HR    | GFIII | 33  | 36.70%  | 57  | 63.30% | 90  | 6.90%  |
| HR    | GFII  | 20  | 21.70%  | 72  | 78.30% | 92  | 7.10%  |
| IAS   | FGIV  | 3   | 60.00%  | 2   | 40.00% | 5   | 3.30%  |
| IAS   | GFIII | 1   | 100.00% | 0   | 0.00%  | 1   | 0.70%  |
| IAS   | GFII  | 3   | 100.00% | 0   | 0.00%  | 3   | 2.00%  |
| INTPA | FGIV  | 417 | 44.20%  | 527 | 55.80% | 944 | 33.50% |
| INTPA | GFIII | 36  | 40.40%  | 53  | 59.60% | 89  | 3.20%  |
| INTPA | GFII  | 9   | 20.90%  | 34  | 79.10% | 43  | 1.50%  |
| JRC   | FGIV  | 469 | 53.50%  | 408 | 46.50% | 877 | 33.30% |
| JRC   | GFIII | 41  | 38.70%  | 65  | 61.30% | 106 | 4.00%  |

Table 2: European Commission Active Staff by Directorate General and Gender

|      |       |    |        |     |        |     |        |
|------|-------|----|--------|-----|--------|-----|--------|
| JRC  | GFII  | 19 | 27.50% | 50  | 72.50% | 69  | 2.60%  |
| JUST | FGIV  | 3  | 33.30% | 6   | 66.70% | 9   | 2.10%  |
| JUST | GFIII | 7  | 30.40% | 16  | 69.60% | 23  | 5.40%  |
| JUST | GFII  | 1  | 12.50% | 7   | 87.50% | 8   | 1.90%  |
| MARE | FGIV  | 14 | 48.30% | 15  | 51.70% | 29  | 8.60%  |
| MARE | GFIII | 11 | 55.00% | 9   | 45.00% | 20  | 5.90%  |
| MARE | GFII  | 1  | 20.00% | 4   | 80.00% | 5   | 1.50%  |
| MENA | FGIV  | 80 | 43.00% | 106 | 57.00% | 186 | 37.30% |
| MENA | GFIII | 9  | 40.90% | 13  | 59.10% | 22  | 4.40%  |
| MENA | GFII  | 2  | 22.20% | 7   | 77.80% | 9   | 1.80%  |
| MOVE | FGIV  | 11 | 50.00% | 11  | 50.00% | 22  | 4.80%  |

Table 2: European Commission Active Staff by Directorate General and Gender

|      |       |     |         |     |        |     |        |
|------|-------|-----|---------|-----|--------|-----|--------|
| MOVE | GFIII | 12  | 46.20%  | 14  | 53.80% | 26  | 5.70%  |
| MOVE | GFII  | 1   | 5.00%   | 19  | 95.00% | 20  | 4.40%  |
| OIB  | FGIV  | 10  | 25.60%  | 29  | 74.40% | 39  | 3.00%  |
| OIB  | GFIII | 51  | 45.10%  | 62  | 54.90% | 113 | 8.60%  |
| OIB  | GFII  | 140 | 23.00%  | 469 | 77.00% | 609 | 46.60% |
| OIL  | FGIV  | 2   | 22.20%  | 7   | 77.80% | 9   | 2.10%  |
| OIL  | GFIII | 18  | 37.50%  | 30  | 62.50% | 48  | 11.30% |
| OIL  | GFII  | 71  | 34.30%  | 136 | 65.70% | 207 | 48.70% |
| OLAF | FGIV  | 4   | 40.00%  | 6   | 60.00% | 10  | 3.10%  |
| OLAF | GFIII | 2   | 100.00% | 0   | 0.00%  | 2   | 0.60%  |
| OLAF | GFII  | 2   | 100.00% | 0   | 0.00%  | 2   | 0.60%  |

Table 2: European Commission Active Staff by Directorate General and Gender

|       |       |    |        |     |        |     |        |
|-------|-------|----|--------|-----|--------|-----|--------|
| OP    | FGIV  | 1  | 50.00% | 1   | 50.00% | 2   | 0.30%  |
| OP    | GFIII | 4  | 25.00% | 12  | 75.00% | 16  | 2.70%  |
| OP    | GFII  | 1  | 50.00% | 1   | 50.00% | 2   | 0.30%  |
| PMO   | FGIV  | 5  | 50.00% | 5   | 50.00% | 10  | 1.60%  |
| PMO   | GFIII | 45 | 36.60% | 78  | 63.40% | 123 | 20.20% |
| PMO   | GFII  | 77 | 23.50% | 251 | 76.50% | 328 | 53.80% |
| REFOR | FGIV  | 27 | 49.10% | 28  | 50.90% | 55  | 20.40% |
| REFOR | GFIII | 4  | 23.50% | 13  | 76.50% | 17  | 6.30%  |
| REFOR | GFII  | 1  | 20.00% | 4   | 80.00% | 5   | 1.90%  |
| REGIO | FGIV  | 21 | 45.70% | 25  | 54.30% | 46  | 6.80%  |
| REGIO | GFIII | 18 | 23.40% | 59  | 76.60% | 77  | 11.40% |

Table 2: European Commission Active Staff by Directorate General and Gender

|       |       |    |         |     |        |     |        |
|-------|-------|----|---------|-----|--------|-----|--------|
| REGIO | GFII  | 3  | 16.70%  | 15  | 83.30% | 18  | 2.70%  |
| RTD   | FGIV  | 85 | 42.90%  | 113 | 57.10% | 198 | 20.90% |
| RTD   | GFIII | 12 | 37.50%  | 20  | 62.50% | 32  | 3.40%  |
| RTD   | GFII  | 4  | 28.60%  | 10  | 71.40% | 14  | 1.50%  |
| SANTE | FGIV  | 14 | 32.60%  | 29  | 67.40% | 43  | 5.80%  |
| SANTE | GFIII | 4  | 22.20%  | 14  | 77.80% | 18  | 2.40%  |
| SANTE | GFII  | 3  | 12.00%  | 22  | 88.00% | 25  | 3.40%  |
| SCIC  | FGIV  | 1  | 100.00% | 0   | 0.00%  | 1   | 0.10%  |
| SCIC  | GFIII | 3  | 25.00%  | 9   | 75.00% | 12  | 1.60%  |
| SCIC  | GFII  | 10 | 29.40%  | 24  | 70.60% | 34  | 4.50%  |
| SG    | FGIV  | 10 | 37.00%  | 17  | 63.00% | 27  | 4.20%  |

Table 2: European Commission Active Staff by Directorate General and Gender

|       |       |    |         |    |        |    |       |
|-------|-------|----|---------|----|--------|----|-------|
| SG    | GFIII | 14 | 48.30%  | 15 | 51.70% | 29 | 4.50% |
| SG    | GFII  | 2  | 16.70%  | 10 | 83.30% | 12 | 1.90% |
| SJ    | FGIV  | 4  | 36.40%  | 7  | 63.60% | 11 | 2.70% |
| SJ    | GFIII | 3  | 100.00% | 0  | 0.00%  | 3  | 0.70% |
| SJ    | GFII  | 1  | 10.00%  | 9  | 90.00% | 10 | 2.50% |
| TAXUD | FGIV  | 12 | 70.60%  | 5  | 29.40% | 17 | 3.50% |
| TAXUD | GFIII | 13 | 43.30%  | 17 | 56.70% | 30 | 6.10% |
| TAXUD | GFII  | 2  | 100.00% | 0  | 0.00%  | 2  | 0.40% |
| TRADE | FGIV  | 7  | 46.70%  | 8  | 53.30% | 15 | 2.10% |
| TRADE | GFIII | 8  | 50.00%  | 8  | 50.00% | 16 | 2.20% |
| TRADE | GFII  | 2  | 14.30%  | 12 | 85.70% | 14 | 1.90% |

### 3.2 B Why the European Parliament?

Why choose the European Parliament for this study instead of other institutions? First, the European Parliament's gender gap is significant, as women hold only 39% of the seats in the 2024 European Parliament (European Parliament, 2024). This is a greater gender gap than in the European Commission, where there are 13 women (48.1%) and 14 men (51.9%) (European Commission, 2022). This indicates that the Parliament has a more pronounced gender gap than the Commission. The 2024 parliament elections also saw the number of female MEPs stop increasing towards full gender parity, and the percentage of women dropped 2.4% from 2019 (Kantola, 2025). By studying the European Parliament as opposed to a national parliament, one can gain insight into national developments on gender equality in multiple member states (Kantola & Lombardo, 2020).

While there are other institutions with larger gender gaps than the parliament, there are issues of transparency for academic studies (Wrtil & Hobolt, 2019). The European Council has a huge gender gap, with only five women out of 27 total members (European Parliament, 2024).

Studying the Council of the European Union is difficult due to transparency issues. Based on EU laws, Council meetings are not public, and deliberations are protected under professional secrecy (Sangaletti, 2016). The Council of the European Union is considered less transparent than the Commission and Parliament (Novak, 2024). Some documents are often registered with the Member state identity redacted, or documents are not made available at all. There are no public records for peer group meetings, and a key characteristic of the meetings is confidentiality and professional secrecy. The Council has been historically seen as detached from the public eye (Wrtil & Hobolt, 2019). While this has improved, videos are only available when the Council acts in a legislative capacity, and it does not publish internal negotiations.

Studies on the Council are very limited due to a lack of reliable information, due to a lack of verbatim reports of the deliberations (Wrtil & Hobolt, 2019). The conclusions that are provided publicly can not be used to determine what happened in the internal debates and what the power dynamics are (Wessels & Dieke, 2018). In a study, like the one proposed here, that is based on

interactions, this proves problematic and therefore the Council is not a good choice for the study (Wrátil & Hobolt, 2019).

The European Parliament is renowned for its stance on gender equality as compared to other parliaments and is sometimes even considered an “equality parliament,” making it a good case to study for gender studies. Generally, there are more women in the European Parliament than in the national parliaments (Kantola, 2009). There are a few explanations as to why. First, some countries use different electoral methods to elect the national and European parliaments. For example, France uses proportional representation for the European Parliament, but not in their national elections, and proportional representation is a better system to represent more women (Kantola, 2009). Another potential explanation is that the European Parliament is often considered less important, less attractive, and more remote than national parliaments and thus is less competitive than national elections and easier for women to win seats (Kantola, 2009). A third explanation is that the style of politics in the European Parliament is different from that in national parliaments and is less confrontational and has more structured hours, making it better for women. A final explanation is that the European Parliament, compared to national parliaments, is relatively new as an institution and that men's hegemony is much more entrenched into the institutional practices and norms in national parliaments than in the European Parliament (Kantola, 2009).

While it has been called an “equality parliament”, it still sees some of the gendered traits with other parliaments, such as widespread harassment of MEPs and staff, the backlash from radical right against gender equality, and resistance to bodies for gender equality (Kantola & Waylen, 2024). The European Parliament has sexual harassment issues, and there is resistance to any attempts to remedy this issue (Kantola & Miller, 2022). This resistance comes especially from radical right-wing populists who use debates about sexual harassment to defend men as the victims (Kantola & Lombardo, 2020). Additionally, the European Parliament rejected the Estrela report, a non-binding resolution on women’s health and reproductive rights, demonstrating that the EP may not be as gender equal and progressive as it is often portrayed to be (Warasin et al., 2019).

Of the EU institutions, the European Parliament is considered the most democratic and most supportive institution for gender equality (Elomäki & Kantola, 2022). However, the FEMM committee, the committee on Women's Rights and Gender Equality, has less power and prestige than the other committees, and their work is often tampered with. The committee rarely gets legislative proposals and mainly works on its own, less significant initiative reports (Elomäki & Kantola, 2022). Elomäki & Kantola also found that the committee is often disregarded from an organizational standpoint, as the lead committee meetings often conflict with the FEMM committee meetings, which hinders member participation and leads to low attendance (Elomäki & Kantola, 2022). The FEMM committee is considered "voluntary" for MEPs and does not count toward the requirement for MEPs to be in at least two committees, making it low on the list of priorities for MEPs (Elgström & Sundström, 2024). Furthermore, during the COVID-19 pandemic, the committee was one of seven committees whose work was initially suspended and had less frequent meetings than others. The result of this is the silencing of a strong women's rights advocate during a crisis, which had implications for gender equality in Europe (Elomäki & Kantola, 2022).

Another distinctive characteristic of the European parliament compared to national politics is its designation as a "working parliament" rather than a "debating parliament" (Silva, 2023). This characterization is due to a culture geared towards cooperation and collaboration rather than partisanship, as is typical of many national parliaments (Silva, 2023). This means that there is much more engagement with participants from different parties because it lacks a clear government opposition dynamic where pro-European parties strike deals and coalitions across partisan divides (Silva, 2023).

Additionally, care responsibilities and work-life balance issues in the EP disproportionately affect women. The right to vote in the EP plenary is considered personal and not associated with a group or member state, and MEPS cannot have a substitute vote for them while on maternity (or leave) leave (Kantola & Agustín, 2019). While men can also take parental leave, this disproportionality affects women. Additionally, meetings are often held in the evening, further disadvantageous primary caregivers who are often women (Kantola & Agustín, 2019). MEPs who are mothers face dual expectations from society as MEPs; they are expected to be present

and hardworking, but if this means they are less present as mothers, they are judged for it (Kantola & Agustín, 2019).

Additionally, the European Parliament represents a large variety of nationalities, so this allows us to observe a diversity in gender norms due to the wide representation of European countries. Different countries have different gender-regimes which will impact how they respond to gender-related issues (Silva, 2023). The European Parliament is therefore a good case to observe gender dynamics because one can observe the variety of gender norms in the various member states and how they influence communications.

In summary, the European Parliament is the best institution to study due to the significant gender gap, continued struggles for female MEPs, and the availability of information for study.

### 3.2 C Why does Political Group/ Party matter?

There are five main reasons why it is important to consider Political Groups in the study of the European Parliament. First, the groups are responsible for determining gender equality within themselves, as there are no formal rules. Additionally, group formation is often done to maximize their size, and groups elect leaders democratically, but in practice, nominations are decided behind closed doors. A political group requires much coordination and communication, meaning political groups are a major communication site. Leaders of political groups have a disciplining role, and groups have incentives to work together and are relatively cohesive. Finally, within political groups, women can build networks with other women.

The formal rules and institutions of the European Parliament do not provide much guidance on equality in processes like forming groups or filling leadership positions (Kantola & Waylen, 2024). Political groups have a lot of power and a great impact on gender equality as they decide leadership positions, select committee members, appoint political group coordinators on committees, and influence the choices for rapporteurs for committee reports (Warasin et al., 2019). This means the political groups are responsible for promoting gender equality through their internal decisions and policy-making structures, either formally, informally, or not at all, as is the case with the far right (Kantola & Waylen, 2024).

In the European Parliament, group formation is often executed with the objective of maximizing size; but this is sometimes at the expense of group unity (Berthet et al., 2023). The negotiation of leadership positions varies between groups; some are more standardized and some are more quasi-ad hoc. While groups elect leaders democratically, in practice, instead of open voting, nominations are agreed to in advance by a small group and decided at a high level (Kantola & Miller, 2022). The Rules of Procedure of the European Parliament do not include rules for political groups and distribution of positions except for rule 15, “when selecting the President, Vice-President and Quaestors, account should be taken of the need to ensure an overall fair representation of political views as well as gender, and geographical balance.” (Ahrens & Kantola, 2022). Beneath the group leaders, the National Party Delegation leaders play a large role, being called to speak first in group meetings and facilitating intergroup compromise. These are also dominated by men. Left-leaning groups tend to prioritize unified policy positions, while the radical right puts a greater emphasis on accommodating national viewpoints and wants open voting (Berthet et al., 2023). This is seen in the 8th parliament. Three groups had very high voting cohesion: the Green/EFA had 96% cohesion, the EPP had 94% cohesion, the S&D had 92%, and the ECR 79% (Silva, 2023). The ID, ENF, and EFDD emphasize the importance of accepting differing national positions and therefore prefer open voting and have no incentives for policy congruence (Silva, 2023).

Additionally, leadership roles and the running of a political group require coordination and communication. Political groups are well organized, over time they have created a well organized competitive European party system (Hix et al., 2007). Leaders are responsible for assigning members to committees and offices. They also enforce party organization. This system of coordination has led to reduced volatile voting and more predictability with voters, leading to more efficient decision making due to specialization within groups (Hix et al., 2007). Finally, coordination of voting requires leaders to communicate party positions and enforce party positions (Hix et al., 2007). All these leadership tasks require coordination and communication within political groups, between leaders as well as ordinary members.

More specifically, political groups and their leaders have a disciplining role. While national parties mainly control their MEPs, they tend to delegate significant policy and organizational

leadership powers to the European Political group. They also tend to use their power to discipline the MEPs to follow the European party line (Hix et al., 2007). Political groups within the European Parliament are allocated speaking time, and they decide internally how to divide this time (Proksch & Slapin, 2009). Additionally, groups decide which members will get seats in committees. They also allocate rapporteurships and legislative reports to MEPs, which are used as a reward for loyalty (Warasin et al., 2019). Party leaders thus can ensure that important committees are occupied by loyal members (Yordanova, 2009).

Political groups have an incentive to work together, which may impact interactions within the parliament. Through the establishment of a political party or group, politicians find others with similar policy preferences, and thus have a greater chance at achieving their policy goals, and at a lower cost. European Parliament Group leaders want cohesiveness within the group in order to meet their legislative goals (Lindstädt et al., 2011). It can also reduce workload, as creating positions on every item requires a large amount of work and information collection (Hix et al., 2008). If politicians work together, MEPs could become experts on issues and rely on one another to inform them how to vote on that issue to reduce workload and advance their interests. Additionally, for Political Group leaders, because they want to be re-elected as leaders, there is an incentive to monitor voting behavior, and groups have “whips” who issue voting instructions to members. At the midterm, there is the opportunity to reassign committees and leadership, which acts as an additional incentive for party cohesion. Additionally, the election of legislators is, according to partisan rationale, conditional on the collective reputation of the political group, leading leaders to focus on party cohesion (Yordanova, 2009). This theory of partisan rationale also says that party loyalty is the most important determinant in committee assignment (Yordanova, 2009). This demonstrates that there is an incentive for political groups to work together and interact with one another to meet legislative goals and advance reelection.

Political groups are relatively cohesive. Over time, party cohesion has increased as the powers of the European Parliament have increased, which implies that due to higher stakes in decision-making, it has given MEPs with the same policy preferences an incentive to form parties and delegate power to a leader. According to Hix, especially in comparison to the United States Congress, political groups in the European Parliament are relatively cohesive (Hix et al.,

2007). MEPs generally vote along party lines rather than national ones (Hix et al., 2007). MEPs vote along group lines over 90% of the time (Warasin et al., 2019). Another interesting finding is that cohesiveness of groups has not decreased in the long run due to groups becoming ideologically more heterogeneous. However, there is a difference in voting cohesion overall and voting cohesion on gender specific issues. This is especially relevant for the EPP group which, for the 7th legislative session, had 93% cohesion generally, but only 77% on gender equality policy, demonstrating how contentious the issue can be (Warasin et al., 2019). Overall, the high voting cohesion suggests that collaboration within groups is valued and important. National parties play a key role in this cohesiveness as individual MEPs almost always vote with their national party and it is rare for these national parties to vote against their corresponding European party. European parties are therefore able to use national parties to mobilize MEPs votes. National parties and groups shape the behaviour of MEP behavior on the parliament floor (Lindstädt et al., 2011).

Within groups, women can find networks of women and support each other. In an interview with MEPs, Kantola and Rolandsen-Agusín stated that an interviewee expressed solidarity among women in their group (The Left), and women supported one another and found alliances with men in the group to prevent sexism. They stated this was done instead of openly calling out sexist practices to avoid being labeled as angry feminists (Kantola & Agustín, 2019). Relevant to the political groups' roles in women's rights, the European People's Party has an unofficial women's network called "W" (Kantola & Agustín, 2019). It was originally initiated to gather support for a specific FEMM report within the EPP, but it continued after (Warasin et al., 2019). MEPs within this network exchange information before voting and seek to advance gender equality within the EPP party and election program. They also pushed to establish rules on the negotiation of vice chair positions (Kantola & Agustín, 2019). Some female Members of the European Parliament interviewed stated that they socialized more with women MEPs as friends, and many of them were a part of informal women's networks (Kantola & Agustín, 2019).

This section has demonstrated that Political Group membership is relevant to this research proposal. These factors all suggest greater interaction between members from the same political group than with those from others.

### 3.2 C.1 Political Group Positions on Gender Equality

Gender equality is a highly divisive factor for political groups, with either strong support or strong disapproval. Some groups oppose gender equality in defense of “traditional family values,” cultural values, and/or national sovereignty. Political group formation is driven by the incentive to increase group size, because larger groups can have more positions and more resources, such as longer speaking time; however, this means that groups can have ideological differences (Silva, 2023). In some cases, this dividing line, even running between groups and dividing them internally (Kantola, 2025). Divisions within some political groups are specifically pronounced for gender equality policies (Warasin et al., 2019). There are greater issues within the FEMM committee than in any other policy area, showing that gender is especially polarizing. Most of these dividing lines on controversial issues are attributed to ideology and national belonging (Warasin et al., 2019). Because informal rules and norms can affect groups differently, there is a need to look at political groups individually to understand the challenges and opportunities for gender equality within them (Kantola & Waylen, 2024).

### 3.2 C.2 The Far Right in the European Parliament

Gender and sexual equality rights have become increasingly contested worldwide (Ahrens, Gaweda, et al., 2021). Attempts to rewrite gender and sexuality equality have already been successful on the international level, where progressive language has been removed from United Nations documents about sexual health and reproductive rights (Ahrens, Gaweda, et al., 2021). For instance, in the Commission on the Status of Women 2019, a paragraph was removed that stated that governments should create educational policies and programs that teach young people information about sexual and reproductive health, HIV prevention, gender equality, and human rights in an age appropriate manner (Gilby et. al, 2021). The rise of the far right has affected the European Parliament. Populist movements appeal to men who perceive themselves as having lost power and influence due to cosmopolitan elites and feminists, which leads to anti-gender movements as well as the current anti-gender political climate (Sawer et al., 2023). The EU has generally been associated with gender equality, and anti-gender discourses are used as part of populist anti-EU rhetoric (Lombardo & Kantola, 2019). Often, indirect opposition to gender equality is presented through euroscepticism (Kantola & Lombardo, 2020). Euroscepticism is defined as a political phenomenon that takes a critical stance on European integration (Gad et al.,

2024). This is done by arguing that the EU should not interfere with gender equality and should be dealt with by member states. They use a subsidiary argument to argue that, for example, education should not be decided by the EU, and therefore, oppose equality initiatives without directly attacking women's rights (Kantola & Lombardo, 2020). They want to foster disintegration by constructing gender equality in the EU as a project of EU elites rather than the "people" and thus fuel euroscepticism (Lombardo & Kantola, 2019). Actors who are trying to promote positive change in equality face opposition from actors trying to defend the unequal status quo (Lombardo and Kantola et al., 2021). This anti-gender backsliding leads to the escalation of hate speech, violence, and persecution, as well as increased targeting against individuals, groups, and minorities, including parliamentarians and activists. There is a greater risk of targeted violence and persecution for feminists, LGBT activists, and anti-racist movements (Lombardo et al., 2021). Additionally, the dismantling of existing equality policies, heightened legislative scrutiny, and greater resource strain through cuts to funding (Lombardo et al., 2021). There is a shift from the previous advancement of rights to merely the protection of the rights that already exist. This rise of the far right brings questions about the core values of democracy, such as equality and respect for minorities (Lombardo and Kantola et al., 2021). The radical right opposes gender equality, making an already contentious issue even more controversial (Elomäki & Kantola, 2022). The notion of "gender" as opposed to "women and men" has become contested in Europe (Elomäki & Kantola, 2022).

These radical right actors and populists use hate speech against women and minorities in debates, and seek to silence opponents through discrimination, intimidation, and the subordination of women (Elomäki & Kantola, 2022). Contesting that women's rights are human rights is one of the main drivers of opposition to gender equality (Ahrens, Gaweda, et al., 2021). Often actors self-victimize, presenting populists as victims who have been silenced by gender-sensitive language dictating how a debate should proceed (Kantola & Lombardo, 2020). One method in which they achieve this is through blue-card questions, where MEPs ask speakers direct questions. Right-wing populists use this to attack women and make gender issues more contentious (Elomäki & Kantola, 2022). The ECR and ID use amendments to delete references to gender and call gender equality an "ideological theory" (Elomäki & Kantola, 2020). This

contributes to creating an aggressive and intimidating atmosphere that is unfriendly toward women and creates obstacles for feminism (Elomäki & Kantola, 2022).

According to Korolczuk, this is how the Christian right has globalized a resistance to secularization by defining feminism and equal rights movements as “gender ideology” (Korolczuk et al., 2025). These movements seek to establish a masculine hegemony by presenting it as a struggle against gender. These radical right and far right groups use the language of “gender ideology” to paint gender equality as harmful, elite EU terminology used to destroy natural gender roles in society (Kantola, 2025). Kantola and Lombardo describe this as “bending” the meaning of gender equality towards other issues and goals unrelated to gender, such as migration or islamophobia (Kantola & Lombardo, 2020). They describe this as being a way to be Islamophobic, by constructing an “other” that is hostile to women and seeking to protect its “own women” from the Islamic “other” threat (Kantola and Lombardo, 2021). Thus, opposition to gender equality can be seen not only as an international issue, but as a side effect of other intentions such as euroscepticism and islamophobia (Kantola & Lombardo, 2020). Within the European Parliament, many members opposing gender equality present this as corrupt international elites interfering with national politics and imposing political correctness (Kantola & Lombardo, 2020). They emphasize gender equality as a national issue and say that the EU should not be interfering (Lombardo & Kantola, 2019). When Silva approached representatives from the ECR, ENF, EFDD, and ID, one representative said they were only interested in real science and that “gender studies, witchcraft, and dosing do not fall into this category” (Silva, 2023). This quote demonstrates the overall opposition to gender issues by these groups. Additionally, among those who agreed to interviews, individuals from the RRP group reported not understanding core terms such as gender equality or intersectionality (Silva, 2023). The authors concluded that “Gender, age, and the career state appeared to incite inappropriate behavior by male radical right populist MEPS more often than other participants.” (Silva, 2023). These groups also oppose abortion, sex education, equality directives, and funding for equality of work (Kantola, 2025).

There is a connection between anti-gender politics and the democratic backsliding occurring in today’s world. They reopen questions about policies that have been accepted, such as equal

employment opportunities, gender quotas, LGBT rights, and policies targeting gender violence (Kantola and Lombardo, 2021). The radical right parties are often seen as “Männerparteien” because generally the voters, representatives, and leaders of these parties are men (Kantola, 2025). The right-wing populist movement is associated with wounded masculinity and backlash by angry white men who are attracted to the alt-right’s anti-feminist and anti-woke rhetoric (Korolczuk et al., 2025). For these parties, compromise and cooperation are associated with women and seen as a weakness (Lombardo & Kantola, 2019). They marginalize those who show empathy towards underprivileged groups and present compromise as a form of weakness (Lombardo & Kantola, 2019). They attempt to depoliticize gender equality by presenting gender as biological and indisputable and thus a “medical issue” instead of a political one (Kantola & Lombardo, 2020).

In the parliament of the 14 Vice Presidents, there are seven men and seven women (Kantola, 2025). However, we see a divide between the groups. Of the women VPs, two are from the ECR and none are from the other two right-wing political groups. However, this has begun to change globally, and specifically in the European Parliament due to the French quota law. Unfortunately, because there are still more women in the left, green, and liberal groups, gains by the right in seats still lead to women’s representation in parliament declining (Kantola, 2025). These actors use hate speech, strategic litigation, and silencing of civil society actors, journalists, researchers, and politicians who are working for equality (Korolczuk et al., 2025).

### 3.2 D Why does Nationality matter?

There are six main reasons that nationality affects the behavior and relationships of MEPs. The national party affects the representation of women in the European Parliament by determining the number of women who are represented. Secondly, the size of member states affects the amount of power they have within political groups. Third, MEPs represent the interests of their constituents in the European Parliament. Additionally, several factors in the representation of women vary by member state. Fifthly, the gender regimes of the member states affect their positions on equality. MEPs from the same member state have a shared experience. Finally, gender roles in the member state and communication norms will impact the ways in which MEPs interact and communicate.

First, the national party affects the representation of women in the European Parliament. National party-level characteristics are, according to Kantola, the most significant factor impacting women's representation in the EP (Kantola, 2025). These characteristics include incumbents' rates, party size, ideological orientation, intraparty power struggles, and party gatekeeper attitudes towards women (Kantola, 2025). Member states also affect the representation of women because, generally, EU elections are held by proportional representation, which has been seen to be more amenable to female political representation (Kantola, 2025). Findings on policy outcomes have suggested that the national delegations have a bigger impact on the MEPs than the political groups do. (Kantola & Lombardo, 2023). Voting cohesion is stronger within the national delegations than within the groups, and national delegations can better reward, sanction, supervise, and control MEPs (Kantola & Lombardo, 2023). However, this is not equal across groups; the groups consider the roles of the national delegations differently. According to Kantola and Lombardo, the Greens emphasize the group over the delegation, but radical right populists, who are opposed to integration, emphasize the role of national delegations. These populists are not concerned about policy cohesion, rather they expect group members to act on national interest (Kantola & Lombardo, 2023).

Additionally, some big member states dominate the political groups, and member state size impacts the MEP experience. In interviews, Kantola and Lombardo found that the big size of the German delegation was painted as power-hungry. There is a power imbalance between member states, because seats are allocated based on population size (Kantola & Lombardo, 2023). For example, before the eastern enlargement, the two biggest political groups, the EPP and the S&D, were dominated by two national delegations that accounted for almost half of their membership. However, post-enlargement, this is no longer the case for some, as Germany now only has 17% of the EPP (Kantola & Lombardo, 2023). However, two nationalities hold the majority in three smaller groups. Italy and France hold the majority in ID, Poland and Italy in the ECR, and Germany and France in the Green group (Kantola & Lombardo, 2023). In four groups, a single nationality represents more than a quarter of MEPs (Kantola & Lombardo, 2023). The challenges within Political Groups are political differences between the national delegations, specifically about gender equality (Ahrens & Kantola, 2022). This can be seen after Brexit when the UK MEPS left the EP and the ECR was dominated by Polish Law and Justice Party members, which

is a party known for opposing gender equality and women's and LGBT rights (Kantola, 2025). After the Polish party, the second biggest delegation is the Brothers of Italy, who also strongly oppose gender equality. This party responds to human rights issues with religious and sovereignty arguments and refers to women's and LGBT rights as “gender ideology” (Kantola, 2025). On the other hand, Italian MEPs from EFDD often favored gender equality and sexuality practices, while the broader group generally opposes it (Kantola & Lombardo, 2020). According to interviews, Italian S&D members sometimes voted against the group line, and were instructed to either vote with the group or abstain or otherwise face sanctions (Ahrens, Gaweda, et al., 2021).

Second, MEPs represent the political interests of their constituents. Hix found that, on average, most MEPs see the interests of voters in their home country as more important than representing the interests of EU voters, and considered national party interests over political group interests (Hix et al., 2007). This is specifically relevant when on sensitive issues, where Cencig and Sabani note that some members even vote with their national interest and against the position of their party group (Cencig et al., 2017). These included interest in areas such as employment, environment, and agriculture policy. More specifically, in the area of economics, countries that saw worsening economic conditions were more likely to tighten fiscal rules in their voting behavior. This was also the case when the unemployment rate in a given MEP’s member state was higher (Cencig et al., 2017). They also found that nationality is the main explanation for the behavior of members of parliament in legislative oversight. Fratescu found that in specific situations where the interests of the constituents in a country were perceived to be disproportionately affected by a decision, there was a greater incentive for MEPs to vote differently from their political group (Fratescu, 2015). Likewise, Cencig and Sabani found that while the most powerful indicator of voting behaviour was Political Group, the economic situation in the MEP’s country of origin played a significant role (Cencig et al., 2017).

Thirdly, member state identity is relevant because there is variation between member states in gender equality. Within the parliament, there has been a break in the trend towards an increasing gender balance in the European Parliament (Kantola, 2025). There is high variation within the member states. For example, Finland, France, and Sweden each have more female MEPs than

men. Spain has an equal number of female and male MEPs (Kantola, 2025). However, seven countries have only 40% female MEPS (Kantola, 2025). Lithuania, Malta, and Romania each have less than 20% female representation (Kantola, 2025). Meanwhile, Cyprus does not have any females among its six MEPs (Kantola, 2025). Nationality is also relevant because most MEPs maintain connections to the national political scene in their home countries. According to Scully, most MEPs keep regular contact with their domestic political base and don't cease participation in national politics (Scully, 2005). Most MEPs keep ties to national politics and their domestic political supporters, and often act through their actions and political loyalties as national politicians (Scully, 2005).

Apart from representation, the diversity of member states' gender regimes affects their positions on gender policy issues. For example, there is a difference in the way member states view gender-based violence (Silva, 2023). Some prefer shelter and support victims from the civil society, autonomous from the state, and others assume states have a responsibility to provide services in a neutral and professional way. Additionally, there are different positions on sex work; some state that criminalize it, while others approach sex work as work (Silva, 2023). Religion plays a role in this, for some national delegations and according to Ahrens et al. reports on the sex industry never reached the plenary due to religious taboo and opposition by some religious sects (Ahrens, Gaweda, et al., 2021). This shapes the EP debates, and in research, definitions of concepts differ between member states (Ahrens et al., 2024). Concern for regional and national balance often overshadows concern for gender equality (Kantola & Lombardo, 2023). For example, cultural diversity is often used as a justification for the European Parliament's slow and weak response to sexual harassment, and this responsibility is attributed to "other cultures" (Berthet & Kantola, 2020). Berthet and Kantola also found that this is often dealt with through individual case solutions, rather than an institutional response (Berthet & Kantola, 2020).

Another reason that nationality is relevant is the shared experience of MEPs from the same country. Members of the European Parliament come from different countries, and each of these countries has very different economic situations, cultural contexts, and religious traditions, which all may affect decision-making. Religion also plays a role, and is sometimes used to justify the

domination of male power and the subordination of women as “divinely approved” (Kantola, 2009). Countries that are majority Protestant have a higher percentage of women in parliament than those that are majority Catholic, and both Protestant and Catholic majority countries have more female representation than Orthodox and Muslim countries (Kantola, 2009). According to Cencig and Sabani, national identities are a strong predictor of voting behavior (Cencig et al., 2017). While not the most important factor, MEPs' offices in Brussels and Strasbourg are typically grouped by national party contingents (Scully, 2005). These social factors also show how nationality plays a role in MEP behavior.

Communication style also varies based on nationality and culture. Individuals from different backgrounds communicate in different ways and this may lead to misconceptions (Balakrishnan, 2022). Culture influences one's thoughts, feelings, actions, and interactions which all are components of communication.

Hofstede identifies four cultural tendencies: power distance uncertainty, avoidance, individualism and masculinity (Balakrishnan, 2022). Additionally, Smith identifies four types of cultures. The first is extremity culture, which is associated with strong loyalty to culturally favored viewpoints and a strong sense of apathy towards other groups (Smith, 2011). The second is consensus, this type of culture encourages expression of harmony and uniformity of opinions. The third type is dissent, which is a type of culture where expressions of individual opinion are more strongly favored than in other types of cultures. Finally, there are moderate cultures where individuals are cautious about expressing their opinion (Smith, 2011). There are also warm and cold communication styles. This is defined by Bojadjev et al., as the degree to which people in a culture express emotion and empathy through their communication. This includes touch gestures, elaborateness, personal space, being personal, being loud, and eye contact (Bojadjev et al., 2023). Within Europe, those in northern Europe are characterized as being colder, avoiding touching and gesturing while talking (Bojadjev et al., 2023). Similarly, the authors characterize Germany as a country that is extremely professional and moderately cold, in contrast to Sweden, which they describe as moderately casual and extremely cold, while they describe Italy as unprofessional and moderately warm (Bojadjev et al., 2023). As EU countries, these cultural characterizations may come into play at the European Parliament, and will influence how an

MEP behaves and impact their communications with others, especially cross-cultural communication (Bojadjiev et al., 2023).

The different types of communication styles will have an impact on the way that MEPs act in the European Parliament. Another distinction is high-context and low-context cultures. In high context cultures, people communicate in a less direct and elaborate way that assumes the listener is familiar with issues; on the other hand, in low context cultures, people communicate more directly and distinctly (Smith, 2011). These factors influence how individuals will communicate within the parliament and may explain differences in communication roles.

There are also differences among cultures in what is appropriate to say, how it should be said, how much to say, which words are clear, and what is deemed relevant. Context clues signal how a conversation should be understood (Tannen, 1981). The style of conversation, pitch, volume, pacing, turn-taking mechanism, storytelling method, humor, irony and sarcasm differ from culture to culture (Tannen, 1981). Understanding of this is technically determined and can lead to breakdowns in communication between speakers with different ethnicities. One example presented by Tannen is that Indian-English speakers use a higher pitch when they wish to take the floor, and this is often misinterpreted by British English speakers as anger (Tannen, 1981). Additionally, different cultures have differences in what traits are considered important in order to be an effective leader and what relationships between leaders and subordinates are appropriate. Nationality has an impact on the ability to be an effective leader in the context of a supranational organization such as the European Union (Minelgaite Snaebjornsson & Edvardsson, 2012).

Finally, Weziak-Bialowolska, finds that the formation of gender norms and the historical track of formulation of gender attitudes differed between Eastern and Western Europe which influences gender roles today. According to Weziak-Bialowolska, Western Europe had the breadwinner/homemaker model up until the 1970s and then after women's liberation there was a more even division of labor (Weziak-Bialowolska, 2014). On the other hand, the former socialist countries promoted a dual earner model and provided state childcare from the 1960s and 80s and shifted to more traditional roles after the fall of communism (Weziak-Bialowolska, 2014). This

has an impact on gender roles today and may affect how women and men interact with one another in the European Parliament (Weziak-Bialowolska, 2014).

These reasons demonstrate why it is important to take nationality into consideration when studying the European Parliament. The member state from which an MEP originates affects the representation of women, their power in the parliament, the constituents they represent, their stance on gender equality, and their experiences.

#### 4. Research Design and Method

I will do a qualitative study in order to answer the research question. I am interested in the population of leaders in the European Union. The sample I will use will be Members of Parliament who participate in debates in the European Parliament. In the proposed research question, the independent variable is gender, and the dependent variable is dynamics in the European Parliament. The independent variable of gender will be operationalized based on self-defined gender, as previously discussed, defined as the gender that an individual presents and defines themselves as.

The dependent variable is dynamics in the European Parliament. In the literature discussed in the literature review, collaboration and decision making has been operationalized and measured in a few different ways. In Timko's study, it was measured through perceived effectiveness of leadership (Timko, 2017). It was measured by Hargrave and Blumenau, as well as Hargrave and Langengen, through the type of language used, specifically the use of collaborative vs. combative language (Hargrave & Blumenau, 2022; Hargrave & Langengen, 2022). Similarly, Berdecia-Cruz et al measured differences between men and women and the frequency at which they delegated (Berdecia-Cruz et al., 2022). Conversely, Rominiecka measured it through body signals and how they were interpreted (Rominiecka, 2008). Stefano Gagliarducci and Daniele Paserman found measured gender dynamics as gender interactions within hierarchies between the mayor and "subordinates" in the council (Gagliarducci & Paserman, 2009).

Consistent with the literature, which has been discussed in the previous paragraph, dynamics in the European Parliament will be measured through interactions between men and women MEPs, as well as those between men and men, and women and women MEPs, both in non-verbal and verbal interactions, similar to Rominiecka. These interactions include both direct verbal interactions and non-verbal positive facial expression directed at another MEP. These are detailed in the codebook on interactions.

#### 4.1 Content Analysis

I will conduct a content analysis on EU Parliament Debates, looking at the interaction within the debates, and who is speaking to whom, and the genders of those who are speaking. European Parliament debates are a good method because they provide access to studying a large number of women who hold political office (Ash et al., 2024). Additionally, the European Parliament has transcripts and videos available, which allow for studying reactions and actions during debates. Of the EU institutions, the Parliament has the most access to documents and videos available for viewing by the public (Moser, 2001). Looking at parliament debates is the most feasible method to answer this research question, because other institutions have more limited access to videos and transcripts of meetings.

Legislative studies have been dominated by quantitative studies, and research on role calling has ignored gender (Kantola & Waylen, 2024). Additionally, gender studies are underrepresented in Political Science research. According to Ahrens, Erzeel, et al. of the five main Political Science Journals, the percentage of articles with a primary focus on gender, sexuality, and intersectionality. The percentage for these journals was at best 10%, but many had a much lower percentage (Ahrens, Erzeel, et al., 2021). External resistance to gender and politics research comes in multiple forms: continued marginalization of feminist analysis, anti-gender attacks, and the underrepresentation of gender studies in Political Science research (Ahrens, Erzeel, et al., 2021).

I am interested in observing the gender dynamics at this point in time rather than observing the evolution of gender dynamics, and for that reason, I only want to look at recent debates. Female

participation in politics has increased immensely since 2000; thus, in order to avoid looking at the evolution of representation, it is necessary to look only at recent debates (Hessami & Da Fonseca, 2020). Since there has been little change from the previous parliamentary term, I will only look at debates for the current term and the last term (Ash et al., 2024).

As previously mentioned, gender dynamics are defined as patterns of interaction and communication observed between MEPs reflecting gendered structures. Gender dynamics are measured by the frequency of interactions between MEPs, which are observed through a content analysis.

For each debate, every verbal and non-verbal interaction observed will be cataloged. Non-verbal interactions will include the exchange of facial expressions targeted at another Member of Parliament that express emotions such as happiness, fear, sadness, anger, surprise, and disgust. A second non-verbal interaction I will observe is gestures (Dumitrescu, 2016). Other gestures I intend to take note of are: waves, pointing, thumbs up, thumbs down, clear eye contact, and touch interactions such as handshakes or hugs. One verbal interaction will be noted when MEPs speak to one another, and when an MEP mentions another MEP during a debate. I will then look to see if there are differences between interactions of men and women MEPs. Once I have observed the debates, I will then compare the results to one another to determine if there is a difference in the amount of interactions between the two genders.

Another potential method could be to conduct interviews. Interviews with MEPs could allow for better understanding of networks and interactions. However, interviews would assume the MEPs are consciously aware of the social network ties that exist, and this would not necessarily be the case (Dye, 2023). Additionally, interviewees may not be honest about their interactions due to fear of being perceived as not being open-minded. Additionally, interviews with MEPs could be difficult to arrange logistically, and could come at a high financial and time cost (Dye, 2023). Discourse analysis could also fit this research question, however, without a wide knowledge of all the EU languages, with the multi-lingual nature of the European Parliament it would be difficult to make inferences.

This method is suitable because it is a situation where there is a large group of women and men who work for the EU together, allowing me to observe the interactions that they have with one another (Moser, 2001). I believe looking at videos is an important aspect of this method in order to catch any nonverbal dynamics that may occur and be lost by looking at a transcript of meetings from other EU branches that do not have their meetings available for public viewing (Moser, 2001).

#### 4.2 Social Network Analysis Approach

According to Simmel, society is no more than a web of interactions. For example, poor African Americans have continually come to live in low-income neighborhoods and therefore lost connections to the people who have ties to the labor market. In the case of this thesis, it is hypothesized that women in the European Parliament are isolated from the male social networks who generally hold higher positions; as a result of this, women miss out on opportunities for leadership and support in the European Parliament, due to not being a part of this male network (Scott & Carrington, 2014).

Social network analysis fits this study because it attempts to analyze individual actors within a network and the ties (interactions) connecting them. It is a set of socially relevant nodes connected by one or more relationships; the nodes are the network members who are studied in social network analysis and are connected to one another through relationships (Scott & Carrington, 2014). These ties between actors are channels that allow for the flow of resources, and the network offers opportunities and constraints on actor behavior (*EU CAP Network*, 2016). It measures the relationships between the actors in the network, and it can offer further insight into density, quality, robustness, and communication structures within them (*EU CAP Network*, 2016). According to social network theory, causation is not measured through an individual but rather in the social structure. People with similar attributes may behave similarly if they occupy similar positions in society, and have similar network positions and experience similar outcomes due to opportunities, constraints, and perceptions that are created due to their similar network position (Scott & Carrington, 2014). In this analysis, patterns of relations are studied not just between pairs, but rather the broader impact that these ties have.

According to the SAGE Handbook of Social Network Analysis, social network analysis requires four essential properties: the first, is the intuition that the links among social actors are important. Second, it must be based on the collection and analysis of data, that is, a record of social relations that link actors. Then it relies heavily on graphic imagery to display patterns, and develops mathematical and computational models to describe and explain those patterns (Scott & Carrington, 2014). Similarly, according to Ehrlich and Carboni, there are three important elements to conduct this analysis: a group, interactions, and attributes that can help determine whether there are systemic factors influencing interactions between people (Ehrlich & Carboni, 2005).

The first step in conducting social network analysis is to define the boundaries of the network; the members of the network, in this case, are the European Parliament Members. When studying networks, characteristics can be determined, such as the proportion of the network members who are women (Scott & Carrington, 2014). The approach used to select this is the position-based approach, which is when, in social network analysis, the actors who are studied as network members are those who are members of a particular organization (European Parliament) or hold a specific position (MEP) (Scott & Carrington, 2014). Once those are selected, one must identify the relationships, interactions, behaviors that are based on ties, such as speaking with or helping another member; these interactions occur in the context of social relationships. This information about interactions can be inferred from existing data sources that allow direct observations of group interactions, such as observing recorded European Parliament debates (Ehrlich & Carboni, 2005). There are then flows which are relations based on the transfers between nodes, which can include information about resources, info, or influence. These things flow through networks. The next step is to select a data method, which is, in this case, content analysis, then to conduct the content analysis, in which the focus is closeness centrality to measure the distance between actors and other actors in the European Parliament (*EU CAP Network*, 2016). The social network data reports who shares particular relationships (Scott & Carrington, 2014). Then it is important to visualize the results in some way, and then interpret these results and report and discuss what is found ( *EU CAP Network*, 2016). According to Ehrlich & Carboni, a matrix should be the result of the social network analysis in a numerical form showing the existence, type, or quality of interactions between pairs of people (Ehrlich & Carboni, 2005). This is often in the form of a

table showing the interactions.

There are various network explanations: transmission, adaptation, binding, and exclusion. In transmission, information about jobs, social support, norms, workplace identities, material aid, and knowledge of culture flows through networks. Specifically, job opportunities are more likely to flow through strong ties (Scott & Carrington, 2014). A second explanation is adaptation, where two people make the same choice due to similar network positions that impose similar constraints and opportunities on them. According to the binding explanation, networks bind together and act as a unit, and thus outcomes are influenced by the internal structure of the network (Scott & Carrington, 2014). Finally, exclusion is when the presence of one social tie precludes the existence of another, which affects the relationships of the excluded nodes with others. So, the way two nodes are connected affects whether one node can form ties with others.

This thesis combines the content analysis and social network analysis approaches. The content analysis describes the process of observing and coding interactions during European Parliament debates, while the social network analysis comes in to interpret these actions in the greater context outside of the interactions between two MEPs, interpreting a larger picture of interactions in the European Parliament. Content analysis provides the data of coded interactions that allow for social network analysis to be conducted. This allows gendered patterns of interactions to be quantified and observed. Analysis will be conducted in two stages, first gendered interactions are observed through the content analysis of debates and then through a social network analysis of these observations to identify gendered patterns in the observed interactions.

The Social Network Analysis will be conducted based on the forms of address between MEPs and the chair. Heatmaps will be created to demonstrate the strongest connections (Boileau et al., 2022). The titles are divided into three categories: informal, semi-formal, and formal. Using Little and Gelles' classification system formal are those using a person's title (President), informal are terms indicating familiarity such as "Dear first name" and semi-formal are those in between such as Mr. or Mrs. (Little & Gelles, 1975). These maps will be created for each debate, AFET and DEVE totals, and the overall total. From these maps the strongest connections will be

identified.

The social network analysis approach is a good approach for this research question, because it allows for an understanding of the dynamics within the European Parliament and between genders. The content analysis approach is a good approach because it provides the data for which to conduct a social network analysis.

#### 4.3 Selection of Debates: AFET and DEVE

Considering that different policy fields are more or less welcoming to women than others, I will compare two fields: one traditionally considered more masculine (foreign policy) and the other traditionally considered more feminine (development). According to the European Parliament Rules and Procedure, the European Parliament established twenty standing committees that are each competent for specific matters (Delpitte et al., 2016). The committees are the bodies that perform most of the actual work in the parliament. Policy is first sealed in the committees as long as the political groups agree, and then later ratified by the plenary (Delpitte et al., 2016). In this case, I will look at the AFET Committee, the European Parliament's Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The AFET committee is considered relatively weak in EU law on internal affairs, but has oversight powers in the Common Security and Defence policy arena for international cooperation and assistance programmes and agreements with third countries, the accession of new EU member states, and in human rights promotion in third countries (Delpitte et al., 2016). It also facilitates parliament's interface with the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy and exchanges views and opinions with the representative. It coordinates with interparliamentary delegations (Delpitte et al., 2016).

The second committee I will select debates from is the DEVE committee. This is the Committee on Development (*Highlights | Home | DEVE | Committees | European Parliament*, 2025). This committee is considered the champion in the European Parliament for the Sustainable Development Goals and the 2030 UN agenda. The rise of populist parties has brought increased contention over development policy, and DEVE seeks to bring attention to issues that affect

humanitarian assistance and long-term strategies to ensure development efforts (*Highlights | Home | DEVE | Committees | European Parliament*, 2025). However, DEVE mainly brings together champions of development policies, and its members are in favor of increasing aid and a stronger role for the EU in development policy (Raunio & Wagner, 2020). DEVE is the committee involved in monitoring development and is responsible for the political dialogue with developing countries through bilateral or multilateral relations, authorization of financial aid for developing countries, and the promotion of democracy (Delputte et al., 2016).

There are three main reasons why these committees are a good comparison for this research. The first reason is that they each represent two ends of the spectrum: AFET is considered a “hard” committee, while DEVE is considered a “soft committee.” Development is considered “low politics”; the fact that it focuses on cooperation contributes to its status as low politics among other EU external relations areas (Cardwell & Jančić, 2019). While DEVE does not seem very attractive as a committee for most MEPS, AFET, on the other hand, is considered highly prestigious, even though it lacks significant legislative power (Hurka & Kaplaner, 2020). When committees are popular due to prestige, there is more competition for membership and a larger pool of applicants for leadership to choose from, which can make it more difficult for women to win seats (Hurka & Kaplaner, 2020). AFET as a committee is very in demand, while seats in DEVE are rarely contested due to low competition for the seats (Daniel & Thierse, 2021). Additionally, according to Elgström and Sundström, the AFET committee is generally less radical on gender issues and is more focused on a foreign policy perspective with a transnational emphasis on sovereignty and subsidiarity (Elgström & Sundström, 2024). As a comparison, the FEMM committee finalized 33 opinions for 11 committees, and in AFET, only 28% of amendments were approved compared to 39.5% in the Committee on Employment and Social Affairs. This shows they may not be as amenable to incorporating feminist policy.

Another reason this is a good representation is that the two have different levels of representation of women. While the current chair of DEVE is a male, two of the four vice chairs are women. Of the forty-four other members, only 13 are women. Among the members, six (not including vice chairs) are women, and among the substitutes, six are women. DEVE is one of only nine out of twenty-three total European Parliament committees that had a woman as a chair in 2013 (Istituto

per la Ricerca Sociale (IRS) - Italy et al., 2014). Additionally, the proportion of experts invited to EP hearings who are women is above average for DEVE as compared to AFET (Istituto per la Ricerca Sociale (IRS) - Italy et al., 2014). AFET does not have a female chair, and only one of four vice chairs is female (Istituto per la Ricerca Sociale (IRS) - Italy et al., 2014).

These are two good committees for comparison because they conduct similar work in the area of external action of the EU. The two bodies are tasked with sustaining the growing external dimension of the European Parliament, and both have status as standing committees. According to Delputte, especially ever since the Lisbon treaty, the AFET and DEVE committees (and the LIBE committee) contribute many meetings to external affairs (Delputte et al., 2016).

These committees are a good case for comparison due to their representation of a harder and a softer field, while still doing similar work. I will review four AFET debates and four DEVE debates. The debates are available on the European Parliament website under the page for each committee. I will ensure that the debates picked have videos of the debates included, in order to ensure analysis of non-verbal dynamics that may occur, which could be related to the gender of the speakers. I will filter out any debates that do not include videos, as those will not capture non-verbal interactions (Moser, 2001). I will assign each of these debates a number and copy them into a spreadsheet. I will then use the 'Rand()' Excel function to generate random numbers. I will do this four times for debates from DEVE and four times for debates from AFET until eight debates are selected.

#### 4.4 Selection of Debate Type: Non-legislative Reports (INI)

The European Parliament produces two types of reports: non-legislative reports (INI) and legislative reports (INL). INI are non-legislative reports and are not referred to in the treaties, and can be adopted by a simple majority of the parliament (Ridley, 2021). In response, the Commission must provide information within three months (Ridley, 2021). On the other hand, INL, legislative reports are based on the treaties, specifically Article 225 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union. Legislative reports are adopted by an absolute majority, and require the Commission to respond within three months, and submit a legislative proposal within one year, or include a proposal in its work program for the following year (Ridley, 2021). The

Commission must provide a detailed reason if it does not submit a proposal (Ridley, 2021).

For this thesis debates on INI reports will be used, as opposed to INL reports. This is for two main reasons. The first is that INI reports are more available and more common. From 2014-2019, there were 546 INI reports, and only 16 INL reports (Best, 2021). According to Best, INL reports are rare as they require justification and there are legal procedure constraints (Best, 2021). Therefore, INI reports were chosen, because there are more publicly available.

Another reason debates for INI reports were selected is because they allow Political Groups and MEPs to present their original argument to the public, which is often used more for the purpose of publicity and re-election purposes (Best, 2021). This means that debates on these reports will have MEPs speaking more freely, as they are less technical (Best, 2021).

The debates selected from AFET and DEVE will be debates on INI reports rather than INL reports due to availability, and because MEPs will likely speak more freely than in debates for INL reports. This thesis aims to understand natural interactions between female and male MEPs ;therefore, debates where MEPs speak more freely are more effective for this purpose. Due to the limited availability of INI reports, debates will be selected from the current EU Parliament term (2024-29) and the previous term (2020-2024).

#### 4.5 Language of Debates

The EU has twenty-four official languages. Multilingualism is indispensable as an international organization; it allows individuals to maintain their position as representatives of their national identity, while still being able to communicate and build a common political community (Ringe, 2022). It is important to distinguish between civil servants and Members of the European Parliament in this regard. Civil servants in the EU can be required to speak a specific language, but elected officials cannot (Ringe, 2022). According to the European Parliament resolution of 1995 MEPs have the right to express themselves and work in their own language, and as a part of their democratic right and mandate (Ringe, 2022). MEPs can speak, listen, read, and write in their own language or any EU official language. It is a principle of the EU that any citizen can

become an MEP even if they don't speak English or another language. To guarantee equal working conditions, they must have full access to information in their preferred language.

Therefore, it is important that language services are made available to MEPs to ensure equality and to not disadvantage those who are less educated and socioeconomically disadvantaged (Ringe, 2022). Additionally, if English (or another language) were required to become an MEP, less competitive candidates with foreign language skills would crowd out other, more qualified candidates who don't possess the same language skills.

Multilingualism is not just important for MEPs but also for the member states, responsible for implementing EU law. The EU ensures that every language version of EU law is equally valid (Ringe, 2022). No "master" or "official" version prevails if there is a dispute. The member states are responsible for transposing, implementing, and adjudicating EU law, so they must be able to understand it and receive this information in their own language. This is essential for the harmonization of EU law, as well as equal rights. Multilingualism in EU law ensures equality of all EU citizens under the law (Ringe, 2022).

Multilingualism in the EU acknowledges languages as a way for people to identify socially, culturally and politically with their home country. Speaking in their native language is a basic right of an MEP. MEP speeches are simultaneously interpreted into official languages, and all official texts are translated into 24 official languages. Multilingualism is not just crucial to the functioning of the democracy through MEPs but also for the citizens to participate in EU politics by having access to information to understand how decisions are made, what the EU laws are, and evaluate their MEPs performance (Ringe, 2022). A MEP can only be held responsible for their actions by constituents if they are able to understand the proceedings and evaluate their performance (Ringe, 2022). Even though the United Kingdom has left the EU, English has not been removed as an official language. If the EU wanted to remove English as an official language, it would need to be decided unanimously, but it is unlikely, especially since English is an official language of Ireland and Malta (European Parliament).

However, multilingualism in the EU is not without challenges. It is impossible to produce exactly parallel texts with the exact same meaning, in different languages (Ringe, 2022). However, the alternative would be to only have one main language, which would not be fair. This system is more equal and is preferred as long as the translations are similar enough (Ringe, 2022). According to Ringe, the language-related cases of the Court of Justice have demonstrated that while translations can create uncertainty in the intent of the law, multiple language versions can help with the interpretation of the law because comparing versions can help determine what the intent of the law most likely was (Ringe, 2022). Generally, it is found that multilingualism in the EU does not produce enough mistakes or mistakes so serious that the political and legal outcome is affected (Ringe, 2022).

In general, interpreters and translators work in their mother tongue. However, with 24 official languages, there are 552 possible combinations of languages; sometimes, translation is done through a “relay system.” (European Parliament). This means a text is first interpreted into a widely used language such as English, French, or German, and then translated further into other languages (European Parliament). English is the most common language used in negotiations, deliberations, and written language. Interpretation and translation are separate processes. Interpreters translate languages orally in real time during meetings, while translators translate written documents. Interpretation for the European Parliament is provided by the DG for Interpretation and Conferences (Ringe, 2022). Therefore, for this thesis, debates will be viewed in English with the translation (European Parliament). When trying to view a European Parliament debate, the debate can be viewed in English.

#### 4.6 Gender Identities of AFET and DEVE MEPs

As previously stated, self-defined gender will be used for this thesis, unfortunately, not every MEP has their pronouns clearly listed. Therefore, determining how MEPs self-identify can be difficult. Ideally, the personal website of an MEP is used to determine this, as it is their platform. The use of self-defined gender, according to the European Commission, ensures respect and autonomy of individuals, helps avoid misgendering, and is gender-inclusive (European Commission, 2023). Therefore, if the personal website was not available or did not include pronouns, a variety of other methods were used.

The following methods were used in lieu of a clear statement on the personal website. References to roles that are gendered, such as mother/father, husband/wife, or another social role, were taken as an identification with the gender associated with that. There are some slight concerns with this, as mother and father might be used separately, and a trans parent may maintain the title from before their transition. Since no MEP has publicly stated that they are transgender or nonbinary, this title was taken to imply gender. Another method used was the inclusion of pronouns in a biography that can be reasonably assumed was either submitted or approved by the MEP. Additionally, since many languages are gendered, one can identify their gender from their writings. So if a MEP spoke in a language that is gendered, this was used to determine how they identify. If these forms were not available, the CV from the European Parliament website was consulted, which often contains references to the person's gender. It is stated that “the MEP is solely responsible for the information published,” so we can take this as a self-statement. If these were not available, other more unreliable methods were used including, assuming that an individual is cis-gendered if they made statements against “gender ideology,” as well as statements from a family member (a MEPs wife using he/him pronouns in reference to the MEP), and finally, context clues such as a member participating in a Women’s group.

Table 3: Committee on Development (DEVE) Gender Identities<sup>2</sup>

| Name                          | G <sup>3</sup> | Member State | Political Group         | Member State Political Party | Proof                                                                                 |
|-------------------------------|----------------|--------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Barry Andrews<br>*Chair       | M              | Ireland      | Renew <sup>4</sup>      | Fianna Fáil Party            | Use of “he” in the “meet me” part of his personal political <a href="#">website</a> . |
| Isabella Lovin<br>*Vice Chair | W              | Sweden       | Greens/EFA <sup>5</sup> | Miljöpartiet de gröna        | Use of “she” on her Swedish Green Party <a href="#">profile</a> .                     |

<sup>2</sup> *Members | Home | DEVE | Committees | European Parliament*. (2019). Europa.eu. <https://www.europarl.europa.eu/committees/en/deve/home/members>

<sup>3</sup> Gender Identity (W= Woman, M= Man)

<sup>4</sup> Renew Europe Group

<sup>5</sup> Greens/European Free Alliance

Table 3: Committee on Development (DEVE) Gender Identities<sup>2</sup>

|                               |   |         |                  |                                             |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
|-------------------------------|---|---------|------------------|---------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Hildegard Bentele *Vice Chair | W | Germany | EPP <sup>6</sup> | Christlich Demokratische Union Deutschlands | Use of “she “ in personal political <a href="#">website</a> .                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| Abir Al-Sahlanı *Vice Chair   | W | Sweden  | Renew            | Centerpartiet                               | In an <a href="#">Instagram</a> post by her party, she is referenced as “she”.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| Robert Biedroń *Vice Chair    | M | Poland  | S&D <sup>7</sup> | Nowa Lewica                                 | <p>“Robert Biedroń pochodzi z Podkarpacia, wychowywał się w Krośnie. W Ustrzykach Dolnych ukończył Technikum Hotelarskie. – Pamiętam dzień, kiedy z powodu tego, że jestem gejem, chciałem się zabić – wyznał <a href="#">polityk</a>.”</p> <p>Google translated as: I remember the day when I wanted to kill myself because I was gay," the politician confessed.</p> <p>The Polish noun ‘gej’ is reserved only for <a href="#">men</a>. It refers to a man practicing <a href="#">homosexuality</a>.</p> |
| Udo Bullmann                  | M | Germany | S&D              | Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands     | “Until his election to the European Parliament, he was a university lecturer and Jean Monnet Professor                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |

<sup>6</sup> Group of the European People's Party (Christian Democrats)

<sup>7</sup> Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament

Table 3: Committee on Development (DEVE) Gender Identities<sup>2</sup>

|                       |   |            |       |                              |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
|-----------------------|---|------------|-------|------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                       |   |            |       |                              | for European Studies (“Studies on European Integration”) at the Justus Liebig University of Giessen (1998-1999)”<br><br>From the <a href="#">About Me</a> section of his personal website.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| Rosa Estaràs Ferragut | W | Spain      | EPP   | Partido Popular              | In her <a href="#">bio</a> : “Born in 1965. Valldemosa (Mallorca). Graduated in Law. Regional President of the PP in the Balearic Islands since 2007, she is also a member of the National Executive Committee of the PP since 1999. She has been MP in the Balearic Regional Parliament (2000-2003), municipal counsellor in Valldemosa (since 1991), member of the Balearic Regional Government in 1993 and from 1996 to 1999. MEP since 2009.”<br>“My positions in parliament”, “My work in the European Parliament,”” how to contact me” imply this is her site that she controls. |
| Niels Geuking         | M | Germany    | EPP   | Familien-Partei Deutschlands | Refers to himself as “Ehemann und Papa” on his <a href="#">Instagram profile</a> .                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| Charles               | M | Luxembourg | Renew | Parti                        | In a <a href="#">bio for his</a>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |

Table 3: Committee on Development (DEVE) Gender Identities<sup>2</sup>

|                      |   |        |                  |                        |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
|----------------------|---|--------|------------------|------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Goerens              |   |        |                  | démocratique           | <a href="#">contribution to a written piece</a> . “Charles Goerens is a member of the European Parliament and of the Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe; he also serves as a member of the Subcommittee on Human Rights of the European Parliament. He looks back on a long political career, which completed an important stage with his first election into the Parliament of Luxembourg in 1979, and which also encompasses the ministerial offices he held between 1999 and 2004. Since 1997, he instigates Luxembourg’s ‘voyages commémoratifs’ to Auschwitz.” It says this: “All information refers to the publishing date of the second German edition of this volume (2015) unless actualised by the authors,” implying the authors approved the bios. |
| Małgorzata Gosiewska | W | Poland | ECR <sup>8</sup> | Prawo i Sprawiedliwość | <a href="#">“Jestem dumna, że jestem Polką.”</a> In this statement, she uses the <a href="#">feminine form</a> to talk about herself in Polish.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |

---

<sup>8</sup> European Conservatives and Reformists Group

Table 3: Committee on Development (DEVE) Gender Identities<sup>2</sup>

|                  |   |         |                   |                             |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
|------------------|---|---------|-------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| György Hölvényi  | M | Hungary | PFE <sup>9</sup>  | Kereszténydemokrata Néppárt | “Marital status: married, <a href="#">father</a> of three children”                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
| Marc Jongen      | M | Germany | ESN <sup>10</sup> | Alternative für Deutschland | His <a href="#">CV</a> in German uses the male form.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
| Murielle Laurent | W | France  | S&D               | Parti socialiste            | <a href="#">Profile</a> about her, she calls herself a mother. “Mon regard sur le monde et mes combats se nourrissent également de mon rôle de maman et de ma passion pour le cinéma et la littérature qui me servent dans mes fonctions d’élue.”                                                                           |
| Reinhold Lopatka | M | Austria | EPP               | Österreichische Volkspartei | “Oststeirer   Österreicher   Europäer<br>Member of the European Parliament<br><a href="#">@europeanparliament</a> <br>Delegationsleiter “ in <a href="#">Instagram bio</a> .<br><br>Uses female form when referring to women in posts. |
| Mimmo Lucano     | M | Italy   | GUE/NGL           | Alleanza Verdi e Sinistra   | In <a href="#">this interview</a> he states “questo io sono uno che ha cercato aiuto”<br>In <a href="#">Italian</a> , “uno” is used with masculine nouns.                                                                                                                                                                   |
| Lukas Mandl      | M | Austria | EPP               | Österreichische Volkspartei | Use of he in <a href="#">bio</a> , then it says “my positions,” implying he is in control of the page and has either written or approved the                                                                                                                                                                                |

<sup>9</sup> Patriots for Europe Group<sup>10</sup> Europe of Sovereign Nations Group

Table 3: Committee on Development (DEVE) Gender Identities<sup>2</sup>

|                     |   |           |            |                                                 |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
|---------------------|---|-----------|------------|-------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Thierry Mariani     | M | France    | PFE        | Rassemblement national                          | <p>bio.</p> <p>“1993-2010 : Elected four times as a Member of the French Parliament for Vaucluse between 1993 and November 2010, during which period he was a member of the Law Committee. Appointed Special Representative of France for Afghanistan and Pakistan from 2009 to 2010 by the President of the Republic.”</p> <p>This statement is from his CV on the <a href="#">European Union website</a>.</p> <p>“(The MEP is solely responsible for the information published)”</p> |
| Liudas Mažylis      | M | Lithuania | EPP        | Tėvynės sąjunga-Lietuvos krikščionys demokratai | <p>Use of he in <a href="#">bio</a>, then it says “my positions” implying he is in control of the page and has written/approved it.</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
| Ana Miranda Paz     | W | Spain     | Greens/EFA | Bloque Nacionalista Galego                      | <p><a href="#">Instagram Bio</a> states: “Nai de Xulia.Filla de Lela e Pepe❤️”</p> <p>Filla means daughter in <a href="#">Galician</a>.</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
| Tiago Moreira de Sá | M | Portugal  | PFE        | Chega                                           | <p>Uses the male form in CV on the <a href="#">European Parliament website</a>.</p> <p>“Curriculum vitae (The MEP is solely responsible for the information published)”</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |

Table 3: Committee on Development (DEVE) Gender Identities<sup>2</sup>

|             |   |       |     |                                      |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
|-------------|---|-------|-----|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Leire Pajín | W | Spain | S&D | Partido Socialista<br>Obrero Español | <p>This <a href="#">statement</a> highly implies she identifies as a woman:</p> <p>“El feminismo es una carrera de relevos, y se agranda y llega a la meta antes, cuanto más firme se pasa el testigo de unas a otras. cuando las mujeres tejemos redes con el poderoso hilo de la #sororidad generosa y empática, el poder se transforma, el patriarcado se debilita y la democracia se fortalece. Me siento profundamente orgullosa de que muchos años después de coger el testigo de #Carmengarciabloise, mi compañera @rebeca_torro lo recoja ahora con firmeza. Cuenta con todas nosotras para tejer y seguir avanzando, para reformar y cambiar las estructuras</p> <p>•@diana.morant<br/>@pilar.bernabe.garcia<br/>@enmalopeza<br/>@iratxegarper@hana.jallo<br/>ul @pilar_alegria_<br/>@montsecanasm<br/>@isabelrguez ....<br/>adelante!!!</p> <p><a href="#">Translated:</a></p> <p>Feminism is a relay race, and it grows and reaches</p> |
|-------------|---|-------|-----|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

Table 3: Committee on Development (DEVE) Gender Identities<sup>2</sup>

|                         |   |       |         |         |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
|-------------------------|---|-------|---------|---------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                         |   |       |         |         | <p>the finish line faster the more firmly the baton is passed from one to another.</p> <p>When women weave networks with the powerful thread of generous and empathetic #sisterhood, power is transformed, patriarchy is weakened, and democracy is strengthened.</p> <p>I am deeply proud that many years after taking the baton from #Carmengarciabloise, my colleague @rebeca_torro now firmly picks it up. Count on all of us to weave and continue moving forward, to reform and change structures.</p> <p>•@diana.morant<br/>         @pilar.bernabe.garcia<br/>         @enmalopeza<br/>         @iratxegarper<br/>         @hana.jalloul<br/>         @pilar_alegria_<br/>         @montsecanasm<br/>         @isabelrguez ....<br/>         forward!!!</p> |
| Isabel Serra<br>Sánchez | W | Spain | GUE/NGL | PODEMOS | <p>Uses female form in CV on the <a href="#">European Parliament website</a>.</p> <p>Curriculum vitae (The MEP is solely responsible for the information</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |

Table 3: Committee on Development (DEVE) Gender Identities<sup>2</sup>

|                      |   |           |     |                                                             |                                                                                                                                  |
|----------------------|---|-----------|-----|-------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                      |   |           |     |                                                             | published)                                                                                                                       |
| Kristoffer Storm     | M | Denmark   | ECR | Danmarks Demokraterne                                       | “Father of four” in bio on <a href="#">Instagram</a> .                                                                           |
| Marco Tarquinio      | M | Italy     | S&D | Partito Democratico                                         | The Italian language of CV on the <a href="#">European Parliament website</a> is gendered consistently using the masculine form. |
|                      |   |           |     |                                                             | “Curriculum vitae (The MEP is solely responsible for the information published)”                                                 |
| Waldemar Tomaszewski | M | Lithuania | ECR | Lietuvos lenkų rinkimų akcija – Krikščioniškų šeimų sąjunga | His <a href="#">personal website</a> uses he/him pronouns he/him in english.                                                     |

Table 4: Committee on Development (DEVE): Substitutes Gender Identities<sup>11</sup>

| Name                | G <sup>1</sup> <sub>2</sub> | Member State | Political Group | Member State Political Party | Proof                                                                                 |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|--------------|-----------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Damien Carême       | M                           | France       | GUE/NGL         | La France Insoumise          | <a href="#">Personal website</a> uses the male masculine form “ <a href="#">il</a> .” |
| Christophe Clergeau | M                           | France       | S&D             | Parti socialiste             | Uses the male gender form in <a href="#">Facebook bio</a> .                           |

<sup>11</sup> *Members | Home | DEVE | Committees | European Parliament*. (2019). Europa.eu. <https://www.europarl.europa.eu/committees/en/deve/home/members>

<sup>12</sup> Gender Identity (W= Woman, M= Man)

Table 4: Committee on Development (DEVE): Substitutes Gender Identities<sup>11</sup>

|                |   |             |     |                           |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
|----------------|---|-------------|-----|---------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Marieke Ehlers | W | Netherlands | PFE | s Partij voor de Vrijheid | <p><a href="#"><i>Blue-card answer</i></a>. –” I think it's a very naive argument to think what we're doing in Africa and the rest of the developing world is actually helping them at the moment. We do not see significant improvements because of the projects of the EU. We spend billions and billions of dollars buying them blenders for schools where they don't have electricity, funding transgender craziness in developing countries. We are not preventing them from migrating. We are not helping them. It has the opposite effect.”</p> <p>Implies she identifies as cisgender and due to her appearance as a woman.</p>                                                                           |
| Dick Erixon    | M | Sweden      | ECR | Sverigedemokraterna       | <p>On <a href="#"><u>X</u></a>: Queer är en teori som inte bara utmanar normativ syn på kön och sexualitet utan driver en politisk agenda, som Gudrun Schyman sa: "Död åt familjen". Det är en extrem förändring av samhället som eftersträvas och som det inte finns någon anledning att ställa upp på. #pride</p> <p>Translated from Swedish :</p> <p>Queer is a theory that not only challenges normative views on gender and sexuality but also drives a political agenda, as Gudrun Schyman said: "Death to the family". It is an extreme change in society that is being sought and that there is no reason to support. #pride</p> <p>Implies he identifies as cisgender and due to his appearance as a</p> |

Table 4: Committee on Development (DEVE): Substitutes Gender Identities<sup>11</sup>

|                      |   |         |              |                             |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
|----------------------|---|---------|--------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Tomasz Froelich      | M | Germany | ESN          | Alternative für Deutschland | man.<br><br>“Many are realizing that what the left and liberals claim has little to do with reality. There are not 67 genders. Immigration does not bring positive effects—neither economically, nor in terms of security, nor socially.” This statement is reported in a <a href="#">news article</a> .<br>Implies he identifies as cisgender and due to his appearance as a man.                                                                                                                                                                                                |
| Andrzej Halicki      | M | Poland  | EPP          | Platforma Obywatelska       | On his Political Group <a href="#">website</a> section: My positions in parliament”, “My work in the European Parliament”” How to contact me” implies this is his site that she controls<br><br>“He graduated from the Department of Internal Trade of the Warsaw School of Economics with expertise in air transportation. During his studies, between 1988 and 1989, he was a member of the national authorities of the underground anti-communist organisation NZS (the Independent Students Association) and a leader of the organisation at the Warsaw School of Economics.” |
| Anna-Maja Henriksson | W | Finland | Renew Europe | Svenska folkpartiet         | <a href="#">Personal website</a> uses she/her.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |

Table 4: Committee on Development (DEVE): Substitutes Gender Identities<sup>11</sup>

|                  |   |         |     |                                             |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
|------------------|---|---------|-----|---------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Paolo Inselvini  | M | Italy   | ECR | FRATELLI D' ITALIA                          | <a href="#">X bio</a> :Deputato Parlamento Europeo per Fratelli d'Italia<br><br>Deputato is masculine in <a href="#">Italian</a> .                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
| Mariusz Kamiński | M | Poland  | ECR | Prawo i Sprawiedliwość                      | “I have a commitment to those people who died, who shed blood for the homeland. Those who fought in the November, January, and Warsaw uprisings,” Mariusz Kamiński told his wife before his unlawful arrest. Barbara Kamińska recounted a moving conversation with her husband that took place before his detention on Telewizja Republika.<br><br>I couldn't find a personal statement but his <a href="#">wife referred to him</a> with he/him. |
| Ondřej Kolář     | M | Czechia | EPP | TOP 09 a Starostové                         | <a href="#">Party website</a> uses he/him.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
| Norbert Lins     | M | Germany | EPP | Christlich Demokratische Union Deutschlands | Use of he in <a href="#">bio</a> , then it says “my positions” implying he is in control of the page and has written/approved it.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |

Table 4: Committee on Development (DEVE): Substitutes Gender Identities<sup>11</sup>

|                      |   |             |            |                                   |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
|----------------------|---|-------------|------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Juan F López Aguilar | M | Spain       | S&D        | Partido Socialista Obrero Español | Use of male form in Spanish in <a href="#">X bio</a> : Catedrático Derecho Constitucional. Portavoz Comisión Asuntos Constitucionales Parlamento Europeo. Miembro d Comité Federal PSOE. Eurodiputado RUP.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| Marit Maij           | W | Netherlands | S&D        | GroenLinks-PvdA                   | “ <a href="#">Every woman knows another woman who has suffered violence or has suffered violence herself</a> ”<br>Suggests she includes herself in the category of women.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| Erik Marquardt       | M | Germany     | Greens/EFA | Bündnis 90/Die Grünen             | “Erik Marquardt got a first-hand impression of the inhuman conditions in the Moria refugee camp, where more than 20,000 people live in the most miserable conditions. An outbreak of coronavirus would be devastating. In order to draw more attention to this issue, he has co-created the Leave no One Behind campaign.” written <a href="#">before an article</a> that he wrote himself, implying he approved of it or wrote it himself. |
| Fulvio Martusciello  | M | Italy       | EPP        | Forza Italia                      | A <a href="#">webpage</a> that says “How to contact me ?” implies he controls the page.<br>His bio uses he/him pronouns.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| Carolina Morace      | W | Italy       | GUE/NGL    | Movimento 5 Stelle                | “Sono una donna di sport”<br>I am a sports woman. A statement from her <a href="#">Facebook</a> .                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| Nadine               | W | France      | EPP        | Les                               | Uses the feminine form of French                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |

Table 4: Committee on Development (DEVE): Substitutes Gender Identities<sup>11</sup>

|                               |   |          |              |                               |                                                                                                                                                                      |
|-------------------------------|---|----------|--------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Morano                        |   |          |              | Républicain<br>s              | on her <a href="#">personal website</a> .                                                                                                                            |
| Mounir<br>Satouri             | M | France   | Greens/EFA   | Les<br>Écologistes            | On <a href="#">linktree</a> he says :<br>This is “his site” implying he has<br>control of it .<br>“Il travaille” uses <a href="#">he/him pronoun<br/>in french</a> . |
| Cecilia<br>Strada             | W | Italy    | S&D          | Partito<br>Democratic<br>o    | “Campionessa” in <a href="#">Instagram bio</a> ,<br>feminine version of the word in<br>Italian.                                                                      |
| Carla<br>Tavares              | W | Portugal | S&D          | Partido<br>Socialista         | Uses feminine form in her <a href="#">X bio</a><br>“Deputada.”                                                                                                       |
| Hermann<br>Tertsch            | M | Spain    | PFE          | VOX                           | Uses Portuguese male form in <a href="#">X<br/>bio</a> .                                                                                                             |
| Tomas<br>Tobé                 | M | Sweden   | EPP          | Moderaterna                   | Has his pronouns in his<br><a href="#">Instagram bio</a> as “(M)” for man.                                                                                           |
| Rody<br>Tolassy               | M | France   | PFE          | Rassemblem<br>ent national    | Uses the French male form in<br><a href="#">Facebook</a> bio.                                                                                                        |
| Vlad<br>Vasile-Voic<br>ulescu | M | Romania  | Renew Europe | Uniunea<br>Salvați<br>România | Uses the male form in Romanian<br>on <a href="#">his personal website</a> .                                                                                          |

Table 5: Committee on Foreign Affairs (AFET): Gender Identities<sup>13</sup>

| Name                             | G <sup>1</sup><br>4 | Member State | Political Group | Member State<br>Political Party                      | Proof                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
|----------------------------------|---------------------|--------------|-----------------|------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| David McAllister<br>*Chair       | M                   | Germany      | EPP             | Christlich<br>Demokratische<br>Union<br>Deutschlands | His CV from <a href="#">his website</a> uses he/him pronouns.                                                                                                                                                         |
| Hana Jalloul Muro<br>*Vice Chair | W                   | Spain        | S&D             | Partido<br>Socialista<br>Obrero Español              | <a href="#">Instagram bio</a> uses feminine Spanish gendered language.                                                                                                                                                |
| Urmas Paet<br>*Vice Chair        | M                   | Estonia      | Renew Europe    | Eesti<br>Reformierakond                              | He said in this <a href="#">video</a> that he joined the white ribbon campaign, a campaign to engage men and boys against violence against women, which implies he identifies as a man.                               |
| Alberico Gambino<br>*Vice Chair  | M                   | Italy        | ECR             | FRATELLI D'<br>ITALIA                                | Refers to himself as a father on <a href="#">his website</a> and also says “as a young man.”                                                                                                                          |
| Ioan-Rareș Bogdan<br>*Vice Chair | M                   | Romania      | EPP             | Partidul<br>Național Liberal                         | While he does not explicitly state his gender, he seems to state that he is against <a href="#">people identifying as genders other than the sex they are born as</a> , which highly suggests he identifies as a man. |
| Mika Aaltola                     | M                   | Finland      | EPP             | Kansallinen<br>Kokoomus                              | Refers to himself as a father in his <a href="#">instagram bio</a> .                                                                                                                                                  |
| Lucia Annunziata                 | W                   | Italy        | S&D             | Partito<br>Democratico                               | “Mi sono dimessa tante volte” uses the feminine form in Italian <a href="#">in statements about herself</a> .                                                                                                         |

<sup>13</sup> *Members | Home | AFET | Committees | European Parliament.* (2019). Europa.eu.<https://www.europarl.europa.eu/committees/en/afet/home/members><sup>14</sup> Gender Identity (W= Woman, M= Man)

Table 5: Committee on Foreign Affairs (AFET): Gender Identities<sup>13</sup>

|                     |   |           |              |                                |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
|---------------------|---|-----------|--------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Petras Auštrevičius | M | Lithuania | Renew Europe | Liberalų sąjūdis               | In Lithuania, nouns with “ys” ending are <a href="#">masculine</a> . His <a href="#">Instagram bio</a> says “Europos Parlamento narys” implying he identifies as a male.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| Jordan Bardella     | M | France    | PFE          | Rassemblement national         | <a href="#">Instagram bio</a> uses male gendered form in french.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| Dan Barna           | M | Romania   | Renew Europe | Uniunea Salvați România        | His section on the <a href="#">party website biography</a> uses male pronouns.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| Wouter Beke         | M | Belgium   | EPP          | Christen-Democratisch & Vlaams | <a href="#">His website</a> consistently uses he/him pronouns.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| Robert Biedroń      | M | Poland    | S&D          | Nowa Lewica                    | <p>“Robert Biedroń pochodzi z Podkarpacia, wychowywał się w Krośnie. W Ustrzykach Dolnych ukończył Technikum Hotelarskie. – Pamiętam dzień, kiedy z powodu tego, że jestem gejem, chciałem się zabić – wyznał <a href="#">polityk</a>.”</p> <p>Google translated as: I remember the day when I wanted to kill myself because I was gay," the politician confessed.</p> <p>The Polish noun ‘gej’ is reserved only for <a href="#">men</a>. It refers to a man practicing <a href="#">homosexuality</a>.</p> |
| Adam Bielan         | M | Poland    | ECR          | Prawo i Sprawiedliwość         | X <a href="#">bio</a> is gendered “Przewodniczący delegacji @pisorgpl w Parlamencie Europejskim, koordynator                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |

Table 5: Committee on Foreign Affairs (AFET): Gender Identities<sup>13</sup>

|             |   |          |                      |                          |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
|-------------|---|----------|----------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Luboš Blaha | M | Slovakia | Non-attached Members | SMER-Sociálna demokracia | <p><a href="#">@ecrgroup</a> w Komisji Spraw Zagranicznych</p> <p>"</p> <p>Przewodniczący- masculine in <a href="#">Polish</a>.</p> <p>His <a href="#">statement</a> against multiple genders: "We don't want to have 67 different genders. For them, a family is comprised of a father, mother, and children," European Parliamentarian Luboš Blaha said during an ongoing debate on Georgia in the European Parliament. As he noted, Georgia has adopted a law against extremist ideology.</p> <p>"There is outrage, outrage about EU involvement in Georgian sovereignty. This is an attempt to dictate to Georgia. Georgia has adopted a law, which rejects extreme ideology. We, in Slovakia, are a traditional society like Georgia. We don't want to have 67 different genders. For them, a family is comprised of a father, mother, and children. So I'm crossing my fingers for them. If we look at America and the U.S. Neoliberal foundations, they are providing and making large amounts of money available to try to topple governments that they don't like. But if something were to be done by Russia, you would cry out against it. This is all preposterous. You hate Georgia because this country wants to have pragmatic relations with</p> |
|-------------|---|----------|----------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

Table 5: Committee on Foreign Affairs (AFET): Gender Identities<sup>13</sup>

|                      |   |          |                      |                                         |                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
|----------------------|---|----------|----------------------|-----------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                      |   |          |                      |                                         | Russia, it wants dialogue, it wants peace. And we want that too. We want that in Slovakia, that's why Prime Minister Fico was almost killed by an extremist. Long live freedom!"<br>Luboš Blaha declared. |
| Marc Botenga         | M | Belgium  | GUE/NGL              | PVDA-PTB                                | Implies he identifies as he/him based on the way he presents himself.                                                                                                                                     |
| Helmut Brandstätter  | M | Austria  | Renew Europe         | NEOS – Das Neue Österreich              | <a href="#">X profile</a> uses the male form in French for "Eurodéputé"                                                                                                                                   |
| Grzegorz Braun       | M | Poland   | Non-attached Members | Konfederacja Korony Polskiej            | <a href="#">X profile</a> uses male form in bio.                                                                                                                                                          |
| Sebastião R. Bugalho | M | Portugal | EPP                  | Partido Social Democrata                | <a href="#">Personal website</a> uses he/him pronouns.                                                                                                                                                    |
| Petr Bystron         | M | Germany  | ESN                  | Alternative für Deutschland             | <a href="#">Instagram bio</a> uses the male form of Member of Parliament.                                                                                                                                 |
| Tobias Cremer        | M | Germany  | S&D                  | Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands | <a href="#">Instagram bio</a> uses the male form in German.                                                                                                                                               |
| Danilo Della Valle   | M | Italy    | GUE/NGL              | Movimento 5 Stelle                      | "Einer" is the male form in German on his <a href="#">personal website</a> .                                                                                                                              |
| Özlem Alev Demirel   | W | Germany  | GUE/NGL              | DIE LINKE                               | <a href="#">X bio</a> uses masculine language in Italian.                                                                                                                                                 |
| Elio Di Rupo         | M | Belgium  | S&D                  | Parti Socialiste                        | Refers to herself as a daughter on her <a href="#">website</a> .                                                                                                                                          |
|                      |   |          |                      |                                         | Uses masculine form in French                                                                                                                                                                             |

Table 5: Committee on Foreign Affairs (AFET): Gender Identities<sup>13</sup>

|                    |   |           |              |                                                             |                                                                                       |
|--------------------|---|-----------|--------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                    |   |           |              |                                                             | in <a href="#">Facebook bio</a> .                                                     |
| Loucas Fourlas     | M | Cyprus    | EPP          | Democratic Rally                                            | Uses he/him pronouns on his page on the <a href="#">EPP page</a> .                    |
| Michael Gahler     | M | Germany   | EPP          | Christlich Demokratische Union Deutschlands                 | Uses masculine form in German on his <a href="#">personal website</a> .               |
| Gál Kinga          | W | Hungary   | PFE          | Fidesz-Magyar Polgári Szövetség-Kereszténydemokrata Néppárt | In an <a href="#">interview</a> ‘for me, as a woman and a mother.’                    |
| Geadis Geadis      | M | Cyprus    | ECR          | Εθνικό Λαϊκό Μέτωπο                                         | <a href="#">Personal website</a> uses he/him pronouns.                                |
| Giorgos Georgiou   | M | Cyprus    | GUE/NGL      | Progressive Party of Working People - Left - New Forces     | <a href="#">X bio</a> uses the masculine form in Greek.                               |
| Raphaël Glucksmann | M | France    | S&D          | Place publique                                              | <a href="#">CV</a> uses French masculine language.                                    |
| Christophe Gomart  | M | France    | EPP          | Les Républicains                                            | <a href="#">X bio</a> uses the male masculine form in French.                         |
| Bernard Guetta     | M | France    | Renew Europe | Sans parti                                                  | Bio refers to “his team” on <a href="#">X</a> .                                       |
| Rima Hassan        | W | France    | GUE/NGL      | La France Insoumise                                         | <a href="#">X Bio</a> uses French feminine language.                                  |
| Rasa Juknevičienė  | W | Lithuania | EPP          | Tėvynės sąjunga-Lietuvos krikščionys demokratai             | “Chairwoman” in <a href="#">bio</a> uses “I” language, implying she wrote it herself. |

Table 5: Committee on Foreign Affairs (AFET): Gender Identities<sup>13</sup>

|                       |   |          |              |                                                                    |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
|-----------------------|---|----------|--------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Sandra Kalniete       | W | Latvia   | EPP          | Jaunā Vienotība                                                    | Uses she/ her language on her <a href="#">personal website</a> .                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| Łukasz Kohut          | M | Poland   | EPP          | Independent                                                        | Uses the male form in Polish in <a href="#">X bio</a> .                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| Ondřej Kolář          | M | Czechia  | EPP          | TOP 09 a Starostové                                                | <a href="#">Party website</a> uses he/him.                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
| Rihards Kols          | M | Latvia   | ECR          | Nacionālā apvienība "Visu Latvijai!" - "Tēvzemei un Brīvībai/LNNK" | <a href="#">His website</a> uses he/him pronouns.                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| Andrey Kovatchev      | M | Bulgaria | EPP          | Citizens for European Development of Bulgaria                      | “Chairman” on <a href="#">his website</a> .                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| Vilis Krištopans      | M | Latvia   | PFE          | Latvija pirmajā vietā                                              | <a href="#">Political group website</a> uses he/him.                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| Sergey Lagodinsky     | M | Germany  | Greens/EFA   | Bündnis 90/Die Grünen                                              | <a href="#">His website</a> uses male pronouns in German.                                                                                                                                                                                         |
| Nathalie Loiseau      | W | France   | Renew Europe | Horizons                                                           | <a href="#">X bio</a> uses French feminine form.                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| Reinhold Lopatka      | M | Austria  | EPP          | Österreichische Volkspartei                                        | “Oststeirer   Österreicher   Europäer<br>Member of the European Parliament<br>@europeanparliament <br>Delegationsleiter “ in <a href="#">instagram bio</a> . |
| Antonio López-Istúriz | M | Spain    | EPP          | Partido Popular                                                    | Uses female form when referring to women in posts.<br><br>His <a href="#">personal website</a> uses he/him pronouns.                                                                                                                              |

Table 5: Committee on Foreign Affairs (AFET): Gender Identities<sup>13</sup>

|                      |   |         |              |                              |                                                                                                                 |
|----------------------|---|---------|--------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| White                |   |         |              |                              |                                                                                                                 |
| Jaak Madison         | M | Estonia | ECR          | Eesti Keskerakond            | “Chairman” in <a href="#">EP Curriculum vitae</a> (The MEP is solely responsible for the information published) |
| Claudiu Manda        | M | Romania | S&D          | Partidul Social Democrat     | <a href="#">Facebook profile</a> uses masculine form.                                                           |
| Marion Maréchal      | W | France  | ECR          | Identité Libertés            | CV on the <a href="#">EP website</a> uses the feminine form in French.                                          |
| Costas Mavrides      | M | Cyprus  | S&D          | Democratic Party             | <a href="#">X bio</a> is gendered in Greek.                                                                     |
| Vangelis Meimarakis  | M | Greece  | EPP          | Nea Demokratia               | His part of <a href="#">EPP website</a> with “my positions in parliament” uses he/him pronouns.                 |
| Sven Mikser          | M | Estonia | S&D          | Sotsiaaldemokraatlik Erakond | Refers to himself as a father in an <a href="#">interview</a> .                                                 |
| Francisco Millán Mon | M | Spain   | EPP          | Partido Popular              | <a href="#">X bio</a> uses the male gendered form in Spanish.                                                   |
| Arkadiusz Mularczyk  | M | Poland  | ECR          | Prawo i Sprawiedliwość       | Refers to himself as a husband and father on <a href="#">his website</a> .                                      |
| Hannah Neumann       | W | Germany | Greens/EFA   | Bündnis 90/Die Grünen        | <a href="#">Personal website</a> uses feminine form in German.                                                  |
| Leoluca Orlando      | M | Italy   | Greens/EFA   | Independent                  | Referred to as he/him in a <a href="#">bio submitted by his wife</a> - assume she correctly genders him.        |
| Kostas Papadakis     | M | Greece  | Non-attached | Communist Party of Greece    | His party's <a href="#">website</a> refers to him with he/him. He has no personal website or social             |

Table 5: Committee on Foreign Affairs (AFET): Gender Identities<sup>13</sup>

|                      |   |             |            |                                        |                                                                                                                                                       |
|----------------------|---|-------------|------------|----------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                      |   |             |            |                                        | media, so this is the best I could do.                                                                                                                |
| Tonino Picula        | M | Croatia     | S&D        | Socijaldemokratska partija Hrvatske    | <a href="#">Personal website</a> uses he/him pronouns.                                                                                                |
| Thijs Reuten         | M | Netherlands | S&D        | GroenLinks-PvdA                        | Refers to himself as a son on <a href="#">his website</a> .                                                                                           |
| Nela Riehl           | W | Germany     | Greens/EFA | Volt                                   | Refers to herself as a black woman in an <a href="#">interview</a> .                                                                                  |
| Ignacio Sánchez Amor | M | Spain       | S&D        | Partido Socialista Obrero Español      | <a href="#">CV</a> uses the male form in Spanish.                                                                                                     |
| Mounir Satouri       | M | France      | Greens/EFA | Les Écologistes                        | On <a href="#">linktree</a> he says : This is “ <a href="#">his site</a> ” implying he as control of it “Il travaille” uses he/him pronoun in french. |
| Andreas Schieder     | M | Austria     | S&D        | Sozialdemokratische Partei Österreichs | <a href="#">Personal website</a> uses the male form in German.                                                                                        |
| Alexander Sell       | M | Germany     | ESN        | Sozialdemokratische Partei Österreichs | <a href="#">German party website</a> uses he/him pronouns.                                                                                            |
| Villy Søvndal        | M | Denmark     | Greens/EFA | Socialistisk Folkeparti                | <a href="#">CV</a> refers to him as a son.                                                                                                            |
| Davor Ivo Stier      | M | Croatia     | EPP        | Hrvatska demokratska zajednica         | Referred to as a father on his <a href="#">personal website</a> .                                                                                     |
| Sebastiaan Stöteler  | M | Netherlands | PFE        | Partij voor de Vrijheid                | <a href="#">Party website</a> uses he/him pronouns.                                                                                                   |

Table 5: Committee on Foreign Affairs (AFET): Gender Identities<sup>13</sup>

|                               |   |          |              |                                              |                                                                                                   |
|-------------------------------|---|----------|--------------|----------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Stanislav Stoyanov            | M | Bulgaria | ESN          | Revival                                      | Posted about being elected “chairman” on <a href="#">X</a> .                                      |
| Marie-Agnes Strack-Zimmermann | W | Germany  | Renew Europe | Freie Demokratische Partei                   | <a href="#">Her website</a> refers to her with female forms of nouns in German.                   |
| Michał Szczerba               | M | Poland   | EPP          | Platforma Obywatelska                        | <a href="#">Personal website</a> uses he/him pronouns.                                            |
| António Tânger Corrêa         | M | Portugal | PFE          | Chega                                        | <a href="#">The political group website</a> uses he/him pronouns.                                 |
| Marta Temido                  | W | Portugal | S&D          | Partido Socialista                           | <a href="#">X bio</a> uses the female form in Portuguese.                                         |
| Cristian Terhes               | M | Romania  | ECR          | Partidului Național Conservator Român (PNCR) | <a href="#">Referred</a> to transgender individuals as “perverts”, which implies he is cisgender. |
| Riho Terras                   | M | Estonia  | EPP          | Isamaa                                       | <a href="#">The section on the EPP</a> website uses he/him pronouns.                              |
| Hermann Tertsch               | M | Spain    | PFE          | Vox                                          | Uses Portuguese male form in <a href="#">X bio</a> .                                              |
| Pierre-Romain Thionnet        | M | France   | PFE          | Rassemblement national                       | <a href="#">X</a> uses the male form in French                                                    |
| Sebastian Tynkkynen           | M | Finland  | ECR          | Perussuomalaiset                             | Referred to as “chairman” on his <a href="#">personal website</a> .                               |
| Roberto Vannacci              | M | Italy    | PFE          | Lega                                         | <a href="#">Instagram bio</a> uses the Italian male form.                                         |

Table 5: Committee on Foreign Affairs (AFET): Gender Identities<sup>13</sup>

|                   |   |         |              |                                      |                                                            |
|-------------------|---|---------|--------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|
| Hilde Vautmans    | W | Belgium | Renew Europe | Open Vlaamse Liberalen en Democraten | <a href="#">Personal website</a> uses she/her pronouns.    |
| Harald Vilimsky   | M | Austria | PFE          | Freiheitliche Partei Österreichs     | <a href="#">Facebook</a> uses the male form in German.     |
| Nicola Zingaretti | M | Italy   | S&D          | Partito Democratico                  | <a href="#">His website</a> uses the male form in Italian. |
| Zeljana Zovko     | W | Croatia | EPP          | Hrvatska demokratska zajednica       | <a href="#">Personal website</a> uses she/her pronouns.    |

Table 6: Committee on Foreign Affairs (AFET) Substitutes: Gender Identities<sup>15</sup>

| Name            | G <sup>16</sup> | Member State | Political Group | Member State Political Party            | Proof                                                                                                        |
|-----------------|-----------------|--------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Jaume Asens     | M               | Spain        | Greens/EFA      | Movimiento Sumar                        | <a href="#">Video</a> from Greens group introducing their interview uses he/him pronouns in the description. |
| Francisco Assis | M               | Portugal     | S&D             | Partido Socialista                      | His <a href="#">Instagram</a> uses the male form in Portuguese                                               |
| Malik Azmani    | M               | Netherlands  | Renew Europe    | Volkspartij voor Vrijheid en Democratie | His <a href="#">party website</a> uses he/him pronouns.                                                      |

<sup>15</sup> *Members | Home | AFET | Committees | European Parliament.* (2019). Europa.eu.

<https://www.europarl.europa.eu/committees/en/afet/home/members>

<sup>16</sup> Gender Identity (W= Woman, M= Man)

Table 6: Committee on Foreign Affairs (AFET) Substitutes: Gender Identities<sup>15</sup>

|                       |   |         |              |                                             |                                                                                                                                 |
|-----------------------|---|---------|--------------|---------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Laura Ballarin Cereza | W | Spain   | S&D          | Partido Socialista Obrero Español           | <a href="#">X bio</a> uses feminine form.                                                                                       |
| Pernando Barrena      | M | Spain   | GUE/NGL      | EH BILDU                                    | In an <a href="#">interview</a> , he is referred to as a married man, which is reasonable to assume is information he provided. |
| Nikola Bartůšek       | W | Czechia | PFE          | Přísaha                                     | <a href="#">Instagram</a> uses the female form in Czech.                                                                        |
| Krzysztof Brejza      | M | Poland  | EPP          | Platforma Obywatelska                       | <a href="#">National Party website</a> uses he/him form.                                                                        |
| Jaroslav Bžoch        | M | Czechia | PFE          | ANO 2011                                    | <a href="#">X bio</a> uses the male form, refers to him as father and husband.                                                  |
| Daniel Caspary        | M | Germany | EPP          | Christlich Demokratische Union Deutschlands | <a href="#">Website</a> uses male form.                                                                                         |
| Susanna Ceccardi      | W | Italy   | PFE          | Lega                                        | <a href="#">Personal website</a> uses the female form in Italian.                                                               |
| Vasile Dîncu          | M | Romania | S&D          | Partidul Social Democrat                    | His <a href="#">blog</a> has his gender set as male.                                                                            |
| Michał Dworczyk       | M | Poland  | ECR          | Prawo i Sprawiedliwość                      | <a href="#">X bio</a> uses male form of parliament member.                                                                      |
| Engin Eroglu          | M | Germany | Renew Europe | Freie Wähler                                | His <a href="https://www.engineofeurope.de/">https://www.engineofeurope.de/</a> uses male form in german.                       |

Table 6: Committee on Foreign Affairs (AFET) Substitutes: Gender Identities<sup>15</sup>

|                    |   |         |                      |                                                             |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
|--------------------|---|---------|----------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Jan Farský         | M | Czechia | EPP                  | Starostové a nezávislí                                      | <a href="#">Instagram bio</a> uses male form.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| Viktória Ferenc    | W | Hungary | PFE                  | Fidesz-Magyar Polgári Szövetség-Kereszténydemokrata Néppárt | Her <a href="#">party website</a> refers to her with she/her pronouns.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| Carlo Fidanza      | M | Italy   | ECR                  | FRATELLI D'ITALIA                                           | <a href="#">Personal website</a> uses male form in Italian.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
| Ruth Firmenich     | W | Germany | Non-attached Members | Bündnis Sahra Wagenknecht – Vernunft und Gerechtigkeit      | <a href="#">Website</a> uses the female form in German.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| Emmanouil Fragkos  | M | Greece  | ECR                  | Elliniki Lusi-Greek Solution                                | Uses the male form in Greek in <a href="#">X bio</a> .                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| Tomasz Froelich    | M | Germany | ESN                  | Alternative für Deutschland                                 | <a href="#">Statement</a> : “Many are realizing that what the left and liberals claim has little to do with reality. There are not 67 genders. Immigration does not bring positive effects—neither economically, nor in terms of security, nor socially.”<br>Implies he identifies as cisgender and due to his appearance as a man. |
| Sandra Gómez López | W | Spain   | S&D                  | Partido Socialista Obrero Español                           | <a href="#">CV</a> uses spanish female form.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |

Table 6: Committee on Foreign Affairs (AFET) Substitutes: Gender Identities<sup>15</sup>

|                      |   |             |              |                                         |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
|----------------------|---|-------------|--------------|-----------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Giorgio Gori         | M | Italy       | S&D          | Partito Democratico                     | On <a href="#">instagram</a> , he refers to himself as a father.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| Małgorzata Gosiewska | W | Poland      | ECR          | Prawo i Sprawiedliwość                  | Refers to herself as a daughter on her <a href="#">website</a> .                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| Bart Groothuis       | M | Netherlands | Renew Europe | Volkspartij voor Vrijheid en Democratie | His <a href="#">party website</a> refers to him as a man.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
| Christophe Grudler   | M | France      | Renew Europe | Mouvement Démocrate                     | <a href="#">Website</a> uses male form in french.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
| Andrzej Halicki      | M | Poland      | EPP          | Platforma Obywatelska                   | <p><a href="#">My positions in parliament</a>”, “My work in the european parliament””how to contact me” implies this is his site that she controls.</p> <p>“He graduated from the Department of Internal Trade of the Warsaw School of Economics with expertise in air transportation. During his studies, between 1988 and 1989, he was a member of the national authorities of the underground anti-communist organisation NZS (the Independent Students Association) and a leader of the organisation at the Warsaw School of Economics.”</p> |
| Mircea Hava          | M | Romania     | EPP          | Partidul Național Liberal               | <a href="#">Refers</a> to himself as a man in an article.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
| Evin Incir           | W | Sweden      | S&D          | Arbetarepartiet-Socialdemokraterna      | Refers to herself as a female in <a href="#">this interview</a> .                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |

Table 6: Committee on Foreign Affairs (AFET) Substitutes: Gender Identities<sup>15</sup>

|                       |   |          |              |                                                             |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
|-----------------------|---|----------|--------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Assita Kanko          | W | Belgium  | ECR          | Nieuw-Vlaamse Alliantie                                     | <a href="#">On X</a> says she is a woman and a mother.                                                                                                                                                                           |
| Manolis Kefalogiannis | M | Greece   | EPP          | Nea Demokratia                                              | His <a href="#">EPP</a> group page uses he/him pronouns.                                                                                                                                                                         |
| Sean Kelly            | M | Ireland  | EPP          | Fine Gael Party                                             | The news section on <a href="#">his website</a> refers to him with he/him pronouns.                                                                                                                                              |
| Michał Kobosko        | M | Poland   | Renew Europe | Polska 2050                                                 | His <a href="#">LinkedIn bio</a> uses he/him pronouns.                                                                                                                                                                           |
| Merja Kyllönen        | W | Finland  | GUE/NGL      | Vasemmistoliitto                                            | Her <a href="#">national party website</a> uses she/her pronouns.                                                                                                                                                                |
| Ilhan Kyuchuk         | M | Bulgaria | Renew Europe | Movement for Rights and Freedoms                            | <a href="#">His website</a> uses he/him pronouns.                                                                                                                                                                                |
| Eszter Lakos          | W | Hungary  | EPP          | Tisztelet és Szabadság Párt                                 | When translated, <a href="#">her CV</a> refers to her as a mother.                                                                                                                                                               |
| András László         | M | Hungary  | PFE          | Fidesz-Magyar Polgári Szövetség-Kereszténydemokrata Néppárt | While I could not find him referring to himself with his pronouns, he has stated opposition to “gender ideology” <a href="#">on X</a> which strongly implies that he identifies as the gender that he presents as which is male. |
| Afroditi Latinopoulou | W | Greece   | PFE          | Foní Loyikís                                                | Refers to herself as a granddaughter on her <a href="#">website</a> .                                                                                                                                                            |
| Miriam Lexmann        | W | Slovakia | EPP          | Kresťanskodemokratické hnutie                               | On <a href="#">her website</a> they have “quick news” which refers to her with                                                                                                                                                   |

Table 6: Committee on Foreign Affairs (AFET) Substitutes: Gender Identities<sup>15</sup>

|                       |   |           |            |                                                 |                                                                                                                                       |
|-----------------------|---|-----------|------------|-------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Javi López            | M | Spain     | S&D        | Partit dels Socialistes de Catalunya (PSC-PSOE) | she.<br><a href="#">His website</a> contact page says to contact him and “his team.”                                                  |
| Yannis Maniatis       | M | Greece    | S&D        | PASOK-KINAL                                     | <a href="#">His website</a> uses he/him pronouns.                                                                                     |
| Jorge Martín Frías    | M | Spain     | PFE        | VOX                                             | <a href="#">Instagram bio</a> uses the male form in Spanish.                                                                          |
| Gabriel Mato          | M | Spain     | EPP        | Partido Popular                                 | <a href="#">X bio</a> uses male form in Spanish.                                                                                      |
| Liudas Mažylis        | M | Lithuania | EPP        | Tėvynės sąjunga-Lietuvos krikščionys demokratai | Use of he in <a href="#">EPP bio</a> , then it says “my positions” implying he is in control of the page and has written/approved it. |
| Ana Catarina Mendes   | W | Portugal  | S&D        | Partido Socialista                              | <a href="#">Instagram bio</a> uses female form.                                                                                       |
| Irene Montero         | W | Spain     | GUE/NGL    | PODEMOS                                         | <a href="#">CV</a> uses the female form in Spanish.                                                                                   |
| Alessandra Moretti    | W | Italy     | S&D        | Partito Democratico                             | On her <a href="#">website</a> , she refers to herself as a mother, and states “as a little girl”.                                    |
| Matjaž Nemec          | M | Slovenia  | S&D        | Socialni demokrati                              | <a href="#">X bio</a> uses male form.                                                                                                 |
| Hans Neuhoff          | M | Germany   | ESN        | Alternative für Deutschland                     | <a href="#">Instagram</a> uses male form in bio.                                                                                      |
| Angelika Niebler      | W | Germany   | EPP        | Christlich-Soziale Union in Bayern e.V.         | <a href="#">Website</a> uses feminine form in german.                                                                                 |
| Ville Niinistö        | M | Finland   | Greens/EFA | Vihreä liitto                                   | <a href="#">Website</a> uses he/him pronouns.                                                                                         |
| Nicolás Pascual de la | M | Spain     | EPP        | Partido Popular                                 | <a href="#">CV</a> uses male form in spanish.                                                                                         |

Table 6: Committee on Foreign Affairs (AFET) Substitutes: Gender Identities<sup>15</sup>

| Parte               |   |          |              |                                                                                            |                                                                                                           |
|---------------------|---|----------|--------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Ana Miguel Pedro    | W | Portugal | EPP          | Partido do Centro Democrático Social-Partido Popular                                       | Refers to herself as a woman in <a href="#">this video</a> .                                              |
| Reinis Pozņaks      | M | Latvia   | ECR          | Apvienotais saraksts — Latvijas Zaļā partija, Latvijas Reģionu Apvienība, Liepājas partija | <a href="#">X bio</a> uses male form.                                                                     |
| Vladimir Prebilič   | M | Slovenia | Greens/EFA   | Vesna – zelena stranka                                                                     | <a href="#">His website</a> uses the male form in Slovenian.                                              |
| Diana Riba i Giner  | W | Spain    | Greens/EFA   | Esquerra Republicana de Catalunya                                                          | <a href="#">CV</a> uses the feminine form in Spanish.                                                     |
| Chloé Ridet         | W | France   | S&D          | Parti socialiste                                                                           | <a href="#">Instagram profile</a> uses feminine french form.                                              |
| Massimiliano Salini | M | Italy    | EPP          | Forza Italia                                                                               | Uses the male form in Italian on <a href="#">his website</a> .                                            |
| Ilaria Salis        | W | Italy    | Greens/EFA   | Alleanza Verdi e Sinistra                                                                  | Her <a href="#">facebook</a> uses the feminine form.                                                      |
| Silvia Sardone      | W | Italy    | PFE          | Lega                                                                                       | I am a woman, “Sono una donna ...” from her <a href="#">website</a> .                                     |
| Marjan Šarec        | M | Slovenia | Renew Europe | Gibanje Svoboda                                                                            | <a href="#">X bio</a> is gendered in Slovenian.                                                           |
| Sven Simon          | M | Germany  | EPP          | Christlich Demokratische Union Deutschlands                                                | Uses the male form in German on his <a href="#">website</a> .                                             |
| Jonas Sjöstedt      | M | Sweden   | GUE/NGL      | Vänsterpartiet                                                                             | While not stated explicitly, in an <a href="#">interview</a> , he mentions in an answer to whether he has |

Table 6: Committee on Foreign Affairs (AFET) Substitutes: Gender Identities<sup>15</sup>

|                         |   |             |                      |                                      |                                                                                                                                                                                            |
|-------------------------|---|-------------|----------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                         |   |             |                      |                                      | questioned his sexual identity and says yes, but that he is happy with his wife, implying he identifies as heterosexual and thus as a man.                                                 |
| Martin Sonneborn        | M | Germany     | Non-attached Members | Die PARTEI                           | CV on <a href="#">his website</a> uses male form in German.                                                                                                                                |
| Tineke Strik            | W | Netherlands | Greens/EFA           | GroenLinks-PvdA                      | Her <a href="#">X banner</a> has the words “Woman, life, liberty,” not a sure sign, but highly likely that she identifies as a woman.                                                      |
| Șerban-Dimitrie Sturdza | M | Romania     | ECR                  | Partidul Acțiunea Conservatoare      | <a href="#">Personal websites</a> use he/him pronouns.                                                                                                                                     |
| Marco Tarquinio         | M | Italy       | S&D                  | Partito Democratico                  | Italian language of <a href="#">CV</a> is gendered consistently using the masculine form<br><br>“Curriculum vitae (The MEP is solely responsible for the information published)”           |
| Claudiu Târziu          | M | Romania     | ECR                  | Partidul Acțiunea Conservatoare      | <a href="#">States</a> that “gender ideology is total nonsense” implies that he identifies as the gender he presents as.                                                                   |
| Alice Teodorescu Măwe   | W | Sweden      | EPP                  | Kristdemokraterna                    | Her <a href="#">political group website</a> page uses she/her pronouns.                                                                                                                    |
| Ingeborg ter Laak       | W | Netherlands | EPP                  | Christen Democratisch Appèl          | <a href="#">National party website</a> uses she/her pronouns, and one of the sentences uses “I” implying she was in charge of providing the information and identified herself as she/her. |
| Matej Tonin             | M | Slovenia    | EPP                  | Nova Slovenija – Krščanski demokrati | His <a href="#">party website</a> uses he/him pronouns.                                                                                                                                    |

Table 6: Committee on Foreign Affairs (AFET) Substitutes: Gender Identities<sup>15</sup>

|                             |   |            |                      |                                                        |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
|-----------------------------|---|------------|----------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Mihai Tudose                | M | Romania    | S&D                  | Partidul Social Democrat                               | <a href="#">X bio</a> uses male form for minister in Romanian.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| Ivaylo Vulchev              | M | Bulgaria   | ECR                  | There Is Such a People                                 | <a href="#">Interview</a> with him uses he/him pronouns, he also seems to make a subtle statement against gender identity “ We refer to things by their actual names because that is the natural way to communicate. For example, when it comes to defending the rights of women who are about to give birth, we speak of pregnant women, not a person ready to give life to another person” Make an assumption she identifies as male. Not a sure sign, but nothing more explicit could be found. |
| Matthieu Valet              | M | France     | PfE                  | Rassemblement national                                 | <a href="#">X bio</a> uses male form in french.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| Marko Vešligaj              | M | Croatia    | S&D                  | Socijaldemokratska partija Hrvatske                    | A <a href="#">website</a> for Women’s Weekend, which he created, refers to him as he/him.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
| Petar Volgin                | M | Bulgaria   | ESN                  | Revival                                                | <a href="#">His website</a> refers to him as he/him.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
| Michael von der Schulenburg | M | Germany    | Non-attached Members | Bündnis Sahra Wagenknecht – Vernunft und Gerechtigkeit | His <a href="#">author bio</a> uses he/him pronouns.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
| Thomas Waitz                | M | Austria    | Greens/EFA           | Die Grünen - Die Grüne Alternative                     | <a href="#">Social media</a> uses the male form in German.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
| Isabel Wiseler-Lima         | W | Luxembourg | EPP                  | Parti chrétien social luxembourgeois                   | Refers to herself as “alderwoman” on <a href="#">her website</a> .                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |

Table 6: Committee on Foreign Affairs (AFET) Substitutes: Gender Identities<sup>15</sup>

|            |   |          |              |                               |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
|------------|---|----------|--------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Lucia Yar  | W | Slovakia | Renew Europe | Progresívne Slovensko         | Her <a href="#">blue sky bio</a> “  Member of the <a href="#">@europarl.europa.eu</a> for Progresívne Slovensko <a href="#">#EUForeignPolicy</a> <a href="#">#Security</a> <a href="#">#WomenInPolitics</a> <a href="#">#Feminist</a> ” implies she identifies as a woman |
| Milan Zver | M | Slovenia | EPP          | Slovenska demokratska stranka | Refers to himself as a father and grandfather on his <a href="#">website</a> .                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |

#### 4.7 Challenges

One major challenge of this research design is the inevitable human error, as interactions may be missed or misinterpreted. Psychological research has shown that there is a range of biases that affect how humans reason and interpret (Elliott & Resnik, 2014). Having only one coder for this study results in a lack of intercoder reliability (Shah et al., 2016). Studies have also shown that gender, race, employment (whether working in academics or industry), and political ideology affect risk perceptions of certain phenomena. This is in part due to confirmation bias, where the researcher may give more weight to support preexisting views. In order to avoid this, there are several methods that can be used; the first is to disclose factors that could influence reasoning, and to make all study data publicly available so others can identify biases. Additionally, while bias and human error cannot be entirely avoided, a codebook will be created for this study to allow for replicability, and detailed notes of the coded interactions that are observed will be kept. The code book will include the code name, definition, and an example. In addition, detailed notes taken will allow for the evaluation of errors or bias by readers of the study. Additionally, for the interactions that are verbal, the transcript of debates will be checked to confirm that the interaction was correctly recorded.

As done by Shah et al. for this thesis, codes are particularly created for non-verbal behaviors such as facial expressions and body language. Codes are then developed through the collective

comprehension of what these emotions are generally understood to portray. This can also signal defiance of aggression. This is consistent with the behavioral approach, specifically, facial expressions with key elements are considered to be a certain emotion. For example, lowered eyebrows, a staring gaze, visibility of lower teeth, lowered mouth corners (frowning), facial rigidity, lips pressed firmly together, or overly negative or hostile expressions constitute anger or threat displays (Shah et al., 2016). On the other hand, happiness and reassurance are made up of one or more of the following; a smile with a relaxed mouth position, visibility of upper or both rows of teeth, nodding up and down, brief eye contact to avoid staring, open or just slightly closed eyes, crow's feet, wrinkles around the eyes or an overall welcoming expression (Shah et al., 2016). Research has shown that certain expressions elicit certain perceptions by the receiver. For example, smiling elicits perceptions of a politician as competent, friendly, approachable, and altruistic (Wasike, 2019). According to Wasike, raised eyebrows, raised heads, and relaxed (as opposed to tightened or pursed) lips when combined with smiles are associated with feelings of happiness and reassurance (Wasike, 2019). Additionally, Shah et al. identify gestures and body language related to either affinity or defiance. Affinity hand, body, or facial movements that suggest friendly relationships or attempts at bonding, include waving thumbs up, while defiance, suggesting a threatening or antagonist relationship, includes finger pointing, wagging or shaking, raising a fist or shaking head in disagreement, and a negative expression with a prolonged stare (Shah et al., 2016). Other nonverbal actions include eye contact, which, according to Wasike, is seen as an action that gains trust from others and marks confidence and sincerity, while gaze avoidance is interpreted as guilt. Maintaining eye contact is a sign of respect and shows that the person is interested (Wasike, 2019). Finally, to increase the reliability of the study, the combination of more subjective actions, such as eye contact, and more objective such as a handshake (Wasike, 2019). In reference to reliability of verbal interactions, these will be cross checked with the transcripts to ensure it was correctly observed by the researcher.

Table 7: Categories of Interactions

| Type of Interaction                          | How it will be recorded.                        | Why is it important?                    |
|----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|
| Verbal interaction between two or more MEPs. | Count the number of interactions and record the | It reveals the engagement between MEPs. |

Table 7: Categories of Interactions

|                                              |                                                                                                  |                                                                                                  |
|----------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                              | gender of speakers.                                                                              |                                                                                                  |
| Mentioning of other MEPs in a speech.        | Count the number of times it occurs, and record the gender of the speaker and the MEP mentioned. | Acknowledgment of other MEPs during debates.                                                     |
| Facial expressions.                          | Recording of the emotion that seems to be conveyed as well as who is the target.                 | Shows general engagement as well as an expression of approval or disapproval towards an MEP.     |
| Gestures (waving, pointing, thumbs up/down). | Type of gesture, and gender of MEP making the gesture and gender of MEP who is the target.       | Signals agreement, support, challenges general attitude and engagement towards a particular MEP. |
| Eye Contact.                                 | Note who the eye contact is between, gender of the MEPs, and how long it lasts.                  | Reveals attention and engagement between MEPs.                                                   |
| Touch-based interaction (handshake etc.).    | Record the occurrence and gender of MEPs.                                                        | Indicates camaraderie between MEPs.                                                              |

Table 8: Codebook: Interactions

| Category                                       | Type                | Examples                                                                                       | Definition                                                                                                |
|------------------------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Direct verbal interactions with another MEP    | Verbal Interaction  | Interruptions, rebuttals, speaking at the same time, verbal acknowledgement “I see your point” | Forms of address used by chair, forms of address used for chair. Mentions of another MEP during a speech. |
| Non-chair Interactions: Mention of Another MEP | Verbal Interactions | Thanking the rapporteur, referencing a previous speaker etc.                                   | The mentioning of another MEP who is not the chair or rapporteur.                                         |
| Chair Interactions: Calling, Mentioning by     | Verbal Interaction  | The chair calling the MEPs, and being addressed by MEPs.                                       | The chair calling the net speaker.                                                                        |

Table 8: Codebook: Interactions

|                             |                                    |                                                                                |                                                                                                                                |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| chair and mentioning chair. |                                    |                                                                                |                                                                                                                                |
| Handshake                   | Touch-based non-verbal interaction | Two MEPs shaking hands at the beginning of a debate before taking their seats. | Grasping the hand of another MEP. Usually expressed as a greeting or a show of respect, or a show of camaraderie, familiarity. |

#### 4.8 Expectations

Overall, it is expected that the gender of the speaker and the receiver of the communication is expected to influence who engages with whom. The speaker's gender is also expected to reflect gender dynamics, including expressions of dominance, inclusion, and support within the European Parliament debates. This harkens back to the principle of the “good old boys’ club” in which we expect to find that male MEPs will interact more with other men, excluding women, thus causing women to interact more frequently with other women than with men due to both exclusion by their male colleagues and a sense of shared identity and experience with their fellow female colleagues (Kantola & Agustín, 2019). The dependent variable of dynamics in the European Parliament will be measured through the frequency of interactions between men and men, men and women, and women and women.

Based on the theoretical framework, according to social network theory, we expect male MEPs to create male-exclusive networks excluding women, so we expect to see more interactions (particularly positive interactions) between male MEPs than between female and male MEPs (Liu et al., 2017). Additionally, we expect to see more female MEPs interact with more female MEPs than between male and female MEPs. According to social network theory, women and men create different social networks within the same contexts (Liu et al., 2017). Therefore, according to social network theory, we expect the number of interactions between male and male MEPs, and female and female MEPs to be higher than the male-female MEP interactions.

According to constructivist feminism, it is expected that an MEP's cultural background influences their gendered interactions (Prins, 1995). Therefore, it is expected that MEPs' views on gender, influenced by their cultural background, will inform their interactions with the opposite gender. Therefore, we expect to see differences in gendered interactions across the different member states and regions, in both frequency and type.

As has been previously discussed, it is expected that an MEP's political group, member state, and political party will have an impact on these interactions. These are potential confounding variables that may explain patterns in interactions other than the gender of the MEPs involved. In order to control for these, each interaction observed will be checked for these factors (shared member state, political group, or political party) and will be discussed in the analysis if the findings of these interactions could be explained by these factors rather than gender. For each interaction, it will be recorded whether the MEPs involved share any of the identities above, which has already been noted in Tables 3, 4, 5, and 6.

Finally, according to tokenism, women will face more boundaries, increased pressure, and role entrapment (European Parliament). We expect that interactions during debates for AFET will be more male-dominated and exclusionary towards female MEPs than in debates for the DEVE committee.

Through the content analysis of the European Parliament debates it will be observed how gender impacts communications, and the social network analysis will be used to identify patterns in the communication observed. This will allow for patterns of exclusion of women to be observed if they exist.

## 5. Results

In order to select the debates to analyze, the list of INI reports from DEVE and AFET for the current and previous Parliament terms were placed on a spreadsheet. Reports were removed if they did not have a debate available, or if the debate had not taken place yet. There was also one joint AFET/DEVE debate (on 2025/2073 INI Global Gateway-Past Impacts and Future

Orientation), which was removed from the list, because it does not make sense to observe a joint debate when the committees are being compared. Once they were on a spreadsheet sheet a number was randomly generated four times for AFET and four times for DEVE, and the reports were assigned a number from 1-the final number of debates and were listed by most recent to least recent, as is listed on the European Parliament's website. For AFET, there were 104 available debates with video. For AFET, the random numbers generated were 11, 28, 74, and 99. These correspond to **(11) 2025/2022(INI)** 2023 and 2024 Commission reports on Serbia, **(28) 2023/2050(INI)** Role of preventive diplomacy in tackling frozen conflicts around the world – missed opportunity or change for the future?, **(74) 2020/2207(INI)** Implementation of the Common Security and Defence Policy and annual report 2020 and **(99) 2019/2172(INI)** Report on the 2019-2020 Commission Reports on Kosovo. For DEVE, there were significantly fewer INI reports available, with only 13 debates available with video; the randomly generated numbers were 1, 2, 3, and 7. These correspond to **(1) 2023/2010(INI)** Implementation and delivery of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), **(2) 2023/2000(INI)** How to build an innovative humanitarian aid strategy: spotlight on current and forgotten crises, **(3) 2022/2002(INI)** Implementation and delivery of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), and **(7) 2021/2003(INI)** The Gender Action Plan.

### 5.1 Results Debate 1

Table 9: Debate 1 Number of Interactions

| Type of Interaction | Count |
|---------------------|-------|
| MM                  | 46    |
| WW                  | 0     |
| MW                  | 9     |
| Total               | 55    |

Table 10: Forms of Address Used by the Chair in Debate 1

|             | MM | MW | Total |
|-------------|----|----|-------|
| Mr. or Mrs. | 2  | 1  | 3     |
| Full Name   | 15 | 3  | 18    |
| Last Name   | 1  | 0  | 1     |
| Total       | 18 | 4  | 22    |

Table 11: Forms of Address Used for the Chair in Debate 1

|               | MM | MW | Total |
|---------------|----|----|-------|
| President     | 6  | 1  | 7     |
| Mr. President | 2  | 1  | 3     |
| Total         | 8  | 2  | 10    |

Debate 1 focused on **2025/2022(INI)** 2023 and 2024 Commission reports on Serbia. In this debate, the Chair was a man. Younous Omarjee (M, France, GUE/NGL). In the debate I observed 46 interactions between men and men, nine between men and women, and none between women and women. The Chair used three different methods to refer to MEPs including referring to them as Mrs. or Mr., using their full name, and just using their last name. He referred to 2 male MEPs as Mr. and 1 woman as Mrs. He referred to 15 male MEPs with their full name and 3 female MEPs. He referred to one male MEP with just their last name. In the way that the MEPs referenced the President two terms were used, 6 male members and one female member referred to him as “president” and two male members and one female member referred to him as Mr. President.

When performing a chi-squared test with the results in google sheets in the comparison of MM and MW, it showed there was a statistical significance in this data in the number of interactions as the p-value was shown as 0. However, in testing for the significance for the way the chair was

referenced by MEPs, the p-value was .27, meaning there is no statistical significance. When testing for the way the chair referred to MEPS the p-value was .36 which means there is no statistical significance. For debate 1, the results showed a significant difference in the number of interactions between the male chair and the MEPS. There were significantly more interactions with male MEPs than the female MEPs.

The only interactions observed that were not between an MEP and the Chair was during the blue card procedure. The President announced a blue card from Sokol (Man, Croatia, EPP) after Reuter (Man, Netherlands, S&D) spoke. The Blue card procedure allows the President to give the floor to a member raising a blue card to give a question to another member while that member is giving a speech (Directorate-General for the Presidency & Directorate for the Plenary, 2019). The question must be related to what the speaker said, the questioner has 30 seconds for the question and then there is 30 seconds for the response.

In reference to controlling for Member State and Political groups guiding interactions, there was one interaction observed where the MEP was from the same political group as the Chair. The Chair called this member by their last name, and was referred to as "President." There was one from the same Member state as the President, and the president referred to them by their full name. The one direct interaction during the Blue Card procedure had no similarities with the chair in terms of Member state, political group, or national party.

When looking at the results, the frequency of interactions can be viewed as use of formal titles signifying a sense of familiarity that can be presumed to have been built through frequent interactions over time. The results of debate 1, show there were no woman/woman interactions but the majority of interactions were between men, which suggests gender had a large impact, and supports the hypothesis that they would exclude women and interact with each other. However, the lack of woman/woman interactions does not support the hypothesis that women would interact more with other women as opposed to men. In this debate, only formal titles were used by MEPs, and only semi-formal were used by the Chair, so no findings were made based on this debate. No difference was observed in terms of the formality of titles.

## 5.2 Results Debate 2

Table 12: Debate 2 Number of Interactions

| Type of Interaction | Count |
|---------------------|-------|
| MM                  | 2     |
| WW                  | 14    |
| MW                  | 39    |
| Total               | 55    |

Table 13: Forms of Address Used by the Chair in Debate 2

| Title       | WW | MW | Total |
|-------------|----|----|-------|
| Mr. or Mrs. | 0  | 1  | 1     |
| Full Name   | 1  | 1  | 2     |
| Total       | 1  | 2  | 3     |

Table 14: Forms of Address Used for the Chair in Debate 2

| Title            | WW | MW | Total |
|------------------|----|----|-------|
| President        | 0  | 1  | 1     |
| Madame           | 0  | 1  | 1     |
| Madame President | 1  | 0  | 1     |
| Total            | 1  | 2  | 3     |

Table 15: Non-Chair Interactions in Debate 2

| Type | MM | MW | Total |
|------|----|----|-------|
|------|----|----|-------|

Table 15: Non-Chair Interactions in Debate 2

|                                         |   |   |   |
|-----------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| Handshake                               | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Mention of another MEP (not rapporteur) | 0 | 2 | 2 |

Debate 2 was a debate for the AFET committee report 2023/2050, Role of Preventive Diplomacy in Tackling Frozen Conflicts around the World: Missed opportunity or change for the future?

This debate was chaired by a woman, and 2 man/man interactions were observed, 39 woman/man and 14 woman/woman interactions. The chi-squared test for this debate demonstrated a 0.000000003608769172 p-value, meaning this is a statistically significant difference in interactions. The chair referenced one man MEP as Mr. and one by their full name. She referred to one woman MEP by their full name. The p-value for the way the chair referenced MEPS was .479 which is not statistically significant. In the way that the chair was referenced, one man referenced her as “President” , one woman referenced her as “Madame President” , and one man MEP referenced her as Madame. For the way she was referenced, the p-value is .096 meaning there is a significant difference in the way the chair was referenced. Of note, in this debate I observed one handshake between two men MEPs and two mentions of an MEP who was not the rapporteur, both between men and women MEPs.

When looking at the results for this debate the “collaborations” between MEPs were shown to be mostly between men and women, which does not support the hypothesis that women would be excluded and our expectation to see more same gender collaboration as opposed to between genders. The handshake between men does suggest increased collaboration between men, but with only one case we cannot draw definitive conclusions from this. In this debate, only formal titles were used by MEPs, and only semi-formal titles were used by the Chair, so no findings were made based on this debate. No difference was observed in terms of formality of the titles.

### 5.3 Results Debate 3

Table 16: Debate 3 Number of Interactions

| Type of Interaction | Count |
|---------------------|-------|
| MM                  | 8     |
| WW                  | 63    |
| MW                  | 107   |
| Total               | 178   |

Table 17: Forms of Address Used by the Chair in Debate 3

| Title          | WW | MW | Total |
|----------------|----|----|-------|
| Mr. or Mrs.    | 8  | 19 | 27    |
| Sir or Madame  | 1  | 1  | 2     |
| Vice President | 0  | 1  | 1     |
| Colleague      | 0  | 2  | 2     |
| Full Name      | 20 | 26 | 46    |
| Total          | 29 | 49 | 78    |

Table 18: Forms of Address Used for the Chair in Debate 3

| Title            | WW | MW | Total |
|------------------|----|----|-------|
| President        | 4  | 9  | 13    |
| Madame           | 0  | 1  | 1     |
| Chair            | 2  | 0  | 2     |
| Madame Chair     | 1  | 3  | 4     |
| Madame President | 10 | 6  | 16    |
| Total            | 17 | 19 | 36    |

Debate 3 was for the AFET Committee report 2020/2270 (INI) Implementation of the Common Security and Defense Policy, annual report 2020. It was chaired by a woman. I observed 8 man/man interactions, 107 man/woman interactions, and 63 woman/woman interactions. The p-value for these interactions was 1 meaning it was not statistically significant. When performing a chi-squared test on the difference in how the president referred to the MEPS the p-value was .00000001153 meaning it was statistically significant. The chair referred to 19 men as Mr. and 8 women as Mrs. She referred to 26 men by their full name and 20 women in this way. She referred to two men as “colleague” and one man as “vice president.” She referred to one man and one woman as “Sir or Madame.” When performing a significance test on how the chair was referenced by MEPs the p-value was .1154 meaning it is not statistically significant.

One interesting observation during this debate was a heated discussion between the President (Heidi Hautala) and Mr. Fest. After Hautala called Gahler, Fest called “point of order.” The president informed him this wasn’t allowed, and he told her the way she was leading was a disgrace. She asked him how that is the case, and he said he was supposed to have spoken already and needed to go to a group meeting, but that she wasn’t sticking to the speaking times. She just informed him that a point of order can’t be called during a debate and continued on with the debate.

For Debate 3, the majority of interactions were between men and women, which does not suggest gender is a large factor in determining interactions, and “collaborations” during debates. The findings also do not support the hypothesis that women would interact more with other women, as the majority of interactions were between men and women. However, this result, like the others, is largely dependent on the gender of the chair, who in this case were women. In terms of formality, all the MEPs used formal titles with the chair, so we cannot make any findings based on this. For the chair references to the MEPs, there was one man/woman formal interaction and the rest were semi-formal, but with such a small number of formal interactions it is difficult to make any inferences about familiarity from this.

#### 5.4 Results Debate 4

Table 19: Debate 4 Number of Interactions

| Type of Interaction | Count |
|---------------------|-------|
| MM                  | 3     |
| WW                  | 27    |
| MW                  | 72    |
| Total               | 102   |

Table 20: Forms of Address Used by the Chair in Debate 4

| Title                 | WW | MW | Total |
|-----------------------|----|----|-------|
| Mr. or Mrs.           | 7  | 20 | 27    |
| Full name             | 1  | 4  | 5     |
| Mr. or Mrs. Full Name | 0  | 2  | 2     |
| Last name             | 1  | 0  | 1     |
| Colleague             | 0  | 1  | 1     |
| Total                 | 9  | 27 | 36    |

Table 21: Forms of Address Used for the Chair in Debate 4

| Title            | WW | MW | Total |
|------------------|----|----|-------|
| President        | 2  | 6  | 8     |
| Chair            | 1  | 0  | 1     |
| Madame Chair     | 1  | 3  | 4     |
| Dear Chair       | 1  | 1  | 2     |
| Madame President | 3  | 4  | 7     |
| Total            | 8  | 14 | 22    |

Table 22: Non-Chair Interactions in Debate 4

|                        | MM | MW | Total |
|------------------------|----|----|-------|
| Mention of another MEP | 3  | 2  | 5     |

Debate 4 focused on the AFET 2019/2172 INI Report on the 2019-2020 Reports on Kosovo. It was chaired by a woman named Ewa Kopacz. I observed 3 man/man interactions, 72 woman/man, and 27 woman/woman. When conducting a chi-squared test the p-value returned was zero meaning the difference is statistically significant. When looking at the way the Chair referred to MEPs she referred to 7 women and 20 men as Mrs. or Mr. She referenced one woman and four men by their full name and one man as “colleague”. When performing the chi-squared test on this the p-value is .0169 meaning the results are statistically significant. When looking at the way the chair was referenced, she was referred to as “President” by two women and 6 men. She was referred to as “Madame President” by three women and four male MEPs, “chair” by one woman and “dear chair” by one woman and one man. The p-value for this was .387 meaning the result is not statistically significant.

For debate 4, the majority of interactions were again between men and women, which does not support the hypothesis. It suggest again that gender is not a large factor in influencing collaborations within debates. The majority of references to the chair were formal with one man/woman, and one woman/woman semi-formal reference. With such a small amount of variation it is difficult to make inferences from this. For the chair references to the MEPs they were all semi-formal titles, so we cannot draw conclusions from this.

### 5.5 Results Debate 5

Table 23: Debate 5 Number of Interactions

| Type of Interaction | Count |
|---------------------|-------|
|---------------------|-------|

Table 23: Debate 5 Number of Interactions

|       |     |
|-------|-----|
| MM    | 4   |
| WW    | 30  |
| MW    | 67  |
| Total | 101 |

Table 24: Forms of Address Used by the Chair in Debate 5

| Title          | WW | MW | Total |
|----------------|----|----|-------|
| Mr. or Mrs.    | 3  | 4  | 7     |
| Full name      | 9  | 21 | 30    |
| Vice President | 0  | 1  | 1     |
| Total          | 12 | 26 | 38    |

Table 25: Forms of Address Used for the Chair in Debate 5

| Title            | WW | MW | Total |
|------------------|----|----|-------|
| President        | 6  | 7  | 13    |
| Madame President | 0  | 7  | 7     |
| Frau Presidentin | 0  | 1  | 1     |
| Madame Chair     | 0  | 1  | 1     |
| Dear Chair       | 1  | 0  | 1     |
| Total            | 7  | 16 | 23    |

Table 26: Non-Chair Interactions in Debate 5

| Type               | MM | MW | Total |
|--------------------|----|----|-------|
| Mention of another | 3  | 1  | 4     |

Table 26: Non-Chair Interactions in Debate 5

|     |  |  |  |
|-----|--|--|--|
| MEP |  |  |  |
|-----|--|--|--|

Table 27: Forms of Address Used in Non-Chair Interactions in Debate 5

| Title          | MM | MW | Total |
|----------------|----|----|-------|
| Mr. or Mrs.    | 1  | 0  | 1     |
| Full Name      | 1  | 0  | 1     |
| Dear Colleague | 1  | 0  | 1     |
| MEP Last Name  | 0  | 1  | 1     |
| Total          | 3  | 1  | 4     |

Debate 5 was a DEVE committee INI report debate. It focused on 2023/2010 (INI) Implementation and delivery of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Evelyn Regner, a woman from Austria in the S&D group, chaired it. In this debate, I observed 4 man/man interactions, 67 man/woman interactions, and 30 woman/woman interactions. When conducting a chi-squared significance test, the p-value was essentially zero, meaning this result is statistically significant.

In terms of how the chair referred to the MEPs, she referred to three woman MEPS and 4 man MEPS as Mr. or Mrs. She referred to 9 women, and 21 men by their full name. Finally she referred to one man as "Vice President." When conducting a significance test the p-value was .05123 meaning it is marginally, not statistically significant.

The chair was referred to with many different terms. 6 women, and 7 men referred to her as "President." 7 men, and no women referred to her as "Madame President." One man referred to her as "Frau Presidentin" and one man referred to her as "Madame Chair." Finally one man referred to her as "Dear Chair." When calculating the p-value for this result it was .01763 which is statistically significant.

There were 4 cases of the MEPS referencing each other (excluding the chair). Three were between male MEPs and one between a woman and a man. When calculating the significance of this the p-value was .0455 meaning this result is statistically significant.

In terms of how the MEPs referenced each other, there was one man/man case of “Mr.” and 1 man/man case of “full name.” There was also one man/man case of “dear colleague” and one woman/man case of “MEP last name.” When calculating the p-value significance it was .22313 , meaning this result is not statistically significant.

As with the previous debates, the majority of interactions were between men and women, suggesting that gender does not play a large role in these interactions. However, again most of these interactions were with the chair, which was largely the determining factor of the result. In terms of forms of address, the chair mainly used semi-formal titles, and one case of formal titles which means it is difficult to interpret this result. For the chair, formal titles were mainly used and there was one case of semi-formal titles being used, so it is difficult to draw conclusions from this result. This result does not support the hypothesis that there would be more same-gender interactions, especially same-gender interactions between men, as these were the least common.

## 5.6 Results Debate 6

Table 28: Debate 6 Number of Interactions

| Type of Interaction | Count |
|---------------------|-------|
| MM                  | 1     |
| WW                  | 0     |
| MW                  | 14    |
| Total               | 15    |

Table 29: Forms of Address Used by the Chair in Debate 6

| Title       | WW | MW | Total |
|-------------|----|----|-------|
| Mr. or Mrs. | 0  | 4  | 4     |
| Rappateur   | 0  | 1  | 1     |
| Total       | 0  | 5  | 5     |

Table 30: Forms of Address Used for the Chair in Debate 6

| Title            | WW | MW | Total |
|------------------|----|----|-------|
| President        | 0  | 1  | 1     |
| Madame President | 0  | 3  | 3     |
| Total            | 0  | 4  | 4     |

Table 31: Non-Chair Interactions in Debate 6

| Type                   | MM | WW | Total |
|------------------------|----|----|-------|
| Mention of another MEP | 1  | 0  | 1     |

Table 32: Forms of Address Used in Non-Chair Interactions in Debate 6

| Title     | MM | MW | Total |
|-----------|----|----|-------|
| Full Name | 1  | 0  | 1     |
| Total     | 1  | 0  | 1     |

Debate 6 focused on the DEVE report, INI 2023/2000 “How to build an innovative humanitarian aid strategy: spotlight on current and forgotten crises.” It was chaired by a woman, Nicola Beer. In this debate I observed 1 man/man interaction, and 14 woman/man interactions. When calculating the significance of this result the p-value was .0000050304, meaning the result is statistically significant.

The chair referred to MEPs in two different ways: as Mr. or Mrs. and as “rapporteur.” She referred to four men as “Mr.” and one man as “rapporteur.” When calculating the significance the p-value was .317 meaning this is not a statistically significant result.

The chair was referred to in two different ways as “President” and as “Madame President.” One man referred to her as “President” and three men as “Madame President.” When calculating the statistical significance of this the p-value returned was .083264, meaning the result was not statistically significant.

Excluding the chair, there was one mention of another MEP between two men. The p-value for this is .3678, meaning it is not statistically significant. They were referred to by their full name. With only one case, the p-value was .31 meaning the result is not statistically significant.

For debate 6, the majority of interactions were again between men and women. This does not support the hypothesis. These results seem to suggest that gender is not a major determining factor in collaboration and decision making in the European Parliament. The titles used by the chair, did not demonstrate any major differences between men and women, and only formal titles were used to refer to the chair. There was one mention of another MEP between men, but this result was not enough to make any real inferences from. In this debate, again the majority of interactions were with the chair, so the gender of the chair largely determined the type of interactions observed.

## 5.7 Results Debate 7

Table 33: Debate 7 Number of Interactions

| Type of Interaction | Count |
|---------------------|-------|
| MM                  | 28    |
| WW                  | 4     |
| MW                  | 20    |
| Total               | 52    |

Table 34: Forms of Address Used by the Chair in Debate 7

| Title                 | WW | MM | MW | Total |
|-----------------------|----|----|----|-------|
| Madame Full Name      | 0  | 0  | 2  | 2     |
| Mr. or Mrs.           | 0  | 4  | 2  | 6     |
| Mr. or Mrs. Full Name | 0  | 2  | 3  | 5     |
| Full Name             | 0  | 3  | 1  | 4     |
| Dear Colleague        | 0  | 1  | 0  | 1     |
| Colleague             | 1  | 0  | 0  | 1     |
| Total                 | 1  | 10 | 8  | 19    |

Table 35: Forms of Address Used for the Chair in Debate 7

| Title            | WW | MM | MW | Total |
|------------------|----|----|----|-------|
| President        | 0  | 4  | 1  | 5     |
| Madame President | 1  | 0  | 0  | 1     |
| Mr. President    | 0  | 0  | 1  | 1     |
| Mr. Chairman     | 0  | 0  | 1  | 1     |
| Chair            | 0  | 0  | 3  | 3     |
| Total            | 1  | 4  | 6  | 11    |

Table 36: Non-Chair Interactions in Debate 7

| Type                   | MM | MW | Total |
|------------------------|----|----|-------|
| Mention of another MEP | 1  | 0  | 1     |

Table 37: Forms of Address Used in Non-Chair Interactions in Debate 7

| Title     | MM | MW | Total |
|-----------|----|----|-------|
| Full Name | 1  | 0  | 1     |
| Total     | 1  | 0  | 1     |

Debate 7 focused on the DEVE INI report “Implementation and delivery of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). In this debate there were 2 chairs of different genders. The first chair was Karas, a man, and the second was Barley, a woman. I observed a total of 52 interactions during the debate. 28 were between two men, four between two women, and 20 between a man and a woman. When conducting a significance test for this result the p-value was .00018129, meaning it is a statistically significant result.

When looking at how the chair referred to MEPs there were two man/woman cases of “Madame full name.” There were two man/woman and four man/man cases of Mr or Mrs. Full Name. There was one man-man case of “dear colleague” and one female/female case of “colleague.” The p-value of this result is .03785, which is a statistically significant result.

When looking at how the chair was referenced by the MEPs there were 4 man/man cases of “president” and one man/woman case. There was one woman/woman case of “Madame President”, one man/woman case of “Mr. President” and one man/woman case of “Mr. Chairman.” There were three man/woman cases of “Chair.” When conducting a significance test for this result the returned p-value was .0619688 meaning the result is not statistically significant.

There was one case of MEPs referencing each other and it was between men. The MEP used the MEPs full name. For this result the p-value is .36787, as expected for such a small value. This is not a statistically significant result. The title used in this reference was “Colleague Full name.” As expected with small data such as this the p-value was .3678, meaning it is not statistically significant.

For debate 7, there were more interactions observed between men and other men, than with women. This does support the hypothesis that men would interact more with other men and exclude women, however, it does not support the hypothesis that there would be less man/woman interactions than interactions between women. This result suggests that gender does not influence collaborations within the European Parliament. For the forms of address used by the chair, there were two cases of formal, one case of informal and the rest were semi-formal. From this there is not really enough variation to make inferences, but the one case of informal address was between two men, which does support the hypothesis that there would be more familiarity between men.

### 5.8 Results Debate 8

Table 38: Debate 8 Number of Interactions

| Type of Interaction | Count |
|---------------------|-------|
| MM                  | 45    |
| WW                  | 2     |
| MW                  | 29    |
| Total               | 76    |

Table 39: Forms of Address Used by the Chair in Debate 8

| Title            | WW | MM | MW | Total |
|------------------|----|----|----|-------|
| Madame Last Name | 0  | 0  | 11 | 11    |
| Mr. or Mrs.      | 0  | 22 | 3  | 25    |
| Last Name        | 0  | 2  | 1  | 3     |
| Dear Full Name   | 0  | 0  | 1  | 1     |
| Our Colleague    | 1  | 0  | 0  | 1     |
| Total            | 1  | 24 | 16 | 41    |

Table 40: Forms of Address Used for the Chair in Debate 8

| Title               | WW | MM | MW | Total |
|---------------------|----|----|----|-------|
| President           | 0  | 5  | 2  | 7     |
| Mr. President       | 0  | 3  | 0  | 3     |
| Chair               | 1  | 2  | 3  | 6     |
| Dear Vice President | 0  | 0  | 1  | 1     |
| Dear First Name     | 0  | 0  | 1  | 1     |
| Total               | 1  | 10 | 7  | 18    |

Table 41: Non-Chair Interactions in Debate 8

| Type                   | MM | MW | Total |
|------------------------|----|----|-------|
| Mention of another MEP | 9  | 2  | 11    |

Table 42: Forms of Address Used in Non-Chair Interactions in Debate 8

| Title         | MM | MW | Total |
|---------------|----|----|-------|
| Full Name     | 4  | 0  | 4     |
| Our Colleague | 1  | 0  | 1     |
| First Name    | 2  | 0  | 2     |
| Mr. or Mrs.   | 2  | 1  | 3     |
| Last Name     | 0  | 1  | 1     |
| Total         | 9  | 2  | 11    |

Debate 8 focused on 2021/2003(INI) The EU Gender Action Plan III. In this debate, there were 2 chairs of different genders: Katerina Barley and Rainer Wieland. I observed a total of 76

interactions. 45 were between two men, two between two women, and 29 between men and women. When conducting a significance test, the p-value was .000000007992, meaning this result is statistically significant.

For the way the chair referred to MEPs, there were 11 woman/man cases of “Madame last name”, 3 man/woman cases of “Madame Last Name”, 3 man/woman cases of “Mr. or Mrs.” There was one man/woman and one man/man case of “last name.” There was one man/woman case of “dear first name” and one woman/woman case of “our colleague.” When conducting a significance test the p-value is .000000000443, meaning this result is significant.

In reference to how the chair was referred to by MEPs, there were 5 man/man and 2 man/woman cases of “President.” There were 3 man/man cases of “Mr. President” and 2 man/man and 3 man/woman cases of “chair.” There was one man/woman case of “Dear Vice President” and one man/woman case of “Dear First Name.” There was one woman/woman case of “Chair.” When conducting a significance test for this result, the p-value is .06315 which is not statistically significant.

There were 11 cases of MEPs mentioning another MEP (other than the chair), 9 were between two men, and 2 were between men and women. When conducting a significance test, the p-value was .002263350388, which means the result is statistically significant.

In terms of how they were referenced, there were 4 man/man cases of “full name” and one man/man case of “our colleague.” There were 2 man/man cases of “first name.” There were 2 man/man cases and one man/woman case of Mr. or Mrs. Finally there was one man/woman case of “last name.” When conducting a significance test for this result, the p-value was .12465 which is not statistically significant.

Debate 8, similar to debate 7, had more interactions between men. This again supports the hypothesis that men would interact more with one another and exclude women, but it was not supported by the fact that there were more man/woman interactions than woman/woman interactions. All the titles used by the chair were semi-formal, except one informal address between a man and a woman, which does not support expectations for more familiarity between

MEPs of the same gender. For the way the chair was addressed, there was one semi-formal and one informal address both between men and women, and the rest were formal. This does not support the hypothesis that there would be more familiarity between same gender interactions. This result demonstrates that gender does not seem to have an impact on collaboration in the European Parliament.

### 5.9 Results AFET Debates

Table 43: AFET Total Interactions

| Type of Interaction | Count |
|---------------------|-------|
| MM                  | 59    |
| MW                  | 227   |
| WW                  | 77    |
| Total               | 363   |

Table 44: Forms of Address Used by the Chair in AFET Debates

| Title                 | MM | MW | WW | Total |
|-----------------------|----|----|----|-------|
| Mr. or Mrs.           | 2  | 41 | 15 | 58    |
| Full Name             | 15 | 34 | 22 | 71    |
| Last Name             | 1  | 0  | 1  | 2     |
| Colleague             | 0  | 3  | 0  | 3     |
| Vice President        | 0  | 1  | 0  | 1     |
| Sir or Madame         | 0  | 1  | 1  | 2     |
| Mr. or Mrs. Full name | 0  | 2  | 0  | 2     |
| Total                 | 18 | 82 | 39 | 139   |

Table 45: Forms of Address Used for the Chair in AFET Debates

| Title            | MM | MW | WW | Total |
|------------------|----|----|----|-------|
| President        | 6  | 17 | 6  | 29    |
| Mr. President    | 2  | 1  | 0  | 3     |
| Madame President | 0  | 14 | 10 | 24    |
| Madame           | 0  | 2  | 0  | 2     |
| Chair            | 0  | 0  | 3  | 3     |
| Madame Chair     | 0  | 3  | 2  | 5     |
| Dear Chair       | 0  | 1  | 1  | 2     |
| Total            | 8  | 38 | 22 | 68    |

Table 46: Non-Chair Interactions in AFET Debates

| Type of Interaction | Count |
|---------------------|-------|
| MM                  | 4     |
| MW                  | 2     |
| WW                  | 0     |
| Total               | 6     |

Table 47: AFET Handshakes

| Type of Interaction | Count |
|---------------------|-------|
| MW                  | 2     |

For the debates for the AFET committee reports, there were a total of 59 man/man, 227 man/woman, and 77 woman/woman interactions. There were a total of 363 interactions

observed. When conducting a significance test the p-value was essentially zero, meaning the result is statistically significant.

For references from the Chair to the MEP, there were 2 man/man, 4 woman/man, and 15 woman/woman cases of “Mr. or Mrs.” There were 34 woman/man cases of “full name”, 22 woman/woman, and 15 man/man. There was one woman/woman case of “last name” and 3 man/woman cases of “colleague.” There was one man/woman case of “Vice President” and one man/man and one woman/woman interaction “Sir or Madame” was used. Finally, there was one man/woman case of “Mr. or Mrs. Full Name”. When conducting a significance test, the p-value was .000000011534, which means the result is statistically significant.

For the way the MEPs referred to the chair, there were 6 man/man, 17 man/woman, and 6 woman/woman cases of “President.” There were 2 man/man cases and 1 man/woman case of “Mr. President.” There were 10 woman/woman and 14 man/woman cases of “Madame President.” There were 2 man/woman cases of “Madame” and 3 woman/woman cases of “Chair.” There were 3 man/woman and 2 woman/woman cases of “Madame Chair.” There were 1 woman/woman and one man/woman case of “Dear Chair.” When conducting a significance test for this result the p-value was .00021164 which means the result is statistically significant.

For the mention of another MEP other than the rapporteur, there were 4 man/man interactions and 2 man/woman. For this result the p-value is .135335 which means this result is not statistically significant.

There were a total of 2 handshakes both between a man and a woman. For this result the p-value is .135335 meaning this result is statistically significant.

According to the hypothesis, we would expect more same-gender interactions as opposed to those between members of the opposite gender. Instead the majority of interactions observed were between men and women. These results show that gender is not a major determining factor in decision making and collaboration among MEPs. In terms of forms of address the majority of interactions were semi-formal with only one formal address between men and women. For the

titles used by the chair, the majority were between men and women using formal titles. There were only 4 instances in which semi-formal titles were used, and most were between men and women. This does not support the expectation to see more familiarity between members of the same gender.

#### 5.10 Results DEVE Debates

Table 48: DEVE Total Interactions

| Type of Interaction | Count |
|---------------------|-------|
| MM                  | 78    |
| WW                  | 36    |
| MW                  | 130   |
| Total               | 244   |

Table 49: Forms of Address Used by the Chair in DEVE

| Title                 | MM | MW | WW | Total |
|-----------------------|----|----|----|-------|
| Mr. or Mrs.           | 26 | 13 | 3  | 42    |
| Full Name             | 3  | 22 | 9  | 34    |
| Last Name             | 1  | 1  | 0  | 2     |
| Our Colleague         | 0  | 0  | 1  | 1     |
| Dear Full Name        | 0  | 1  | 0  | 1     |
| Vice President        | 0  | 1  | 0  | 1     |
| Madame Last Name      | 0  | 11 | 0  | 11    |
| Mr. or Mrs. Full name | 2  | 3  | 0  | 5     |
| Madame Full           | 0  | 2  | 0  | 2     |

Table 49: Forms of Address Used by the Chair in DEVE

| Name           |    |    |    |     |
|----------------|----|----|----|-----|
| Rappateur      | 0  | 1  | 0  | 1   |
| Dear Colleague | 1  | 0  | 0  | 1   |
| Colleague      | 0  | 0  | 1  | 1   |
| Total          | 33 | 55 | 14 | 102 |

Table 50: Forms of Address Used for the Chair in DEVE Debates

| Title               | MM | MW | WW | Total |
|---------------------|----|----|----|-------|
| Frau Presidentin    | 0  | 1  | 0  | 1     |
| Madame Chair        | 0  | 1  | 0  | 1     |
| Dear Chair          | 0  | 0  | 2  | 2     |
| Mr. President       | 3  | 1  | 0  | 4     |
| Chair               | 2  | 6  | 1  | 9     |
| President           | 9  | 11 | 6  | 26    |
| Madame President    | 0  | 10 | 1  | 11    |
| Dear Vice President | 0  | 1  | 0  | 1     |
| Mr. Chairman        | 0  | 1  | 0  | 1     |
| Dear First Name     | 0  | 0  | 1  | 1     |
| Total               | 14 | 32 | 11 | 57    |

Table 51: Non-Chair Interactions in DEVE Debates

| Type of Interaction | Count |
|---------------------|-------|
|---------------------|-------|

Table 51: Non-Chair Interactions in DEVE Debates

|       |    |
|-------|----|
| MM    | 11 |
| MW    | 3  |
| WW    | 0  |
| Total | 14 |

In total for the DEVE debates there were a total of 244 interactions observed. Of these interactions 78 were man/man, 36 were woman/woman, and 130 were man/woman. When calculating the significance of this result, the p-value is essentially 0. This means the result is statistically significant.

For the way the chair referred to the MEPs the results are shown in the table above. There was one woman/woman case of “our colleague” and one man/woman case of “dear full name.” There was one man/woman and one man/man case of “last name.” There were three woman/woman, 13 man woman, and 26 man/man cases of Mr. or Mrs. For this result the p-value is .00004787 meaning this result is statistically significant.

For the way MEPs referred to the Chair there was one man/woman case of “Frau presidentin” and one of “Madame Chair.” There were two woman/woman cases of “Dear Chair.” Three men and one woman referred to a male president as “Mr. President.” There were two man/man, six man/woman, and one woman/woman case of “Chair.” “President” was used in man/man interactions 9 times, 11 times between men and women, and 6 times between women. “Madame President” was used to refer to a female president 10 times, by men and once by a woman. There was one man/woman case of “Dear Vice President.” There was one man/woman case of “Mr. Chairman.” and one woman/woman case of “Dear First Name.” When calculating the p-value of this result the p-value comes back as essentially zero, meaning this result is highly significant.

When looking at MEPs mentioning each other during the DEVE debate there were a total of 14 interactions. 11 were between men, three between men and women, and zero between women.

When conducting a significance test the p-value returned was .000979, which means this result is statistically significant.

In DEVE, the majority of interactions observed were again, between men and women. These results show that gender was not a major determining factor in these interactions. Again, these were largely determined by the gender of the chair. This result does not support the hypothesis that there would be more same gender interactions than between men and women. For the forms of address used by the chair, formal address was used between men and women, and informal once between men, and once between men and women. While these numbers are very small it does not support the expectation for more informality within same-gender interactions.

#### 5.11 DEVE vs. AFET

Table 52: DEVE vs AFET Total Number of Interactions

| Type of Interactions | DEVE | AFET |
|----------------------|------|------|
| MM                   | 78   | 59   |
| MW                   | 130  | 227  |
| WW                   | 36   | 77   |
| Total                | 244  | 363  |

Table 53: Forms of Address Used by the Chair DEVE vs. AFET

| Title      | Type  | AFET | DEVE | Total |
|------------|-------|------|------|-------|
| Mr. or Mrs | MM    | 2    | 26   | 28    |
|            | MW    | 41   | 13   | 54    |
|            | WW    | 15   | 26   | 41    |
|            | Total | 58   | 65   | 123   |
| Full Name  | MM    | 15   | 3    | 18    |
|            | MW    | 34   | 22   | 56    |
|            | WW    | 22   | 9    | 31    |

Table 53: Forms of Address Used by the Chair DEVE vs. AFET

|                       | Total | 71 | 34 | 105 |
|-----------------------|-------|----|----|-----|
| Last Name             | MM    | 1  | 1  | 2   |
|                       | MW    | 0  | 1  | 1   |
|                       | WW    | 1  | 0  | 1   |
|                       | Total | 2  | 2  | 4   |
| Colleague             | MM    | 0  | 0  | 0   |
|                       | MW    | 3  | 0  | 3   |
|                       | WW    | 0  | 1  | 1   |
|                       | Total | 3  | 1  | 4   |
| Vice President        | MM    | 0  | 0  | 0   |
|                       | MW    | 1  | 1  | 2   |
|                       | WW    | 0  | 0  | 0   |
|                       | Total | 1  | 1  | 2   |
| Sir or Madame         | MM    | 0  | 0  | 0   |
|                       | MW    | 1  | 0  | 1   |
|                       | WW    | 1  | 0  | 1   |
|                       | Total | 2  | 0  | 2   |
| Mr. or Mrs. Full name | MM    | 0  | 2  | 2   |
|                       | MW    | 2  | 3  | 5   |
|                       | WW    | 0  | 0  | 0   |
|                       | Total | 2  | 5  | 7   |
| Our Colleague         | MM    | 0  | 0  | 0   |
|                       | MW    | 0  | 0  | 0   |
|                       | WW    | 0  | 1  | 1   |
|                       | Total | 0  | 1  | 1   |

Table 53: Forms of Address Used by the Chair DEVE vs. AFET

|                  |       |   |    |    |
|------------------|-------|---|----|----|
| Dear Colleague   | MM    | 0 | 1  | 1  |
|                  | MW    | 0 | 0  | 0  |
|                  | WW    | 0 | 0  | 0  |
|                  | Total | 0 | 1  | 1  |
| Dear Full Name   | MM    | 0 | 0  | 0  |
|                  | MW    | 0 | 1  | 1  |
|                  | WW    | 0 | 0  | 0  |
|                  | Total | 0 | 1  | 1  |
| Rappateur        | MM    | 0 | 0  | 0  |
|                  | MW    | 0 | 1  | 1  |
|                  | WW    | 0 | 0  | 0  |
|                  | Total | 0 | 1  | 1  |
| Madame Full Name | MM    | 0 | 0  | 0  |
|                  | MW    | 0 | 2  | 2  |
|                  | WW    | 0 | 0  | 0  |
|                  | Total | 0 | 2  | 2  |
| Madame Last Name | MM    | 0 | 0  | 0  |
|                  | MW    | 0 | 11 | 11 |
|                  | WW    | 0 | 0  | 0  |
|                  | Total | 0 | 11 | 11 |

Table 54: Mention of Another MEP DEVE vs. AFET

| Title                  | Type  | AFET | DEVE | Total |
|------------------------|-------|------|------|-------|
| Mention of Another MEP | MM    | 1    | 11   | 12    |
|                        | MW    | 0    | 3    | 3     |
|                        | WW    | 0    | 0    | 0     |
|                        | Total | 1    | 14   | 15    |

Table 55: Forms of Address Used for the Chair DEVE vs. AFET

| Title            | Type  | AFET | DEVE | Total |
|------------------|-------|------|------|-------|
| President        | MM    | 6    | 9    | 15    |
|                  | MW    | 17   | 11   | 28    |
|                  | WW    | 6    | 6    | 12    |
|                  | Total | 29   | 26   | 55    |
| Mr. President    | MM    | 2    | 3    | 5     |
|                  | MW    | 1    | 1    | 2     |
|                  | WW    | 0    | 0    | 0     |
|                  | Total | 3    | 4    | 7     |
| Madame President | MM    | 0    | 0    | 0     |
|                  | MW    | 14   | 10   | 24    |
|                  | WW    | 10   | 1    | 11    |
|                  | Total | 24   | 11   | 35    |
| Madame           | MM    | 0    | 0    | 0     |
|                  | MW    | 2    | 0    | 2     |
|                  | WW    | 0    | 0    | 0     |
|                  | Total | 2    | 0    | 2     |
| Chair            | MM    | 0    | 2    | 2     |
|                  | MW    | 0    | 6    | 6     |
|                  | WW    | 3    | 1    | 4     |
|                  | Total | 3    | 9    | 12    |
| Madame Chair     | MM    | 0    | 0    | 0     |
|                  | MW    | 3    | 1    | 4     |

Table 55: Forms of Address Used for the Chair DEVE vs. AFET

|                     |       |   |   |   |
|---------------------|-------|---|---|---|
| Dear Chair          | WW    | 2 | 0 | 2 |
|                     | Total | 5 | 1 | 6 |
|                     | MM    | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|                     | MW    | 1 | 0 | 1 |
|                     | WW    | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Frau Presidentin    | Total | 2 | 1 | 3 |
|                     | MM    | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|                     | MW    | 0 | 1 | 1 |
|                     | WW    | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Dear Vice President | Total | 0 | 1 | 1 |
|                     | MM    | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|                     | MW    | 0 | 1 | 1 |
|                     | WW    | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mr. Chairman        | Total | 0 | 1 | 1 |
|                     | MM    | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|                     | MW    | 0 | 1 | 1 |
|                     | WW    | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Dear First Name     | Total | 0 | 1 | 1 |
|                     | MM    | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|                     | MW    | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|                     | WW    | 0 | 1 | 1 |

When comparing DEVE and AFET there were 244 and 363 interactions respectively. The man/man interactions made up 16.2% of total interactions in AFET and 31.9% in DEVE. For the woman/man interactions in AFET these made up 62.52%, and 53.27% in DEVE. For woman/woman interactions they made up 21.21% of AFET debates and 14.75% of DEVE debates. Based on the hypothesis with DEVE as a “softer” committee we would expect women to be excluded more in AFET than in DEVE. However man/woman interactions actually higher occurred at a higher rate in the AFET committee than in the DEVE committee. There were more woman/woman interactions in AFET than in DEVE. When calculating the significance of this result the p-value is essentially zero, meaning the result is statistically significant.

When comparing the way the MEPs were referenced by the chair, for Mr. or Mrs. 3.45% of AFET interactions were man/man as opposed to 40% in DEVE. Man/woman was 70.6% in AFET and 20% in DEVE. For “full name” it was 21.13% in AFET compared to 8.82% in DEVE for man/man, 70.6% in AFET to 20% in DEVE for man/woman and 25.86% woman/woman in AFET compared to 40% in DEVE. Man/woman was 47.89% in AFET and 64.71% in DEVE. Woman/woman was 30.9% in AFET compared to 26.47% in DEVE. For “last name” it was one man/man and one woman/woman in AFET and one man/man and one woman/man in DEVE. For “colleague” it was 100% man/woman in AFET and 100% woman/woman in DEVE. For “Vice President” both had one man/woman case. For “Sir or Madame” there were no uses in DEVE and one man/woman and one woman/woman instance in AFET. For “Mr. and Mrs. Full Name” AFET had two man/woman and DEVE had three man/woman and two man/man instances. For “our colleague” there were no cases in AFET and one woman/woman in DEVE. Similarly, for “dear colleague” there were no cases in AFET and one man/woman in DEVE. Again there were no cases of “rappateur” in AFET and one man/woman in DEVE. Additionally, “Madame Full Name” has no cases in AFET and two man/woman in DEVE. Finally, for “Madame Last Name” no cases in AFET and 11 man/woman cases in DEVE.

When testing if the difference for Mr. or Mrs. between AFET and DEVE is significant, the p-value was .000000001, which is statistically significant. For “full name” the p-value was .0000049065, which is statistically significant. When looking at the “last name” differences between AFET and DEVE, the p-value is .367897, which is not statistically significant. When

looking at the difference for “colleague,” the p-value is .0183156. This result is statistically significant. For “Vice President: the p-value is .135335 which is not statistically significant. For “sir or Madame”, “our colleague”, “dear colleague”, “dear full name” “rappateur” “Madame full name” and “madame last name” since in all these cases either AFET or DEVE have no counts a significance test cannot be performed. For “Mr. or Mrs. Full Name” the significance is .033373269 which means this is a statistically significant difference.

When comparing the mentions of another MEP (excluding leadership calling MEPs). In AFET there was one man/man interaction compared to 11 man/man and 3 man/woman interactions in DEVE. When calculating the significance of this result, the p-value is .0003603, meaning this is a statistically significant result.

When comparing the title used for the reference to the Chair, for “President” in AFET there were 20.69% man/man, 58.62% man/woman and 20.69% woman/woman. In comparison for AFET, it was 34.62% man/man and 42.31% man/woman and 23.08% woman/woman. The significance of this result is .00742, meaning this is a statistically significant result. In AFET, the title “Mr. President” was used in interactions with a share of 66.7% man/man and 33.33% man/woman. For DEVE it was 75% man/man and 25% man/woman. When testing for the significance of this, the p-value was .064, meaning this is not a statistically significant result. For the title “Madame President” the interactions in AFET were 58.33% man/woman and 41.67% woman/woman. Comparatively, in DEVE, 90.91% were man/woman and 9.09% were woman/woman. The p-value for this was .0000003839, meaning this is statistically significant. For the title, “Madame” there were 2 man/woman cases in AFET and none in DEVE. Due to there being no values for DEVE, a significance test could not be performed. For the title “chair” in AFET, there were three woman/woman interactions compared to two man/man, 6 man/woman, and one woman/woman. The p-value for this result is .00482 which is statistically significant. For the title “Madame Chair” in AFET, there were 60% man/woman interactions and 40% woman/woman compared to one man/woman interaction in DEVE. This returns a p-value of .74, which is not statistically significant. For the title “dear chair” there was one man/woman and one woman/woman interaction in AFET, and one woman/woman interaction in DEVE. When calculating the significance of this, the p-value is .22313, which is not statistically significant.

For the title “Frau Presidentin” there was one man/woman instance in DEVE, a significance test cannot be performed. For the title “Dear Vice President,” there was one instance of a man/woman in DEVE; again, a significance test cannot be performed. Similarly, “Mr. Chairman” was used once in a man/woman interaction in DEVE. “Dear First Name” was used once in a woman/woman interaction in DEVE. There were two handshakes between men and women in AFET and none in DEVE. Between the two committees, based on the hypothesis, we would expect the interactions between men to be stronger and more informal in AFET, however the only informal addresses were used in DEVE, and they were used between men once, and once between men and women. This does not support expectations as we would expect more informality between same-gender interactions than in opposite gender ones. There were two handshakes between men and women in AFET, and none in DEVE. This again does not support expectations for more interactions between the same gender.

## 5.12 Total Results

Table 56: Total Results

| Type of Interaction | Count |
|---------------------|-------|
| MM                  | 137   |
| MW                  | 357   |
| WW                  | 113   |
| Total               | 607   |

For the total results, 137 man/man (22.57%), 357 man/woman (58.81%), and 113 woman/woman (18.89%) interactions were observed. The p-value is essentially 0, meaning the result is highly significant. In total, man/woman interactions made up 58.81% of interactions. Combined man/man and woman/woman interactions make up for 41.46%, meaning more opposite-gender interactions were observed than same-gender ones. This does not support the hypothesis.

Table 57: Forms of Address Used by the Chair Total

| Title                 | MM | MW  | WW | Total |
|-----------------------|----|-----|----|-------|
| Mr. or Mrs.           | 28 | 54  | 41 | 123   |
| Full Name             | 18 | 56  | 31 | 105   |
| Last Name             | 2  | 1   | 1  | 4     |
| Colleague             | 0  | 3   | 1  | 4     |
| Vice President        | 0  | 2   | 0  | 2     |
| Sir or Madame         | 0  | 1   | 1  | 2     |
| Mr. or Mrs. Full Name | 2  | 5   | 0  | 7     |
| Our Colleague         | 0  | 0   | 1  | 1     |
| Dear Colleague        | 1  | 0   | 0  | 1     |
| Dear Full Name        | 0  | 1   | 0  | 1     |
| Rappateur             | 0  | 1   | 0  | 1     |
| Madame Full Name      | 0  | 2   | 0  | 2     |
| Madame Last Name      | 0  | 11  | 0  | 11    |
| Total                 | 51 | 137 | 76 | 264   |

For the title of how the chair referenced the MEPs, Mr. or Mrs. was used 28 times in man/man interactions, 54 in man/woman and 41 in woman/man interactions, for a total of 123. The p-value for this is .016, meaning this result is statistically significant. For the total “full name” references, there were 18 man/man, 56 man/woman, and 31 woman woman interactions. For a total of 105. The significance of this result is .0000235, meaning this result is statistically significant. For the total “last name” references there were two man/man, one woman/man, and 1 woman/woman instances. The p-value for this is .7788, which is not statistically significant. For the total “colleague” references, there were three man/woman and one woman/woman

interactions. The p-value is .17 which is not statistically significant. For the title “Vice President,” it was used in two man/woman interactions; the p-value was .135, which is not statistically significant. For the title “Sir or Madame” it was used in one man/woman and one woman/woman interaction. The p-value was .606, which is not statistically significant. The title “Mr. or Mrs Full Name” was used in 5 man/man and 5 woman/woman interactions. The p-value was .06625; this result is not statistically significant. For the title “our colleague,” it was used once in a woman/woman interaction, the p-value was .367 which was not statistically significant. For the title “our colleague” it was used once in a woman/woman interaction, returning a p-value of .367; this is not statistically significant. For the title “dear colleague” it was used in one man/man interaction, returning a p-value of .367 this is not statistically significant. For “dear full name,” it was used in one man/woman interaction with a p-value of .367; this is not statistically significant. For the title “Rappateur,” it was used in one man/woman interaction, which is again with a p-value of .367 not statistically significant. For “Madame Full name” it was used in two man/woman interactions, with a p-value of .135 this is not statistically significant. “Madame last name” was used in 11 man/woman interactions. The p-value for this is .000016701 which is statistically significant.

Table 58: Forms of Address Used for the Chair Total

| Title            | MM | MW | WW | Total |
|------------------|----|----|----|-------|
| President        | 15 | 28 | 12 | 55    |
| Mr. President    | 5  | 2  | 0  | 7     |
| Madame President | 0  | 24 | 11 | 35    |
| Madame           | 0  | 2  | 0  | 2     |
| Chair            | 2  | 6  | 4  | 12    |
| Madame Chair     | 0  | 4  | 2  | 6     |
| Dear Chair       | 0  | 1  | 2  | 3     |
| Frau Presidentin | 0  | 1  | 0  | 1     |
| Dear Vice        | 0  | 1  | 0  | 1     |

Table 58: Forms of Address Used for the Chair Total

|                 |    |    |    |     |
|-----------------|----|----|----|-----|
| President       |    |    |    |     |
| Mr. Chairman    | 0  | 1  | 0  | 1   |
| Dear First Name | 0  | 0  | 1  | 1   |
| Total           | 22 | 70 | 32 | 124 |

Table 59: Total Non-Chair Interactions

| Type                   | MM | MW | WW | Total |
|------------------------|----|----|----|-------|
| Mention of Another MEP | 12 | 3  | 0  | 15    |
| Handshake              | 0  | 2  | 0  | 2     |

For how the MEPs referred to the Chair, “President” was used in 15 man/man interactions, 28 man/woman and 12 woman/woman. When testing for the significance, the p-value was .0162; this result is statistically significant. The title “Mr. President” was used in 5 man/man interactions and 2 man/woman interactions. The significance for this is .0662, which is not statistically significant. For the title “Madame President” it was used 24 times in man/woman interactions and 11 times in woman/woman interactions. For this result, the p-value was .000004237, which is not statistically significant. For the title “Chair” it was used twice in man/man interactions, 6 in man/woman, and 4 in woman/woman interactions. When testing for the significance of this the p value was .36787, which is not statistically significant. For the title “Madame Chair” I observed one man/woman and two woman/woman interactions. For this result the p-value is .367 which is not statistically significant. For the title “Frau Presidentin” one man/woman interaction was observed with a p-value of .367; this result is not statistically significant. For “Dear Vice President” one interaction was observed between a man and woman with a p-value of .367 this is not statistically significant. The title “Mr. Chairman” I observed one woman/man interaction. The p-value is .367; this is not statistically significant. Finally, for “Dear first name” I observed one woman/woman interaction which is not statistically significant.

For the mention of another MEP, I observed 12 man/man interactions and 3 man/woman interactions. The p-value for this is .000409 which means this is statistically significant. I observed two man/woman handshakes, this has a p-value of .1353 which is not statistically significant.

In total there were more man/woman interactions observed than same gender ones. This demonstrates that gender was not a major determining factor in the interactions between MEPs. It does not support the hypothesis that there would be more interactions between same gender members.

### 5.13 Control for Member State, Political Group, National Delegation

#### 5.13 A Debate 1 Results

When removing interactions from the counts that included individuals from the same member state, for Debate 1 without the interactions between MEPs from the same Member state, there were 44 man/man interactions instead of 46. Without these counts included, the result is still statistically significant. For the result for the chair references to the MEP, when one MM reference of “last name” and one MM reference of “full name” are removed the p-value returned is .00005 which is still statistically significant. Without this there are no “last name” references used, but still 14 MM “full name” references, and this is still way higher than the WW or MW uses. For how the MEP refers to the chair, for the same Member state MEPs, the chair referred to them as “full name” and he did not refer back to the president. When the p-value is calculated the p-value is still .0111 which is still statistically significant.

When removing the interactions between members of the same Political group, there was one MM interaction between members of the same Political Group. This result is still significant. For debate 1, when controlling for the political group on how the chair referred to the MEP, 1 man/man “last name” was removed. For the way the MEP referred to the president, there was one man/man “president” removed. For the same national party there were no instances. The p-value is still statistically significant for how the chair referred to the MEP. For the way the mep referred to the chair the p-value is not statistically significant.

### 5.13 B Debate 2 Results

For Debate 2, there were two same member state man/man interactions, and one same political group man/man interaction. For the p-value without these values it was 0, meaning this is still statistically significant. For the political group interactions the PG significance is 0, meaning it is statistically significant. For chair references to MEP when removing interactions between MEPs from the same political groups a significance test can no longer be performed as the data set is too small. . When removing those with the same Member state, the p-value is not statistically significant. For MEP references to the chair, there was one case of man/woman “Madame” between two individuals from the same political group. When removing this case, this result went from statistically significant to not statistically significant. For mention of another MEP this interaction was between two individuals from the same member state. For handshake both of these interactions occurred between individuals from the same member state.

### 5.13 C Debate 3 Results

For debate 3, there was one man/woman and three woman/woman instances from the same member state. There were 17 men/women, 12 women/women, and 1 man/interaction from the same political group and none of the same national party. When removing the member state cases from the total, the p-value is about zero, meaning the result is still statistically significant. When removing instances of interactions between MEPs from the same political group, for debate three there are seven man/man instances, 90 woman/man and 51 woman/woman. The p-value for this is around zero meaning it is still statistically significant.

For debate 3 for the way the chair was referenced by MEPS for the control of the Political Groups the numbers for Mr. and Mrs. goes to 17 man/woman and 8 woman/woman and for full name it becomes 19 man/woman and 15 woman/woman.

For the MEP to the chair the “Madame Chair” referenced go to 3 MW only and 1 WW. “Madame President” goes to 7 MW and 5 WW, and “president” goes to 8 MW and 4 WW.

For the same member state, the number goes from 25 MW and 20 WW for “full name” for chair to MEP. For MEP to chair for “President” it is 9 MW and 4 WW. For “Madame President” it becomes 9 MW, 6 WW, and 1 MW. For “chair” it becomes 2 WW and finally for “Madame Chair” it is 3 MW and one WW. For Chair to MEP when controlling for the PG the p-value is .15 which is not statistically significant. The p-value for MEP to chair is .129 which is also not statistically significant. For debate 3, there were no cases from the same national party.

### 5.13 D Debate 4 Results

For debate 4, there were 3 WW instances, 1 MM and 1 WM interaction from the same member state. For the same political group there were 23 MW instances. There were no instances of the same national party. When looking at the way the chair referred to the MEP for the same political group “full name” occurred two times in man/woman interactions, “Mr. or Mrs.” five times in man/woman and one time “colleague” between man/woman. For the MEP to the chair references from the same political group there was one man/woman “Madame President”, 2 man/woman “Madame Chair” and three man/woman “President” instances. For the same member state, “Mr. or Mrs” was used by the chair in one woman/woman interaction, and two times in man/woman. “Full name” was used one time between women. One mention of MEPs was between two men, “Mr. and Mrs” was between the same member state. For the political group, this is not statistically significant, and for the mep to chair references from the same member state this is also not statistically significant.

### 5.13 E AFET Results

For AFET, for the same member state, there were 4 man/man, 6 man/woman, and 6 woman/woman interactions. When removing this from the totals it is 55 man/woman, 212 man/woman and 107 woman/woman. When calculating the p-value it is around 0 meaning it is still statistically significant. When controlling for the same political group there were 57 man/man interactions and 174 woman/man and 99 woman/woman interactions. The p-value is still around 0 meaning it is still a statistically significant result. There were no cases of the same national party.

### 5.13 F Debate 5 Results

For debate 5, there were 11 man/woman cases and 9 woman/woman cases from the same Political Group. From the same member state there was 1 man/woman case. There were no similar national party cases. When controlling for the political group, this is still statistically significant. When controlling for the same member state this is still statistically significant. For the same political group, there were 7 man/woman cases of “full name” and 3 man/woman “Mr.” from the chair. There was a man/woman case of “vice president.” For the way the MEP referred to the chair, there was 1 man/woman “frau presidentin”, from the same political group and one woman/woman “dear chair.” For the same member state there was 1 “MEP last name” between man and woman between two MEPs. For how the president was referenced, there were two man/woman cases of “President” and one man/woman case of “Madame Chair” and 2 man/woman cases of “Madame President.”

### 5.13 G Debate 6 Results

For debate 6, there were no cases from the same member state. There were four man/woman cases from the same political group. There were no interactions from the same national party. When controlling for the political group and calculating the significance is .000255 which means this is still statistically significant. For the references from the chair to the MEP there was one same political group case of “Mr. or Mrs” and two same political group cases of “Madame President” from the MEP to the chair.

### 5.13 H Debate 7 Results

For debate 7, there were no cases of the same member state. For the same political group there were three man/man cases and 4 man/woman cases. There were no cases of the same national party. Cases of the same political group were removed; when controlling for those cases, the p-value is .000611 meaning it is still statistically significant. For how the chair referred to the MEP, those from the same political group he used “Mr.” and “dear colleague” with men, “full name” and “Mr. and Mrs. full name” with women. In terms of how the MEP referred to the chair, for the cases where the MEPs were from the same political group, the male president was called “President” one time by a man, and a woman from the same political group referred to him as “chair.”

### 5.13 I Debate 8 Results

For debate 8 for the same, member state there were four man/woman interactions and 9 man/man interactions. When removing these, the p-value is less than .01 so it is still statistically significant. For the same Political Group there were 9 man/woman and 5 man/man interactions. When calculating the p-value it was less than .01, so it is still statistically significant. For the same national party there were 4 man/woman and 9 man/man interactions. This total is still statistically significant. For debate 8 for the same political group, there was one man/man case of “Mr” between MEPS, 1 man/man case of “full name” and one man/man “first name” and one man/woman “last name”. For claps between MEPs there was one man/woman and one man/man instance from MEPs in the same political group. For the chair references to the MEP, there were 2 man/woman cases of “Madame last name” from the same political group and one man/woman “last name.” For the same member state, there were 5 man/man instances of “Mr. and Mrs.” to the MEP from the chair. From the MEP to the chair, there was one man/woman case of “chair” and from the same member state “President” was used two times between men. For the same national party for the chair to the MEP there was one man/woman “Mr.” and one “dear full name” between man and woman. From the MEP to the chair, there was one man/woman dear first name. For the mention of another MEP there was one man/woman “first name.”

### 5.13 J DEVE Results

For DEVE, when removing the same member states, there were 3 woman/woman, 10 man/man, and 6 woman/man interactions. When removing these from the total, there were 68 man/man interactions, 124 woman/man, and 33 woman/woman interactions. When calculating the significance of this, it is still statistically significant. The total from the same political group the p-value is zero so it was still statistically significant. There were 28 man/woman 9 woman/woman cases when calculating the p-value, it was essentially zero meaning it was still statistically significant.

### 5.13 K AFET vs. DEVE and Total Results

When comparing the results of AFET and DEVE, it is still statistically significant when removing the instances from the same member state. For the total, when removing the member

state instance, there are 123 man/man, 336 woman/man, and 140 woman/man interactions. The p-value of this is approximately zero, meaning it is still statistically significant.

### 5.13 L Share of Speakers by Gender

When comparing the share of speakers from each gender for each debate, the AFET committee currently has 64 men (79.75%) and 16 women (20.25%). For debate 1, there were 25 male speakers (86.2%) and 13.8% women speakers. When removing the chair and the rapporteur as speakers, this became 85.18% men and 12.2% women. For debate 2, male speakers exceeded their share of the AFET committee - even when the chair and rapporteur were removed. For debate 2, there were 16 male speakers (80%) and 4 women. When removing the chair and the rapporteur, it became 33.3% women, exceeding their share in AFET. For debate 3, 23 women and 35 men spoke (60.35%). When removing the president and rapporteur, it was 35.84% women and 64.15% men. For debate 4, 7 women (25%) and 21 men (75%) spoke. When removing the president and rapporteur, it became 20.83% women, which is about their share in AFET. When adding up all AFET debates, there were 71 male speakers and 64 female speakers. Which is about 52.59% male to 47.4% female speakers, which largely exceeds their share in the AFET committee.

For DEVE, the committee is 64% male (16) and 36% women (9). For debate 5, there were 12 women and 19 men. This exceeded their share in DEVE. When the President and rapporteur were removed, it was 40% women and 60% male, still exceeding the overall share in DEVE. For Debate 6, there were 3 male speakers 75% and 1 female speaker. When removing the president and rapporteur, there were only 2 male speakers. In this debate, male speakers exceeded their share in DEVE. For debate 7, there were 9 male speakers and 6 female speakers. When removing the president and rapporteurs, 4 men spoke to 6 women. The male speakers accounted for 60% of the speakers, which is around their share of the committee but a bit lower. Women accounted for 40%, exceeding their share of the committee. For debate 8, 6 men spoke compared to 20 women, exceeding their share in DEVE. With men only accounting for 23% of speakers, this is far below their share of the DEVE committee. When removing the President and rapporteur, there were 3 men who spoke, making it 13.63% male speakers. In total, there were 37 male to 39 female speakers, greatly exceeding the female share in DEVE.

Additionally, we can look at the share of speakers as compared to their share of the whole parliament. As of June 2025, women account for 38.7% of the European Parliament (European Parliament, 2025). For debate 1, male speakers exceeded their share of the parliament as a whole. For debate 2, there were 20% of women speakers, which does not meet their share of parliament as a whole. For debate 3, there were around 39.65% of women speakers when counting the president and the rapporteur; when they removed it was about 35.84% female speakers. When counting the president and rapporteur, female speakers accounted for their share of parliament, but when they were removed, they did not. For debate 4, women were significantly below their share, accounting for 25% of speakers. For the total AFET debates combined, female speakers accounted for 47.4%, which exceeds their share in the European Parliament.

For debate 5, women speakers accounted for 36% of total speakers, slightly below their share of the parliament. For debate 6, male speakers accounted for 75%, greatly exceeding their share; there were only four speakers total in debate 6, and it was a very short debate. For debate 7, women accounted for 25% of speakers, which is lower than their share of the European Parliament. For debate 8, women exceeded their share of Parliament, accounting for 77% of speaking time. In total, DEVE, men, and women spoke almost the same amount of times, with women speaking 51.13% of the time. In total, there were 108 male speakers and 103 female speakers, meaning women accounted for 48.81% of the speaking time. As of 2025, women make up 38.7% of the European Parliament, so speaking for almost 50% of the debates largely exceeds their share of the parliament (European Parliament, 2025).

#### 5.14 Results Conclusion

Overall, in AFET 59 man/man, 218 man/woman, and 113 woman/woman interactions were observed. When looking at how the chair referred to the MEPs, there was one man/woman formal reference, and the 138 others were semi-formal. There were no informal references. For DEVE, there were two man/woman formal references, 98 semi-formal and one informal man/woman and one man/man. In reference to how the MEPs referred to the chair in AFET, there were 8 man/man, 35 man/woman, and 18 woman/woman formal references. There were 3

man/woman, and 1 woman/woman semiformal references. In DEVE there were 31 man/woman, 14 man/man, and 8 woman/woman formal references. There was one woman/woman and one man/woman semi-formal and one woman/woman formal. In DEVE there were 8 man/man, 35 man/woman, and 18 woman/woman formal and 3 man/woman and 1 woman/woman semi-formal. There were no informal references. Overall, there were 137 man/man, 348 man/woman, and 149 woman/woman interactions. There were 3 man/woman formal interactions, 133 man/woman, 53 woman/woman, and 50 man/man semiformal and one man/woman and one man/man informal.

Formal titles were used about the same frequency in AFET and DEVE, and semi-formal was used more by same gender actors in AFET, and between the genders in DEVE. Informal titles were only observed in DEVE. I hypothesized that women create different social networks in the European Parliament than men, and interact more with other women. The data did not support this as man/woman interactions occurred most frequently. I also expected AFET as a “hard” committee to be more exclusive to women and to see more same-gender interactions in AFET and more interactions between genders in DEVE. However, man/woman interactions occurred more in AFET than in DEVE and accounted for more than 50% of interactions in both committees. When controlling for the same member-state and same-political group interactions, these results remain the same.

## 6. Analysis

### 6.1 Overall Interactions

According to social network theory, I hypothesized that women would be excluded from male networks and interact more with other women (Liu et al., 2017). The findings do not support this. Man/woman interactions were observed more than interactions between women/women, combined with men/men. However, this could be mainly because the interactions observed were between the Chair and MEPs, meaning observed interaction types were based on the gender of the Chair. If we observe only interactions between non-leadership MEPs, there were 12 man/man, and 3 man/woman interactions, but no woman/woman interactions. This result was statistically significant. This observation does not provide support for the expectation that

women will interact more with other women, but it does support the idea that men form a “good ol’ boys club” and exclude women. We can also look at this through the lens of titles used. Semi-formal was used more between women and women than men and men and men and women. However, without more data for formal and informal titles, it is difficult to reach any conclusions from this, regarding what this says about social networks in the European Parliament. According to “tokenism” I hypothesized that women would be excluded more from AFET than from DEVE due to AFET being a “hard” committee (European Parliament). This was not necessarily supported by the data because there is not much data in the formal and informal categories to conclusively identify a difference.

According to constructivist feminism, we expect cultural backgrounds to influence gendered interactions. (Prins, 1995). There were not many findings related to this, but there were a few. First when doing research for the MEPs backgrounds, I came across one male MEP Bartucila (Croatia, ECR) who made statements against “gender ideology” Additionally Simona Baldessarre, Italy and ID made several statements against “gender identity.” Angel Dzambaski (Bulgaria, ECR) also expressed opposition to “gender ideology.” Beata Kempa (Poland, ECR) has made statements against gender as a social construct. Annika Bruna (France, ID) also has made similar statements.

What all these have in common is that they are all part of far-right groups. This is consistent with what Sawyer et. al. discussed that the far-right populist movement is associated with the anti-gender movement and rhetoric (Sawyer et al., 2023). As discussed by Kantola et. Lombardo, these actors act as though they have been silenced by gender rhetoric and “political correctness.” (Lombardo and Kantola et al., 2021) In the 8th debate, I observed a few instances that are consistent with these theories. Markus Buckheit (ESN, AFD, Germany) stated in reference to a gender related report that it was a “dustbin fire of the jargon of the moment, does it really make sense to spend money on gender projects rather than spending it on specific development goals ... returning illegal migrants, but instead we have lots of politically correct terminology and in the long term means fueling climate change and being wishy washy on the cause of migration.” Again this is an instance of a far-right member acting as though “political correctness” and gender rhetoric have been used by the left and mainstream politics to silence them. Additionally,

this is an example of what Kantola and Lombardo described as “bending” the meaning of gender equality to other issues and goals, by bringing migration into this topic (Kantola & Lombardo, 2020). As Weziak-Bialowolska discussed, there is a difference in gender ideals in Eastern and Western Europe. In Eastern Europe, gender roles are more “traditional,” and it makes sense that this would translate into the behavior of MEPs (Weziak-Bialowolska, 2014). The anti-gender statements observed came from members from Italy, Bulgaria, Poland, France, and Croatia. Italy and France could be considered Western Europe (however, Italy could also be considered Southern Europe). Bulgaria, Poland, and Croatia can be considered Eastern Europe. More instances of discussions of gender ideology would need to be observed to make conclusive statements, but these findings are consistent with what was discussed by Weziak-Bialowolska. There were no cases of this rhetoric from Northern countries. As Kantola and Lombardo discussed, Italy and France hold the majority in the far-right ID, and Poland and Italy in ECR. These nationalities are represented in the observed instances of anti-gender rhetoric.

When comparing AFET and DEVE, there were more woman/woman interactions in AFET than DEVE; there were more man/man interactions in DEVE than in AFET. There were more woman/man interactions in AFET than in DEVE. According to social network theory, it was hypothesised men would interact more with other men and women more with other women. According to tokenism, it was also hypothesized that the “good old boys club” would be stronger in AFET as a hard committee than DEVE (European Parliament). The results did not support this as there were actually more man/man interactions in DEVE than in AFET and more woman/man interactions in AFET than in DEVE (proportionally). These results do not support the hypothesis that exclusion of women would be stronger in AFET than in DEVE.

The majority of observed interactions were between the chair and the MEPs. This in itself is evidence that interactions between MEPs are largely determined through the institutional roles within the parliament. Structure of institutions shape individual choices and social interaction (Risman, 2004). Institutions are defined as rules and processes and shape debates and decision making. It also decides who is in leadership and who is represented in the debates (Lovenduski, 2020). Then when observing the debates, the institutional roles, in this case who is assigned as

chair and rapporteur, determine the representations of members of different genders and their roles within the institution.

Additionally, usually in the debates political groups had representatives speak which were selected by the group. The other speakers were therefore also determined before the debate began and there were very few if any interactions outside of pre-planned speaking time. The majority of interactions were pre-planned due to institutional roles (chair or rapporteur) and prior requests to speak which were made through institutions. As stated by Risman, the institutional structure of the European Parliament determined the majority of interactions.

The majority of interactions were between the MEP and the Chair, or the rapporteur. The MEPs request before the debate to speak, and the speaking time is divided amongst the political groups and they internally can decide who will take the floor (European Parliament). This means the majority of interactions were predetermined either by the chair as a leader, or the political groups, so it was all dependent on the members individual role within the institution.

The only interactions not observed through these pre-determined speaking times was through the blue-card and catch-the-eye procedures. The blue-card procedure allows the president to ask another MEP a question, however this still involves the institutional role of the president for decision making (European Parliament). The other procedure was the catch-the-eye procedure, which allows for a spontaneous one-minute speech. While this bypasses the political groups as institutions it still depends on the institutional role of the president who has discretion to grant the request.

Overall, the interactions observed were largely in the context of the institutional roles and structure of the European Parliament. There were not many observations observed that were outside of the existing power structure between leadership and MEPs. Based on this view, the speaking time between men and women was about 50% of the speaking time going to each gender, which exceeded women's share of both committees and parliament as a whole. Relative equality was observed through the institutional decision making process of which MEPs were allowed to speak.

## 6.2 Forms of Address Used by the Chair

When looking at the title used by the chair to the MEP, I group the titles into three categories: formal, semi-formal, and informal. I use Little and Gelles classification system. Formal is anything using a person's title (Little & Gelles, 1975). The titles observed that fall into this category are: Vice President, Rapporteur, President, Mr. President, Madame President, Madame Chair, Frau Presidentin, and Mr. Chairman. Informal are terms that indicate familiarity including "Dear Colleague" "Dear full name," and "dear first name." Semi-formal are those in between these two and includes: Mr. or Mrs., full name, last name, colleague, Sir or Madame, Mr. or Mrs. Full Name, "our colleague," Madame full name, Madame last name, "dear chair," "Dear Vice President," and Madame. Using this classification, the formal titles used by the chair were used one time in DEVE and twice in AFET. For semi-formal titles they were used 138 times in AFET, 58.69% between men and women, 28.26% between women and women, and 13.04% between men and men, informal titles were not used in AFET. Semi-formal titles were used 98 times in DEVE, 53.06% of these were between men and women, 14.24% between women and 32.65% between men and men. Informal titles were used once between two men and once between men and women in DEVE. When calculating the p-value of this use of formal titles, the p-value is .049 which is marginally statistically significant. When calculating the p-value for semi-formal titles, the p-value is also .049, meaning it is marginally statistically significant. Formal titles were used the practically same amount of times in AFET and DEVE, the semi-formal titles were used at similar rates with 58.69% man/woman in AFET to 53.06% in DEVE, 28.26% woman/woman in AFET to 14.2% in DEVE, 13.04% man/man in AFET and 32.65% man/man in DEVE. Informal titles were used once between men and women. In total, this is not a statistically significant result for formal titles. When looking at the p-value for semi-formal titles, the p-value is also .049 which is marginally significant. Formal titles were used the same amount of times in AFET and DEVE. and semi-formal titles were used at similar rates with 58.69% man woman in AFET and 53.06% in DEVE, 28.26% woman/woman in AFET and 14.2% in DEVE, and 13.04% man/man in AFET and 32.65% man man. Informal titles were used once between men and women. In total, when comparing the use of formal and informal the p-value is essentially zero and statistically significant

Formal titles were used the same amount of times in AFET and DEVE, both between men and women from the Chair to the MEP. The difference existed in semi-formal and informal where semi-formal was used more frequently between women and women, men and men in AFET, and the opposite was observed in DEVE. Informal titles were only used in DEVE. What does this mean? Based on social network theory, I hypothesized that women would be excluded from male networks and interact more with other women (Liu et al., 2017). The findings somewhat support this as semi-formal indicates more of a sense of familiarity, and more use of semi-formal between women and women than between men and women. However, more data would be needed to conclusively make any findings on this.

### 6.3 Non-Chair Interactions

When looking at the mentions of another MEP. According to social network theory, it is expected that women would be excluded more from male networks and interact more with other women than with men (Liu et al., 2017). Overall, there were more mentions of another MEP between men than between men and women. This value was statistically significant which does support social network theory.

When looking at tokenism, it was hypothesized that women would be excluded more from AFET than from DEVE, there were more mentions between men and women observed in DEVE than in AFET, but also more in man/man than others in DEVE (European Parliament). There is not enough data to conclusively identify a difference.

### 6.4 Handshakes

For handshakes, according to social network theory, we would expect to see more same gender handshakes than between different genders (Liu et al., 2017). Two man/woman handshakes were observed; this result was not statistically significant, but does not support expectations.

According to tokenism, we would see less man/woman handshakes in AFET than in DEVE. The handshakes observed were in AFET and between men and women so it does not meet this expectation. However, this finding was not statistically significant.

### 6.5 Social Network Analysis

For the social network analysis, I created heat maps based on the formality of interactions observed, for the titles used between MEPs and the Chair, for each committee, as well as in total. Heat maps can help identify the more meaningful patterns in interactions visually (Boileau et. al., 2022). In the heatmaps, I demonstrate the observed interactions as represented in the formality of titles used. The red colored cells represent the weakest interaction types, and the green represent the strongest.

Table 60: Social Network Analysis: Forms of Address Used by the Chair in DEVE

| Source      | MM | MW | WW |
|-------------|----|----|----|
| Formal      | 0  | 2  | 0  |
| Semi-Formal | 32 | 52 | 14 |
| Informal    | 1  | 1  | 0  |

Table 61: Social Network Analysis: Forms of Address Used by the Chair in AFET

| Source      | MM | MW | WW |
|-------------|----|----|----|
| Formal      | 0  | 1  | 0  |
| Semi-Formal | 18 | 81 | 39 |
| Informal    | 0  | 0  | 0  |

Table 62: Social Network Analysis: Forms of Address Used by the Chair Total

| Source      | MM | MW  | WW |
|-------------|----|-----|----|
| Formal      | 0  | 3   | 0  |
| Semi-Formal | 50 | 133 | 53 |
| Informal    | 1  | 1   | 0  |

To conduct the social network analysis, the titles used from the chair for DEVE, AFET, and total were arranged into a table for social network analysis with source (gender of the speaker), target (gender of the receiver) and the weight (how often it occurred) and the formality. From there, a heatmap was created for AFET, DEVE, and total. For interactions from the chair to MEP, I created a “formality share” heatscale. Semi-formal interactions were those who were observed

the most and they were observed most often between men and women. For DEVE, the data was put into a heatscale with green color being the strongest correction and red the weakest.

Semi-formal titles between men and women, followed by semi-formal between women and women, and semi-formal between men and men were the strongest. For just AFET, the strongest connections were men and women semi-formal titles. For AFET and DEVE, the strongest interactions were semi-formal titles between men and women.

According to tokenism, we expect the “good ol’ boys club” to be more present in AFET and to expect more informality between men and men, and more formality between men and women. Overall, more informality would also be expected between men and men, and women and women. When creating a heat map for how the chair referred to MEPs in DEVE, the semi-formal connection was the strongest between women and men, and women and women, but the strongest connection overall was between men and women. The same pattern was observed in AFET. This does not support what was expected.

Table 63: DEVE Social Network Analysis Forms of Address Used for the Chair

| Source      | MM | MW | WW |
|-------------|----|----|----|
| Formal      | 14 | 31 | 8  |
| Semi-Formal | 0  | 1  | 1  |
| Informal    | 0  | 0  | 1  |

When creating a heat map for DEVE and the formality of the way the MEP referred to the chair, the strongest interactions were man/woman formal interactions followed by man/man and woman/woman formal. The informal and semi-formal interactions were very limited.

Table 64: AFET Social Network Analysis Forms of Address Used for the Chair

| Source | MM | MW | WW |
|--------|----|----|----|
|--------|----|----|----|

Table 64: AFET Social Network Analysis Forms of Address Used for the Chair

|             |   |    |    |
|-------------|---|----|----|
| Formal      | 8 | 35 | 18 |
| Semi-Formal | 0 | 3  | 1  |
| Informal    | 0 | 0  | 0  |

For AFET, when creating a heat map to analyze formality in the way that the MEP referred to the chair, the strongest was formal man/woman followed by woman/woman formal and man/man; the heat map is very similar to the one from DEVE.

Table 65: Total Social Network Analysis Forms of Address Used for the Chair

| Source      | MM | MW | WW |
|-------------|----|----|----|
| Formal      | 22 | 66 | 29 |
| Semi-Formal | 0  | 3  | 2  |
| Informal    | 0  | 3  | 2  |

When looking at the total, the strongest ties were formal ties, and they were strongest between men and women. Overall, the man/woman interactions were the strongest ties. From the chair to the MEP for DEVE, AFET and total semiformal titles were the strongest ties. For DEVE, the man/woman interactions were strongest. Then, man/man, followed by woman/woman. For AFET, it was man/woman semiformal then woman/woman then man/man. This is interesting because we would expect men's presence to be more dominant in AFET than in DEVE as a "harder" committee. In total, man/woman semi-formal was the strongest, followed by woman/woman, then man/man. For the MEP to the chair, in DEVE man/woman formal was the strongest then, man/man formal, and woman/woman formal, followed by man/man formal. Overall, these results do not support the expectation that man/man and woman/woman ties would be stronger than those between men and women.

## 7. Conclusion

The research question asked how gender dynamics impact the decision making in the European Parliament. Based on the results, gender was not a major determining factor in the interactions between MEPs. Instead it was largely based on institutional roles, and these roles determined

which MEPs interacted with one another. This did not support the hypothesis that there would be more interactions between MEPs of the same gender than those with different genders. Gender dynamics were not found to have an impact on decision marking. In total there were more man/woman interactions observed than same gender ones. This demonstrates that gender was not a major determining factor in the interactions between MEPs. It does not support the hypothesis that there would be more interactions between same gender members.

The findings did not support expectations. Based on social network theory it was expected that women would interact more with other women, due to being excluded from male networks. This is not supported by the findings. However, this finding should be taken with caution since the majority of observed interactions were between chairs and MEPs so the data was largely skewed based on the gender of the chair. Based on tokenism, I expected women to be excluded more from male networks in the “hard” committee (AFET) than in the “softer” one (DEVE). This was not the case, especially since there was not much data in the informal and formal categories of titles to make conclusive interpretations from the data. There were actually more interactions observed between men in DEVE than in AFET. According to constructivist feminism, I expected cultural background to impact interactions. Interestingly, as the literature had discussed there were statements from far-right members against “gender ideology.” Additionally, many of these were from Eastern Europe supporting Wiezak-Bialowska’s east-west divide in gender roles. The countries that Kantola and Lombarda identified as the main far-right actors were those represented in the observed anti-gender equality rhetoric. When looking at mentions of non-chair MEPs the findings supported social network theory as there were more man/man than man/woman interactions observed. Handshakes were only observed between men and women, but there was not enough data to reach statistical significance. For the social network analysis, heatmaps were created to analyze the formality of titles used between the chair and MEPs. The strongest connections for both AFET and DEVE were semi-formal titles between men and women. According to tokenism, I expected more informality between men in AFET and more formality in DEVE. In both committees semi-formal ties were the strongest between women and men, and did not meet expectations. In total formal ties were the strongest. Overall the findings did not support expectations.

This study contributes to the existing research gap into female members of the European Parliament, and the European Parliament as a male dominated environment. By studying whether women are still excluded from this environment can inform future policies and programs. This study provides insight into the gender dynamics within the European Parliament.

However, this study faced a few limitations. Firstly, a major limitation was the interpretation. As previously discussed the debates included live translation of what MEPs were saying into English, and the majority of speakers did not speak in English and were observed through interpretation. However, this may have led to some errors and misinterpretation especially in the area of the titles used. Additionally, there were times where it seemed as though an MEP said more, and the interpreter may have skipped or summarized what they said due to a time constraint. This means some of the observed interactions may have been recorded incorrectly due to the interpretation not being entirely accurate, which in general may not have been important, but when it comes to interpreting the formality of references, could have made a big difference (Ringe, 2022). Another major limitation of this study was human error. The method relied heavily on the author's interpretation, and ability to observe all interactions (Elliott & Resnik, 2014). It is very likely that an interaction was missed or incorrectly recorded or interpreted, or even influenced by bias. If there was more time and resources, it would be ideal to have multiple observers and to view each debate multiple times and compare observations between coders and the different observations. An additional challenge was that the camera for the debates did not show everything going on at all times, often focusing on the speaker or a specific MEPs reaction. This means not all interactions could be recorded and observed and this means the results therefore may be inaccurate. Another challenge was that the sample size, especially for DEVE, was very low. For AFET there were 104 debates to select from, but for DEVE there were only 13. This means there is high sampling variability and poorly represents all debates making it hard to draw evidence-based conclusions. This makes it difficult to make generalizations about the results on how the two committees compare. Another limitation was that the nature of the debates meant that the main actors in the debates were the chair and the rapporteur and one of the two were involved in the majority of interactions. This means the results were largely dependent on what the gender of the chair and rapporteur were for that debate. In order to account for this, if I were to conduct the content analysis again, instead of randomly selecting I would divide the

debates into female and male chair and female and male rapporteur, and select two debates from each committee with a female chair, and two with a male chair, and the same for the rapporteur. This way the results would not be skewed by the chair and rapporteurs gender. A final limitation was that this thesis only observed public formal interactions in debates and did not provide much insight into the informal networks, and how women and men interact within them. Future research could go deeper into understanding these dynamics by using other methods such as interviews with MEPs and their staff, observing debates and meetings in person, as to not be reliant on the camera operators and to better understand informal networks.

Given these limitations, future research could use multiple coders who combined know all the languages of the EU (which would be difficult and costly) to balance out human error and bias. Additionally, future research could better select debates to balance out the skew that occurred based on the gender of the chair and rapporteur. Future research could also explore using social network analysis software to aid in the analysis. It could also incorporate interviews with MEPs and their staff, about their experiences and interactions. These changes could limit human error and bias, and could better conclusively aid in understanding gendered interactions and patterns.

In conclusion, this study examined gendered interactions in the European Parliament to better understand gender dynamics. The findings did not support expectations for more same-gender than man/woman interactions. Overall, these findings suggest that women are not systematically excluded in the European Parliament, at least not in the public facing interactions, within the limits of the methodology of this study. According to the research question, gender was not found to be a major determining factor in the interactions between MEPs. In conclusion the study provides additional insight into dynamics within the European Parliament, and how men and women interact within the European Parliament as an institution.

## Bibliography

- Aggestam, K., & Towns, A. E. (Eds.). (2018). *Gendering Diplomacy and International Negotiation*. Springer International Publishing.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-58682-3>
- Aggestam, K., & True, J. (2020). Gendering Foreign Policy: A Comparative Framework for Analysis. *Foreign Policy Analysis*, 16(2), 143–162. <https://doi.org/10.1093/fpa/orz026>
- Ahrens, P., & Kantola, J. (2022). Political group formation in the European parliament: Negotiating democracy and gender. *Party Politics*, 29(5), 135406882211062.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/13540688221106295>
- Ahrens, P., Erzeel, S., Evans, E., Kantola, J., Kuhar, R., & Lombardo, E. (2021). Gender and politics research in Europe: towards a consolidation of a flourishing political science subfield? *European Political Science*, 20(1), 105–122.  
<https://doi.org/10.1057/s41304-020-00304-8>
- Ahrens, P., Gaweda, B., & Kantola, J. (2021). Reframing the language of human rights? Political group contestations on women's and LGBTQI rights in European Parliament debates. *Journal of European Integration*, 44(6), 1–17.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/07036337.2021.2001647>
- Ahrens, P., Gaweda, B., Berthet, V., Kantola, J., & Miller, C. (2024). Friends, experts or witches: doing feminist research in challenging political contexts. *European Journal of Politics and Gender*, 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1332/25151088y2024d0000000039>
- Artaç, N. H., & Oğurlu, E. (2024). A qualitative study on the attitudes of women politicians toward their roles in politics: a case of Northern Cyprus. *Frontiers in psychology*, 14, 1304905. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1304905>

- Ash, E., Krümmel, J., & Slapin, J. B. (2024). Gender and reactions to speeches in German parliamentary debates. *American Journal of Political Science*.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12867>
- Balakrishnan, K. (2022). Influence of Cultural Dimensions on Intercultural Communication Styles: Ethnicity in a Moderating Role. *Journal of Communication, Language and Culture*, 2(1), 46–62.
- Berdecia-Cruz, Z., Flecha, J. A., & Ortiz, M. (2022). The gender differences in innovative mentality, leadership styles and organizational innovative behavior: the case the “40 Under 40” and their impact on organizational success. *European Business Review*, 34(3), 411–430. <https://doi.org/10.1108/eb-07-2021-0160>
- Berthet, V., & Kantola, J. (2020). Gender, Violence, and Political Institutions: Struggles over Sexual Harassment in the European Parliament. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society*, 28(1). <https://doi.org/10.1093/sp/jxaa015>
- Berthet, V., Gaweda, B., Kantola, J., Miller, C., Ahrens, P., & Elomäki, A. (2023). *Guide to Qualitative Research in Parliaments*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-39808-7>
- Berthet, V., Kantola, J., Pihlajamaa, M., Lombardo, E., Díaz Fernández, S., & Caravantes, P. (2025). Attacks on Democracy Require Fast Responses: Advancing Equality in Parliaments in Times of Anti-Gender Hostilities: CCINDLE Policy Brief. *Co-Creating Intersectional Democratic Spaces Across Europe*.  
<https://ccindle.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/CCINDLE-policy-brief-Advancing-Equality-in-Parliaments.pdf>
- Best, Edward “The European Parliament and the Right of Initiative: Change Practice, Not Powers.” *European Institute of Public Administration*, European Commission, 30 June 2021,  
[www.eipa.eu/publications/paper/the-european-parliament-and-the-right-of-initiative-chan](http://www.eipa.eu/publications/paper/the-european-parliament-and-the-right-of-initiative-chan)

[ge-practice-not-powers/](https://doi.org/10.1086/368328).

Blanchard, Eric M. (2003). Gender, International Relations, and the Development of Feminist Security Theory. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 28(4), 1289–1312.

<https://doi.org/10.1086/368328>

Boileau, P., Kakinami, L., Barnett, T., Henderson, M., & Popovic, L. (2022, July 11). *Heatmaps and consensus clustering for ego network exploration*. F1000Research.

<https://f1000research.com/articles/11-771>

Cardwell, P. J., & Jančić, D. (2019). The European Parliament and development cooperation: democratic participation in the “low politics” of EU external relations. *Journal of European Integration*, 41(3), 365–381.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/07036337.2019.1599369>

Celis, K., Kantola, J., Waylen, G., & Weldon, S. L. (2013). Introduction: Gender and Politics: A gendered world, a gendered discipline. In *Oxford University Press eBooks* (pp. 1–26).

<https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199751457.013.0034>

Cencig, E., & Sabani, L. (2017). Voting Behaviour in the European Parliament and Economic Governance Reform: Does Nationality Matter? *Open Economies Review*, 28(5), 967–987.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11079-017-9461-0>

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2024, November 29). *Terminology* [Webpage]. In Adolescent and School Health.

<https://www.cdc.gov/healthy-youth/lgbtq-youth/terminology.html>

Costa, O. (2018, January 1). *Introduction: The need for further research on the European Parliament*.

[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/329267981\\_Introduction\\_The\\_need\\_for\\_further\\_research\\_on\\_the\\_European\\_Parliament](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/329267981_Introduction_The_need_for_further_research_on_the_European_Parliament)

Council of Europe. (2022, December 2). *Exploring gender and gender identity - gender matters - www.coe.int*. Gender Matters.

<https://www.coe.int/en/web/gender-matters/exploring-gender-and-gender-identity>

Council of Europe. (2025). *Sex and gender - gender matters - www.coe.int*. Council of Europe Gender Matters. <https://www.coe.int/en/web/gender-matters/sex-and-gender>

Cullen, Z., & Perez-Truglia, R. (2019). The Old Boys' Club: Schmoozing and the Gender Gap. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3493478>

Daniel, W. T., & Thierse, S. (2021). Individual amending activity in the European Parliament committee system. *Journal of European Integration*, 44(4), 1–20.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/07036337.2021.1950704>

*Debates and videos | Plenary | European Parliament*. (n.d.). © European Union, 2016 - Source: European Parliament. <https://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/debates-video.html>

Delputte, S., Fasone, C., & Longo, F. (2016). The Diplomatic Role of the European Parliament's Standing Committees, Delegations and Assemblies: Insights from acp–eu Inter-Parliamentary Cooperation. *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*, 11(2-3), 161–181.  
<https://doi.org/10.1163/1871191x-12341338>

Deng, J., & Lu, D. (2024). The Old Boys' Club and Board Gender Diversity: Evidence from the Anti-corruption Campaign in China. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 221, 626–656. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2024.04.011>

Dingler, S. C., & Fortin-Rittberger, J. (2022). Women's Leadership in the European Parliament. *Oxford University Press EBooks*, 74–92.  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780192896216.003.0005>

Directorate-General for Human Resources and Security *Statistical bulletin with more figures on staff*. (2025). European Commission.

[https://commission.europa.eu/publications/statistical-bulletin-more-figures-staff\\_en](https://commission.europa.eu/publications/statistical-bulletin-more-figures-staff_en)

Directorate-General for the Presidency , & Directorate for the Plenary. (2019). *The plenary: A user's guide - European Parliament*. European Parliament.

[https://www.europarl.europa.eu/sed/doc/ext/manual/Plenary\\_guide.pdf](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/sed/doc/ext/manual/Plenary_guide.pdf)

Dye, T. (2023, December 11). *The primary methods of qualitative data analysis*. The Primary Methods of Qualitative Data Analysis.

<https://getthematic.com/insights/methods-of-qualitative-data-analysis>

Eklund, K. E., Barry, E. S., & Grunberg, N. E. (2017). Gender and leadership. In *InTech eBooks*.

<https://doi.org/10.5772/65457>

Ehrlich, K., & Carboni, I. (2005). Inside social network analysis. *ResearchGate*.

[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228397102\\_Inside\\_social\\_network\\_analysis](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228397102_Inside_social_network_analysis)

Elgström, O., & Sundström, M. R. (2024). A European Feminist Foreign and Security Policy?

Norm Contestation and Norm Negotiations in the European Parliament. *International Negotiation*, 1(31), 1–31. <https://doi.org/10.1163/15718069-bja10097>

Elliott, K. C., & Resnik, D. B. (2014). Scientific reproducibility, human error, and public policy.

*BioScience*, 65(1), 5–6. <https://doi.org/10.1093/biosci/biu197>

Elomäki, A., & Kantola, J. (2020). European Social Partners as Gender Equality Actors in EU Social and Economic Governance. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 58(4).

<https://doi.org/10.1111/jcms.13018>

Elomäki, A., & Kantola, J. (2022). Feminist Governance in the European Parliament: The

Political Struggle over the Inclusion of Gender in the EU's COVID-19 Response. *Politics & Gender*, 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s1743923x21000544>

European Commission. (2022, June 7). *Commission welcomes political agreement on gender balance on corporate boards* [Press release].

[https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/ip\\_22\\_3478](https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/ip_22_3478)

European Commission. (2023). *Guidance note on the collection and use of data for LGBTIQ equality*. Directorate-General for Justice and Consumers.

[https://commission.europa.eu/document/download/66adbc7e-99cb-4d88-a653-d7fbfba9d7e8\\_en?filename=Guidance%20note%20on%20the%20collection%20and%20use%20of%20data%20for%20LGBTIQ%20equality\\_FINAL.pdf](https://commission.europa.eu/document/download/66adbc7e-99cb-4d88-a653-d7fbfba9d7e8_en?filename=Guidance%20note%20on%20the%20collection%20and%20use%20of%20data%20for%20LGBTIQ%20equality_FINAL.pdf)

European Parliament. (2024, September 6). *MEPs gender balance: 2024 election results: 2024 European Election Results: European parliament*. 2024 European election results.

<https://results.elections.europa.eu/en/mep-gender-balance/2024-2029/>

European Parliament . (2025, June 26). *Women in politics: European Parliament facts and figures | topics | European Parliament*.

<https://www.europarl.europa.eu/topics/en/article/20190226STO28804/women-in-politics-european-parliament-facts-and-figures>

European Union. (2024). *BRIEFING European Council in Action*. European Union.

[https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2024/753203/EPRS\\_BRI\(2024\)753203\\_EN.pdf](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2024/753203/EPRS_BRI(2024)753203_EN.pdf)

Frantescu, D. P. (2015). Values Topple Nationality in the European Parliament. *European View*, 14(1), 101–110. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12290-015-0349-3>

Gagliarducci, S., & Paserman, M. D. (2009). Gender Interactions within Hierarchies: Evidence from the Political Arena. *IZA DP No. 4128*. <https://docs.iza.org/dp4128.pdf>

*Gender mainstreaming | European Institute for Gender Equality*. (2023, November 29).

Eige.europa.eu.

[https://eige.europa.eu/gender-mainstreaming?language\\_content\\_entity=en](https://eige.europa.eu/gender-mainstreaming?language_content_entity=en)

- Goertz, G., & Mazur, A. G. (Eds.). (2008). *Politics, gender, and concepts: Theory and methodology*. Cambridge University Press.  
<https://bibliotecacorteidh.winkel.la/Content/Books/2043.pdf>
- Government of Canada, Statistics Canada. (2024, June 13). *Gender of person*.  
<https://www23.statcan.gc.ca/imdb/p3Var.pl?Function=DEC&Id=410445>
- Hargrave, L., & Blumenau, J. (2022). No longer conforming to stereotypes? gender, political style and parliamentary debate in the UK. *British Journal of Political Science*, 52(4), 1584–1601. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0007123421000648>
- Hargrave, L., & Langengen, T. (2020). The gendered debate: Do men and women communicate differently in the House of Commons? *Politics & Gender*, 17(4), 580–606.  
<https://doi.org/10.1017/s1743923x20000100>
- Hervías Parejo, V., Radulović, B. (2023). Public Policies on Gender Equality. In: Vujadinović, D., Fröhlich, M., Giegerich, T. (eds) *Gender-Competent Legal Education*. Springer Textbooks in Law. Springer, Cham. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-14360-1\\_12](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-14360-1_12)
- Hessami, Z. & Mariana Lopes da Fonseca. (2020). Female Political Representation and Substantive Effects on Policies: a literature review. In *IZA Discussion Paper Series* (No. 13125). <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3555582>
- Highlights | Home | DEVE | Committees | European Parliament*. (2025). Europa.eu.  
<https://www.europarl.europa.eu/committees/en/deve/home/highlights>
- Hix, S., Noury, A., & Roland, G. (2008). Voting patterns and alliance formation in the European Parliament. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 364(1518), 821–831. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2008.0263>

Hix, S., Noury, A. G., & Roland, G. (2007). Democracy, transaction costs and political parties. *Cambridge University Press EBooks*, 32–53.

<https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511491955.003>

Hix, S., Noury, A. G., & Roland, G. (2007a). Democratic Politics in the European Parliament. In *Cambridge University Press*. Cambridge University Press.

<https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/democratic-politics-in-the-european-parliament/03F83F400698CFD0009107FBFC78B98C>

Hurka, S., & Kaplaner, C. (2020). Are popular and powerful committees more representative? Evidence from the ninth European Parliament. *Research & Politics*, 7(2), 205316802091445. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2053168020914453>

Istituto per la Ricerca Sociale (IRS) - Italy , Samek Lodovici, M., Pesce, F., Dente, B., Barbieri, D., Loi, D., Melloni, E., Vasilescu, C., & Zancanaro, I. (2014). *Gender Mainstreaming in Committees and Delegations of the European Parliament Study for the FEMM Committee*. Directorate-General for Internal Policies, policy department citizens' rights and constitutional affairs .

Kantola, J., & Lombardo, E. (2020). Strategies of right populists in opposing gender equality in a polarized european parliament. *International Political Science Review*, 42(5), 019251212096395. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192512120963953>

Kantola, J., & Lombardo, E. (2021). How opposition to gender equality is expressed by radical right MEPs in the European Parliament. *LSE EUROPP blog*. <https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/europpblog/2021/03/01/how-opposition-to-gender-equality-is-expressed-by-radical-right-meps-in-the-european-parliament/>

Kantola, J., & Lombardo, E. (2023). The European Parliament as a gender equality actor: a contradictory forerunner. *Edward Elgar Publishing EBooks*, 299–310. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781800374812.00033>

Kantola, J., & Miller, C. M. (2022). Gendered Leadership in the European Parliament's Political Groups. *Oxford University Press EBooks*, 150–170.

<https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780192896216.003.0009>

Kantola, J., & Rolandsen Agustín, L. (2019). Gendering the Representative Work of the European Parliament: A Political Analysis of Women MEP's Perceptions of Gender Equality in Party Groups. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 57(4), 768–786.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/jcms.12885>

Kantola, J., & Waylen, G. (2024). Analysing legislatures using a feminist institutionalist lens. *European Journal of Politics and Gender*, 1–24.

<https://doi.org/10.1332/25151088y2024d000000048>

Kantola, J. (2009). Women's political representation in the European union. *Journal of Legislative Studies*, 15(4), 379-400.

Kantola, J. (2025, February). *Gender Equality at a Crossroads: Implications of the 2024 European Parliament Elections*. Swedish Institute for European Policy Studies; Swedish Institute for European Policy Studies.

<https://sieps.se/en/publications/2025/gender-equality-at-a-crossroads-implications-of-the-2024-european-parliament-elections/>

Korolczuk, E., Graff, A., & Kantola, J. (2025). Gender danger. Mapping a decade of research on anti-gender politics. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 1–20.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/09589236.2025.2489584>

Lindqvist, A., Sendén, M. G., & Renström, E. A. (2020). What is gender, anyway: a review of the options for operationalising gender. *Psychology and Sexuality*, 12(4), 332–344.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/19419899.2020.1729844>

- Lindstädt, R., Slapin, J. B., & VANDER WIELEN, R. J. (2011). Balancing Competing Demands: Position Taking and Election Proximity in the European Parliament. *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, 36(1), 37–70. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1939-9162.2010.00003.x>
- Little, C. B., & Gelles, R. J. (1975). The social psychological implications of form of address. *Sociometry*, 38(4), 573. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2786369>
- Liu, W., Sidhu, A., Beacom, A. M., & Valente, T. W. (2017). Social network theory. *The International Encyclopedia of Media Effects*, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118783764.wbieme0092>
- Lombardo, E., & Kantola, J. (2019). European Integration and Disintegration: Feminist Perspectives on Inequalities and Social Justice. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 57(S1), 62–76. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcms.12949>
- Lombardo, E., & Kantola, J. (2021). Social Constructivism. In G. Abels, A. Krizsán, H. MacRae, & A. Van der Vleuten (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Gender and EU Politics* (1st ed.). (Routledge International Handbooks). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351049955-5>
- Lombardo, E., Kantola, J., & Rubio-Marin, R. (2021). De-Democratization and Opposition to Gender Equality Politics in Europe. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society*, 28(3), 521–531. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sp/jxab030>
- Malihah, E., Nurbayani, S., Komariah, S., Sisdiana, E., Wirda, Y., Utami, L., & Munggaran, R. A. (2024). Understanding political skills and leadership styles on public satisfaction in women politicians. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 10(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2024.2350111>
- Marjan Bojadjiev, Marjana Vaneva, Ana Tomovska Misoska, Ivona Mileva, & Marija Andonova. (2023). The Ninth Dimension of National Culture: Unpacking Cross-Cultural Communication Styles. *Interdisciplinary Description of Complex Systems*, 21(4),

471–494. <https://doi.org/10.7906/indecs.21.5.4>

Maurer, Andreas Peter, and Michael Wolf. “The European Parliament’s Right of Initiative.” *Publications Office of the European Union*, 11 July 2020, <https://doi.org/10.2861/227831>

European Parliament *Members* | *Home* | *AFET* | *Committees* | (2019). Europa.eu. <https://www.europarl.europa.eu/committees/en/afet/home/members>

European Parliament *Members* | *Home* | *DEVE* | *Committees* | *European Parliament*. (2019). Europa.eu. <https://www.europarl.europa.eu/committees/en/deve/home/members>

European Parliament *Which languages are in use in the Parliament?* | *News* | *European Parliament*. (n.d.). Ww.europarl.europa.eu. <https://www.europarl.europa.eu/news/en/faq/3/which-languages-are-in-use-in-the-parliament>

Lovenduski, J. (2020). The political representation of women: A feminist institutionalist perspective. *Research Handbook on Political Representation*. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781788977098.00025>

Miller, M. G., & Sutherland, J. L. (2022). The effect of gender on interruptions at congressional hearings. *The American Political Science Review*, 117(1), 103–121. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0003055422000260>

Moser, C. (2001). *How open is “open as possible”? Three different approaches to transparency and openness in regulating access to EU documents*. <https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssolar-246314>

Müller and Tömmel (2022). Women and leadership in the European Union. In *Oxford University Press eBooks*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780192896216.001.0001>

- Nousiainen, K., Holli, A., Kantola, J., Saari, M., & Hart, L. (2013). Theorising Gender Equality: Perspectives on Power and Legitimacy. *Social Politics*, 20(1), 41-64.  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/sp/jxs026>
- Novak, S. (2024). *Barriers to implementing transparency in EU institutions. Action publique. Recherche et pratiques* (Special Issue #2), 47–61. <https://doi.org/10.3917/aprp.018.0028>
- Peterson, V. S. (1993b). Gender in International Relations: Feminist Perspectives on Achieving Global Security, by J. Ann Tickner. *Political Science Quarterly*, 108(2), 347–348.  
<https://doi.org/10.2307/2152026>
- Poljak, Ž. (2022). The role of gender in parliamentary attacks and incivility. *Politics and Governance*, 10(4). <https://doi.org/10.17645/pag.v10i4.5718>
- Prins, B. (1995). The Ethics of Hybrid Subjects: Feminist Constructivism According to Donna Haraway. *Science, Technology, & Human Values*, 20(3), 352-367.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/016224399502000305>
- Proksch, S.O., & Slapin, J. B. (2009). Position Taking in European Parliament Speeches. *British Journal of Political Science*, 40(3), 587–611.  
<https://doi.org/10.1017/s0007123409990299>
- Qualitative approaches: social network analysis | EU CAP Network*. (2016, December 1).  
[https://eu-cap-network.ec.europa.eu/training/evaluation-learning-portal/qualitative-approaches-social-network-analysis\\_en](https://eu-cap-network.ec.europa.eu/training/evaluation-learning-portal/qualitative-approaches-social-network-analysis_en)
- Ridley, S. The European Parliament as legislator. *ZERL - Journal for European Legal Linguistics*, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.18716/ojs/zerl.2021/1366>
- Ringe, N. (2022). *The Language(s) of Politics: Multilingual Policy-Making in the European Union*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1353/book.99520>

- Rominiecka, M. (2008). Non-Verbal Cues in Politics: An Analysis of Gestural Signals sent by American and European Politicians. *Poznań Studies in Contemporary Linguistics*, 44(2). <https://doi.org/10.2478/v10010-008-0012-0>
- Risman, B. J. (2004). *Gender as a social structure: Theory wrestling with activism*. American Psychological Association. <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2004-16516-001>
- Sangaletti, C. (2016, July 8). *Transparency in the Council of the European Union*. CVCE.EU; CVCE. European Navigator. [https://www.cvce.eu/obj/transparency\\_in\\_the\\_council\\_of\\_the\\_european\\_union-en-17c906d0-5a12-4726-bf6c-7279a73e8d8d.html](https://www.cvce.eu/obj/transparency_in_the_council_of_the_european_union-en-17c906d0-5a12-4726-bf6c-7279a73e8d8d.html)
- Sawer, M., Banaszak, L. A., True, J., & Kantola, J. (2023). *Handbook of Feminist Governance*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Scott, J., & Carrington, P. (2014). *The SAGE Handbook of Social Network Analysis*. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446294413>
- Scully, R. (2005). 4 UNDERSTANDING INSTITUTIONAL SOCIALIZATION. *Oxford University Press EBooks*, 67–88. <https://doi.org/10.1093/0199284326.003.0004>
- Shah, D. V., Hanna, A., Bucy, E. P., Lassen, D. S., Van Thomme, J., Bialik, K., Yang, J., & Pevehouse, J. C. W. (2016). Dual screening during presidential debates. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 60(14), 1816–1843. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764216676245>
- Silva, C. (2023). European Parliament's political groups in turbulent times. *Journal of Contemporary European Studies*, 31(2), 576–577. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14782804.2023.2175469>
- Smith, K., & Kozielska, M. (2024). *PROJECT REPORT Strengthening the Representation of Women in Diplomacy: Challenges and Policy Solutions*.

<https://www.lse.ac.uk/ideas/Assets/Documents/Project-Reports/2024-05-24-WiD-WEB-FIN.pdf>

Smith, P. B. (2011). Communication Styles as Dimensions of National Culture. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 42(2), 216–233. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022110396866>

Tannen, D. (1981). Indirectness in discourse: Ethnicity as conversational style\*. *Discourse Processes*, 4(3), 221–238. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01638538109544517>

Tapio Raunio, & Wagner, W. (2020). Contestation over Development Policy in the European Parliament. *JCMS Journal of Common Market Studies*, 59(1), 20–36. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcms.13138>

Timko, K. (2017). *Gender, communication styles, and leader effectiveness* (MPRA Paper No. 77021). University of Helsinki. [https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/77021/1/MPRA\\_paper\\_77021.pdf](https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/77021/1/MPRA_paper_77021.pdf)

Tremmel, M., & Wahl, I. (2023). Gender stereotypes in leadership: Analyzing the content and evaluation of stereotypes about typical, male, and female leaders. *Frontiers in psychology*, 14, 1034258. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1034258>

Van Nes, F., Abma, T., Jonsson, H., & Deeg, D. (2010). Language differences in qualitative research: is meaning lost in translation? *European Journal of Ageing*, 7(4), 313–316. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10433-010-0168-y>

Warasin, M., Kantola, J., Rolandsen Agustín, L., & Coughlan, C. (2019). Politicisation of Gender Equality in the European Parliament: Cohesion and Inter-Group Coalitions in Plenary and Committees. In P. Ahrens, & L. Rolandsen Augustin (Eds.), *Gendering the European Parliament: Structures, Policies and Practices* (pp. 141-158). ECPR Press.

- Wasike, B. (2019). Gender, Nonverbal Communication, and Televised Debates: A case study analysis of Clinton and Trump's nonverbal language during the 2016 town Hall debate. *International Journal of Communication*, 13, 251-276.
- Wessels, W., & Dieke, L. (2018, October 24). The European Council: The Fascination and Frustration of Studying a Key Institution. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Politics*. Retrieved 24 June. 2025, from <https://oxfordre.com/politics/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228637.001.0001/acrefore-9780190228637-e-180>.
- West, C., & Zimmerman, D. H. (1987). Doing gender. *Gender & Society*, 1(2), 125–151. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243287001002002>
- Weziak-Bialowolska, D. (2014). Differences in Gender Norms Between Countries: Are They Valid? The Issue of Measurement Invariance. *European Journal of Population*, 31(1), 51–76. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10680-014-9329-6>
- Wrtil, C., & Hobolt, S. B. (2019). Public deliberations in the Council of the European Union: Introducing and validating DICEU. *European Union Politics*, 20(3), 511–531. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1465116519839152>
- Yordanova, N. (2009). The Rationale behind Committee Assignment in the European Parliament. *European Union Politics*, 10(2), 253–280. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1465116509103377>