

A RESEARCH BASED PERSPECTIVE

Women and political representation: the key issues to be addressed

by Rama SITHANEN – l'Express 23.02.09



 Agrandir l'image

For some political scientists, the effectiveness of representation depends more on experience, competence or training, rather than on the degree to which elected officials are similar to their constituents. But others contend that responding to gender issues has become a key test for democratic institutions.

Women in Politics, a group promoting the cause for more women in Parliament, was recently launched. It brings the issue of women and political representation is in the limelight again.

A female journalist covering the event has raised what appears to be two openly provocative questions. Why do we need more women in politics ? And is it a case of women for the sake of women? The answers are not as obvious as they appear at first sight.

In order to throw some light on the key issues that need to be addressed, I propose to answer five questions that are inextricably intertwined . They are as follows: Do we need women (or men) to represent women's (or men's) interests? Does gender (women or men) matter in politics? Do quotas improve female representation ? Do electoral systems affect women representation ? How does Mauritius improve its female representation?

Do we need women to represent women's interests ? Or men to represent men's interests?

Some could argue that this is similar to the question of whether the racial background (in our case religious, ethnic and casteist origin) of the office bearer matters in a representative democracy. The concept of representation and its different dimensions occupy an important place in the political theory literature. While there is agreement that political representation is a very important activity in a democratic society and is a key linchpin that links the citizens to its system of governance, there is hardly any consensus among political scientists on its exact meanings. There are many ways of representing and of being represented. Different theories of democracy often support alternative concepts of representation.

Two important approaches to the concept of representation, especially with respect to gender political representation, are the " politics of ideas" and the " politics of presence". Political scientists distinguish two main concepts of representation: representation as " standing for" and " as acting for". The " standing for" type of representation is usually associated with descriptive representation (politics of presence) while the " acting for" often refers to substantive representation (politics of ideas).

Substantive representation takes place when the elected officials represent their constituents through the fulfilment of their political needs. Citizens are effectively represented when their representatives are chosen in a manner where there is congruence between the politicians' beliefs and the voters' views and aspirations. Here the representation of ideas becomes the crucial element of representation. What matters are the activities of the elected office bearers rather their descriptive or demographic characteristics. The quality and effectiveness of

representation depends more on characteristics such as experience, competence, training and knowledge rather than on the degree to which elected officials are socially similar to their constituents.

It is argued that the lack of descriptive representation does not prevent elected representatives from adequately representing the wide range of constituents' interests, needs and aspirations. Here the conception of representation is colour, ethnic and gender blind.

However this approach is strongly criticised by other political scientists who argue about the importance of descriptive representation.

They contend that in a plural society characterised by race, class, ethnic, religious and gender disparities, these cleavages are bound to affect political representation.

They make a powerful case in defence of the politics of presence as they believe such representation is crucial if political institutions are to be considered as representative.

They are in favour of a theory of representation based ALSO on " the po- litics of presence" compared with one based ONLY on " the politics of ideas". They do not however suggest that presence by itself is sufficient.

They believe that responding to gender issues and multi cultural diversity has become a key test of representativeness for democratic institutions. It is argued that policy measures implemented by a Government that is descriptively representative has greater legitimacy, thus enhancing political stability and encouraging political respect. In the name of political equality, people have equal right to influence issues that affect their lives. There is thus a case for political representation on the basis of gender. Scholars do caution against taking the concept of descriptive representation too far. They argue that it is not necessary for left handed redheads of the world to unite in anger because of their lack of political representation and go on to suggest that what is relevant is exclusion that occurs on politically relevant elements, as in the two cases of women and ethnicity/ race. They conclude that policies that enhance the participation, consultation and representation of these two groups in public life would play an important role in making Parliament more politically representative. The greater presence of groups like women, ethnic and racial minorities is important not only because they can better represent members of their group but because they may change the political agenda and bring new perspectives to bear on existing ways of seeing and doing politics.

They go further by stating that who our representatives are has become especially important as representatives have acquired greater autonomy and freedom in how they vote and behave in Parliament. Increasingly political parties are becoming less bound to the policies and platforms agreed to by their wider membership. To a large extent, this reflects the major political changes that have taken place since the end of the ideological cleavage but also due to the speed and extent of change that any party in Government has to confront.

Therefore, the more autonomous political representatives are, the more it matters who they are. If elected representatives are there only to implement a pre determined mandate, then their social composition is less important. However if representatives have greater freedom and autonomy in their judgement, then the different life experience and perspectives that a more diverse legislature may bring to bear on policy making becomes more critical. The physical presence of groups who were previously excluded in Parliament is important for getting their perspectives into the legislature, requiring others to understand their point of view and hence change the nature of how others think. Thus the presence of women in politics provides an additional guarantee for the political representation of this group. It also offers the possibility for women's representatives to articulate their respective constituents' interests, thus triggering a politics of transformation.

Some analysts argue that descriptive representation might also be itself a form of political representation.

Simply having elected representatives of one's own race, gender or ethnicity may positively influence the constituents' political attitude and behaviour. Political representation can also build public trust, promote political participation and empower citizens. They may also feel that members of their own group may better represent their interests.

Descriptive representation and its manifestation in

Parliament remain important issues in the debate on representation and have been the subject of many empirical studies. Of all the forms of descriptive representation, gender and race have received greater attention. Women and racial/ ethnic minorities have been able to fight against their absence from Parliament. They have increased their presence by challenging direct and indirect discriminatory practices that have prevented their effective participation. Quotas, affirmative actions and changing political recruitment criteria have also contributed to the demographic diversity of elected bodies.

In some countries there has been a huge transformation in the demographic characteristics of elected representatives.

The descriptive representation of women elected office holders has increased quite considerably over the years even if they remain largely underrepresented as a percentage of the population . Some political scientists have focused their research on the relationship between descriptive and substantive representation. They believe that the two cannot be separated, that it may be difficult to ensure substantive representation without descriptive representation. In essence they argue that women representatives are more likely to represent women's interests than male representatives and that changes in the demographic characteristics of elected officials have led to a change in substantive representation. They contend that there is a logical link between the two and that the two types of representation can be achieved simultaneously.

The involvement of previously excluded groups in the political process leads to a crystallisation of their substantive interests. For instance women's political presence as elected officials offers the prospect for a more adequate substantive representation of women than may exist with a male representative. It is thus argued that increased descriptive representation will lead to better substantive representation. That women representatives will not only " stand for" them but also " act for" them.

Does gender matter in politics ?

Do more women as elected representatives make a difference in policies, legislative actions, political attitudes and behaviour and to parliamentary roles? Earlier research in the US found that most women legislators did not see themselves as substantially representing women's interests. This led some scholars to reach the conclusion that descriptive representation of women had no relation to support for women's substantive interests.

They show that women MPs represent first their respective parties, then the voters in their constituencies and finally their gender. These findings seem to validate the important point made by many political theorists.

That the primary function of representation is to represent the substantive interests of the represented.

Therefore descriptive representation should be judged on that criterion. In some cases, non descriptive elected officials have greater ability to represent the substantive interests of their constituents and this becomes a major argument against descriptive representation per se. Overall it was political party and constituents' interests rather than gender that matters to understand differences in values and attitudes.

The limited evidence of women's representation in Mauritius (based on Parliamentary intervention and legislative record) seems to support this view as in the overwhelming majority (if not all) of cases, party loyalty and discipline have been more important than gender.

The above findings may reflect the difficulties of investigating the impact of women's presence, in view

of the small number of women MPs. When inquiry has concerned a critical mass of elected women representatives, it was found that there is a difference that ranges from the style of doing politics to having greater sympathy for policies that help to achieve a better balance to work and family, to different experiences and perspectives to policy debates. When there is a sufficiently important number of women MPs, they can influence legislative agendas and policy formulation. Women are more likely than their male colleagues to support women's issues and perspectives and to actively promote legislation to enhance women's status in society and to focus their legislative attention on issues like health care, family welfare, child care, education, equal pay for equal work and violence against women. Female elected officials are seen to be more responsive to issues that affect women constituents, as measured by their parliamentary interventions and their legislation records.

Research found that while UK male and female MPs agree that the same issues are significant, women perceive those issues differently to men; female representatives are more likely to take a pro- woman line than their male counterparts. For instance, both men and women agree that employment issues are important; however many surveys show that women are more interested in work and family life while men are more concerned about pay, career prospects and benefits. To the extent that women bring different workstyle and perspectives, distinctive qualities and specific experiences and interests to their own work in Parliament, they may, as their numbers increase over time, help to bring about changes in the way business is conducted within the institution.

In a study on whether women and men politicians differ within each party in terms of their political attitudes and values, including towards major economic, social and foreign policy issues commonly dividing British party politics, it was found that on two important issues that are most closely related to women's interests (affirmative action and gender equality issues) women and men differ significantly within the main political parties in the UK, even after controlling for other common social background variables such as their age, education, and income. Thus women leaders in elected office have the capacity to make a substantive difference on these issues.

The findings suggest that once the effect of the party is isolated, there are no significant differences among women and men elected representatives across some key values like the market economy, European issues and traditional moral values. Yet when it comes to issues that are close to women's interests such as support for all women shortlists, reserved seats or positive quotas to get more women candidates nominated, equal opportunities for women and equality in the workplace and home, there is a strong and significant gender gap within all the major parties. If the gender of politicians has such an influence on attitudes and behaviour, then this will have significant consequences for Government, Parliament, party policies and the public perception of representative democracy.

Many researchers argue that Parliaments are not capable of dealing satisfactorily with issues close to women such as reproductive rights and sexual violence without much input at all levels from women and that legislation in other areas would also benefit from female input too. They recognise a gender dimension to political representation at three levels of representation: at the constituency level, in Parliament and in Government.

These findings seem to support the arguments that the politics of women presence does make a difference.

Others found that while the gender of politicians does not seem to matter on everything, it however becomes important on gender-related values which have significant implications for sex equality policy in the labour force and at home.

The “critical mass” theory suggests that as the number of women in Parliament increases, they do have an impact in terms of raising new issues and promoting agenda that defend women’s interests. Research found that women in both the Conservative and the Labour parties in Norway were successful in raising the importance of handling the shortage in day care coverage. These findings signify that the make up of Parliament could matter in terms of what issue is raised and how it is dealt with. Studies in New Zealand showed a correlation between the rising number of female MPs in Parliament and changes in political culture, the political agenda and public policy.

As the number of women MPs grows, there was a gendered difference on two major issues of great concern to women, namely child care and parental leave. Female representatives became more actively involved in discussion, debate and legislative actions on child care and parental leave as their number rose in Parliament. These women MPs also became more committed to defending and representing the interests of women as their number grew in the House.

to be continued

The author holds a PhD in electoral systems for plural societies*

« Some political scientists believe women representatives are more likely to represent women’s interests than male representatives and that changes in the demographic characteristics of elected officials have led to a change in substantive representation. »

« Research found that while UK male and female MPs agree that the same issues are significant, women perceive those issues differently (...) Both men and women agree that employment issues are important; however (...) women are more interested in work and family life while men are more concerned about pay, career prospects and benefits. »

A RESEARCH BASED PERSPECTIVE

Women and political representation: the key issues to be addressed

by Rama SITHANEN – l'Express 24.02.09



For some political scientists, the effectiveness of representation depends more on experience, competence or training, rather than on the degree to which elected officials are similar to their constituents. But others contend that responding to gender issues has become a key test for democratic institutions.

Do quotas improve women representation ?



There are many factors like political, economic, social, cultural, religious, unequal access to training and education, conservative attitudes, difficulties in combining a political career with parental responsibility that explain the low participation of women in Parliament. Equally, the fact that political parties are controlled by men makes it more difficult for women to be selected as candidates for election.

Quotas are very controversial. Some criticise quotas as discriminatory and a violation of the principles of fairness while others welcome them as a compensation for structural barriers that prevent women's access to Parliament. Yet they are efficient instrument to increase women's representation. Evidence across the world suggest that countries with quotas do better in terms of gender fairness. Even if they are construed as temporary measures, quotas aim at ensuring that women constitute a critical mass in decision and policy making bodies. They have worked to increase the participation of women in the political arena. One excellent example is South Africa where the introduction of quota by the ANC has considerably raised women's Parliamentary representation from almost nothing to 30 % in the very first democratic election in that country in 1994.

Spain also has done remarkably well within one generation.

From 6 % in the 80' s, female Parliamentary representation rose to 36 % in 2004 and the new Prime Minister, Jose Zapatero, appointed a gender parity cabinet of eight women and eight men. It was the outcome of the implementation of a gender parity concept by the Socialist Party in Spain.

Rwanda, a patriarchal society where women have had historically subordinated roles, increased female representation to 48 % and it happened in almost one go after the elections of 2003.

Broadly speaking, there are three ways of establishing quotas.

Through constitutional changes, legislation and political parties. Some countries have passed constitutional amendments (Rwanda, Burkina Faso, Uganda, Philippines and Nepal) to adopt quotas for women in national and local legislative bodies while others have enacted special electoral laws (Latin America, Belgium, Portugal, Serbia and Sudan) to achieve that objective. In other countries, affirmative action strategies have been initiated through political parties' internal rules with a view to promoting the training, funding and selection of women candidates.

Most mature democracies in Western Europe apply quotas through political parties. This is the case for Sweden, Norway, Iceland, Denmark, Netherland, Austria, Germany and Luxembourg. It equally applies for countries like South Africa, Tanzania, Namibia, Senegal and Mozambique. The quota is usually around one third of parliamentary seats reserved for women. Spain has gone further by introducing a new electoral law in 2007 that enshrines the principle of balanced presence. It means that party electoral lists are required to have a minimum of 40 % and a maximum of 60 % of either sex among the candidates in all elections. Communist countries like China, North Korea, Laos and Vietnam use a strict quota for women when candidates for elections are nominated. This system has enabled them to attain at least 25 % of female Members of Parliament (MPs) during most of the time. Latin America is often called the continent of women's quotas as no less than 12 of the democratic countries have imposed some kind of quota laws. Quotas can set threshold for the pool of potential candidates, for candidates who contest elections and for those who are elected.

The cases of the United Kingdom (UK) and France and are quite problematic. Almost all European countries use PR or mixed voting formula to elect their national MPs. However, the UK still uses First Past The Post (FPTP) with one member constituency while France has a two round system in single district. While on a Proportional Representation (PR) list, it is possible both to select and to elect candidates, in single member ridings, political parties can only choose candidate as there is no guarantee of election. There is no constitutional or electoral law quota in the UK; however, the Labour party has a complicated quota system for women.

As there is no guarantee of election, the share of women in the House of Commons is only 19.8 %, far lower than countries with both party quota and PR or mixed system.

France has a constitutional provision, an electoral law and a political party quota to promote women's political participation. And yet the share of women in the French National Parliament is only 18.5 %. The electoral law quota applies strictly on a parity (50- 50) basis for elections held under PR formula (European, Municipal and Regional elections), but not for national elections which uses the two round system in single member constituency. It is rather difficult to have an efficient quota for women in majority electoral system, especially in single member district. At best, the system can ensure that women are fielded as candidates, but not always in electable constituencies ! Some countries with constitutional and legislative quotas (France) have fewer women MPs than some states with political party's quotas (Norway). There could thus be a stark contrast between constitutional/ legislative amendments and concrete results.

Do electoral systems affect gender representation ?

Electoral systems exert powerful influence on both women's descriptive and substantive representation.

Why do women make up such a small percentage of Parliaments in most countries in the world? In 2008, women accounted for only 17.9 % of Parliaments worldwide . There is however huge variation in women's political representation across the globe. There are some regions where women hardly find their place in the legislature while in others, they are significantly represented. Females constitute a third or more of MPs in very few countries while in almost 35 % of countries, they account for less than 10 % of total Parliamentarians. In seven countries, there is not a single woman in the Legislature while in 17 Parliaments, there are less than 3 % of women. In Mauritius, women are underrepresented both in Parliament and in the council of Ministers. For the nine elections between 1967 and 2005, the average representation of women was very low, at 6 %. It ranged from 0 % in 1967 to 9 % in 1995. It was 5.7 % in 2000 and is currently at 17 %. At the executive level also, progress has been very slow.

Globally, around 16 % of Ministerial portfolios were held by women in 2008. In three countries (Finland, Grenada and Norway), women held more than 50 % of Ministerial portfolios. There are 22 countries in which women have 30 % or more of executive portfolios.

Here also, Mauritius lags far behind with a historical average of around 5 % of Ministers being women. It is currently at 9 per cent. The same representational deficit exists at Local Government level. We do not currently have a single mayor or chairperson of district council who is a woman ! There is both a spatial and a temporal variation in women's political representation. From a spatial standpoint, female representation is considerably higher in Western Europe (especially the Scandinavian countries), North America, New Zealand than in other parts of the world. In Asia and in regions in North Africa and the Middle East, female representation is significantly lower while the political representation of women has increased quite markedly in Latin America and in Sub Saharan Africa. From a temporal angle, there has been an improvement since the 1940s. The mean value of female representation for all countries has risen from 3 % in 1945 to 10.9 % in 1975, 13.4 % in 2000 and 17.9 % in 2008. It would appear that the level of socio economic development does not necessarily translate into better conditions for higher women's representation. Countries like South Africa, Mozambique and Costa Rica have much higher female representation than the USA, Canada and UK. Essentially because of quotas for women and the electoral system.

Electoral systems and the agenda of political parties can and do contribute to prevent women from playing a more significant political role. While electoral systems alone cannot explain the low representation of women, it appears that some formulae can exaggerate this underrepresentation, in spite of commitments made by Governments and political parties to ensure that women have equal access to and full participation in decision making. The main types of electoral system produce different outcomes for women. While the relationship between the electoral system and women's representation depends on many factors and is not automatic, it is a fact that PR and Mixed (a combination of FPTP and PR) systems improve women's ability to play a key role in political life and provide for greater social representation.

In winner- take- all electoral systems such as one member FPTP formula, women usually have far less chance of being elected. Countries with such voting system usually have the lowest number of women in their legislatures.

Overall, there are more women in Parliament in countries with PR list system (Rwanda at 56 % and Sweden at 47 %) than in states with FPTP (UK at 9 % and Botswana at 18 %). In Mauritius, it was 5.7 % in 2000 and 17 % currently. Even in a mixed member system like in Germany, it is easier for women to be elected on the Party List than in single

member constituencies. In South Africa's local elections based on a mixed system, there are more women elected on the PR list than in the constituency- based seats. In New Zealand, the number of women in Parliament increased from 21 % in 1993 under FPTP to 31 % in 1999 with a new mixed electoral system (FPTP and PR). The change of electoral system in Lesotho from FPTP to a mixed one also led to a higher representation of women in Parliament. In Germany, with a mixed system, it is easier for women to be elected on the Party list than in single member constituencies. The elections to the House of Commons and to the Regional Assemblies in

Scotland and Wales show the same pattern. In Scotland, 37 % of women were elected to the Scottish Parliament with a mixed system (FPTP and PR) while only 13 % of Scottish MPs elected to the House of Commons (with only FPTP) in 1997 were women. In Wales, women comprised 40 % of members in the Welsh Assembly (mixed system) in 1999 while only 13 % of Welsh Mps elected at Westminster (only FPTP) in 1997 were female. It should be pointed out that exactly the same people vote for the two elections. The difference lies in the voting formula for the two elections.

How to improve gender representation in Mauritius ?

Three broad reasons are usually put forward in favour of increased women political participation.

First is the democratic justice argument which is based on the fact that women constitute 50 % of the population and therefore have the right as citizens to fair representation in Parliament. Second is the growing realisation that women bring a different set of values, experience and expertise to politics and these are important to the political debate and to policy making. Third is the “ politics of presence” which hinges on the fact that women’s interests cannot be adequately represented by men. Can we consider a political system where around 50 % of the population is excluded from the political decision making process as a fair and a just one? Would the situation have been different if parties were not male dominated? Especially when the same system guarantees seats to other cohorts in the population that account for far less than 50 % (in some cases as low as 3 % based on ethnic representation through the Best Loser system) and when candidates are chosen on the basis of belonging to a smaller pool (various communal and sub communal groups). Women also share the other characteristics of the population. While many agree with the nature and extent of the problem, they refuse two important solutions that can help to cure it. Evidence across the world clearly show that a combination of PR and quota can help to improve women’s re - presentation in Parliament.

While quotas and the electoral system are neither necessary nor sufficient conditions to guarantee female representation, together they do act as powerful facilitating mechanisms. Of course, it is possible to find countries with quota that have a lower female representation than states without quota. Equally, there may be cases of a FPTP electoral mode that returns more women than a PR or a mixed system. However, the overall pattern across the world shows robust evidence of women being significantly better represented with quotas and PR or mixed electoral

system. The following statistics from some countries are quite revealing:

The evidence is overwhelming. Quotas do improve women’s representation. Equally PR and mixed voting formulae offer better prospects for female to enter Parliament.

Notwithstanding, we find many who support women’s political representation and yet are against both quotas and electoral reform. Some are against quotas and argue that women have to fight to earn their rightful places. Many countries have relied on the goodwill of parties to field more women. Unfortunately not much has changed as parties are usually male dominated and male oriented. It does not help at all to agree that women should gain political representation and to turn down quotas. There is unfortunately no other effective solution than quotas to enhance women’s presence in Parliament. Quotas for women are much more widespread than most people would like to admit. There are around 100 countries that use quotas; 40 % have quota provisions entrenched in the Constitution or embedded in national legislation or regulations while 60 % have rules set by political parties to include a given percentage of women as candidates. The most common percentage is 30 % women although some have a 50 % threshold. The debate in Mauritius would be about the best type of quotas among the three that exist across the world and the threshold level.

In Mauritius, political parties, especially their elites, are the gatekeepers to and managers of elected office. Often they would resist redistributing resources to other groups because they want to retain power and because power distribution is a zero sum game. Parties are not malevolently misogynistic. Rather, they are strategic actors responding to socio cultural background conditions and institutional constraints.

The implementation of quotas appears easier in a new political system than in an older one where most seats might be occupied . South Africa compared to Mauritius; Spain to France and Rwanda to Botswana.

The argument of culture, history and societal values does not always stand the test of empirical evidence. Even in countries with a history and culture of discrimination against women, significant progress has been made in gender fairness through quotas. Latin America has become the continent of women’s quotas. It ranges from 20 % in Paraguay to 40 % in Costa

Rica. Brazil, Argentina and Mexico have a 30 % quota. South Africa and Mozambique also have quotas at around 30 %. While many agree that there should be more women in Parliament, there is divergence on how to attain the goal. There are guidelines like the 1995 UN recommendation that can be followed; equally there is need to

honour the political commitment taken in 1997 by the SADC Heads of States to have at least a critical mass of 30 % of women in Parliament by 2005. Mauritius is very far from the threshold of 30 %. One pathway, using a combination of quotas and electoral reform, to ensure such gender fairness would be as follows: to change the current electoral system by introducing a dose of PR. The exact nature of the mixed system should be agreed by the main political parties. It is understood that the 62 FPTP seats will remain and will constitute the main pillar of the mixed system; to have political parties amend their constitution and internal rules to introduce a quota system for selection of female candidates for national and local elections; to reach consensus, from a very practical standpoint, on a road map to meet the minimum 30 % threshold . Can it be achieved in one election or does it have to be spread over more than one election ? to have at least one woman candidate in each of the 20 constituencies in the Island of Mauritius. This option is fairer to women than to have a national quota of 20 candidates. It is easier to ensure election in a three member constituency than in single member district through quotas; to allot the newly created PR seats from Party lists published before polling; to provide for Party lists to contain at least one third of female candidates; to prevent women being at the bottom of the PR list, one should have a narrow “ zipper” so that candidates on Party lists are ranked in a sequence so that at least every third candidate is a woman; to have at least a minimum threshold of women Ministers in the Cabinet. And also for the other key jobs such as Private Parliamentary Secretary, etc. Again, there should be consensus on the threshold (should it be the same 30 % or a different percentage). And whether it can be achieved in one election or to be staggered over a longer period of time to introduce a women quota for Municipal elections. It should be easier to reach the minimum of 30 % of seats for women faster (may be at the next election); to consider the establishment of a reward and penalty system. To use the stick against those who drag their feet and the carrot for those who adhere to recommended policies. There are many ways of doing it.

The use of quotas is very widespread as there is hardly any better alternative to increase the political participation of women. In the specific case of women, quotas do not necessarily discriminate but compensate for actual barriers that deny them their fair share of political representation.

Quotas have been introduced in a large number of countries with very different political, cultural, religious and socio economic background.

Thus, quotas have been adopted by countries in Scandinavia and Western Europe with far better democratic credentials and robust provisions against discrimination than Mauritius.

They also exist in countries as culturally diverse as Germany and South Africa, economically different as Norway and Mozambique, religiously apart as Costa Rica and India, socially unlike as Burkina Faso and Philippines and politically dissimilar as Belgium and Argentina. Culturally and religiously conservative Latin America has become the continent of women's quotas. South Africa, with a very bitter history of apartheid, where most women were doubly discriminated, has a quota of 30 %. With a combination of a PR system, a quota for local government and the main party's zebra list system, Namibia has shown how it is feasible to reach gender parity in a very short span of time.

While there are many factors that stand in the way of women's political representation, there are two important factors that affect women's Parliamentary representation: the use of quotas for women and the electoral system. It is therefore utterly unfair to argue for more female representation and to refuse both quota and a dose of PR. Without a combination of quotas and a component of PR, the odds of a Parliament in Mauritius with 30 % female are extremely long. Will it be accepted by the political stakeholders or will the huge gap between rhetoric and actions, between international commitment and implementation remain? Will women's representation be merely token or will it be on the way to a critical mass of at least 30 %? Time will tell.

* The author holds a PhD in electoral systems for plural societies.

“ While electoral systems alone cannot explain the low representation of women, it appears that some formulae can exaggerate this underrepresentation.”

“ In the specific case of women, quotas do not necessarily discriminate but compensate for actual barriers that deny them their fair share of political representation.”