

Recognizing Progress on SDG 5 of the 2030 Agenda in Europe: Guidelines for Development in Support of Gender Equality



Alberto Dello Strologo, Niccolò Paoloni, and Edoardo D'Andrassi

1 Introduction

Gender equality policies are closely linked to the political identity of the EU (Salaris et al., 2020). Also, within the UN, gender equality has been one of the central themes of world conferences since 1975 (UNWomen, 2020), in the wake of which first the MDGs (Sachs & McArthur, 2005) then the 2030 Agenda (United Nations, 2015) were introduced. Among the 17 SDGs, which are the founding elements of the Agenda, SDG5 includes indicators concerning different aspects of gender equality, such as discrimination, violence and women's participation in both the political and economic spheres (Heß, 2020).

Although numerous studies have been published on gender inequalities and the degree of implementation of the SDGs (Dello Strologo et al., 2021; Firoiu et al. 2019; Boto-Álvarez & García-Fernández, 2020), there is no research that proposes, through the use of an integrated approach, the analysis of the policies adopted by the nations to achieve the goals set by SDG5. This study fills this gap as its objective is to determine, utilizing a quantitative analysis, from the data provided by Eurostat, the state of implementation of SDG5 in the eurozone countries to identify the

A. Dello Strologo

Department of Human Sciences, European University of Rome, Rome, Italy

e-mail: Alberto.DelloStrologo@uniier.it

N. Paoloni

Department of Law, Roma Tre University, Rome, Italy

e-mail: niccolo.paoloni@uniroma3.it

E. D'Andrassi (✉)

Department of Business Studies, Roma Tre University, Rome, Italy

e-mail: edoardo.dandrassi@uniroma3.it

best-performing countries by 2030 and by means of qualitative analysis to study the policies they have implemented to outline a way forward for governments.

It is the 2030 Agenda itself that emphasizes the presence of interactions between the SDGs, and, with this in mind, studies on the subject must also be analyzed in an integrated manner (Hegre et al., 2020).

Although the progress made towards eliminating gender inequalities is encouraging, there are still many aspects that need to be implemented (Gennari & Fornasari, 2020).

The factors underlying inequalities are mainly found in the imbalance of power and access to resources. Institutionalized relations in these matters often appear unconscious and difficult to identify.

It is, therefore, appropriate to analyze the obtained and achievable results in the SDGs since, by addressing the issue of gender inequality more broadly than the MDGs, they have introduced new indicators that play a decisive role in the process of monitoring and analyzing the actual situation on the ground.

The study makes numerous contributions to the debate on gender inequalities and the policies adopted to eliminate them: the ten-year period covered by the analysis makes it possible to assess the initiatives put in place and to provide useful arguments for identifying the countries that can be defined as “best in class.” It also considers several systemic indicators aimed at analyzing different aspects of gender inequalities. The results of this study, therefore, will help to assess the effects of the rules and regulations adopted by the different Eurozone countries and are relevant in the context of SDG5 as the elimination of gender inequalities will also allow states to achieve other SDGs as the outcomes of the individual goals are interlinked (Hepp et al., 2019).

Governments and businesses, as the main actors in the challenge to equality, must be enabled to evaluate the effectiveness of the measures taken.

The document is structured as follows. Section 2 presents the literature review. Section 3 presents the research method. Section 4 indicates the results obtained and provides an overview of the policies adopted in Iceland and Portugal. Section 5 critically discusses the results and, finally, Sect. 6 concludes the paper.

2 Literature Review

Since their introduction, SDGs have been the subject of numerous studies. Several authors have analyzed the interactions between the SDGs (Pradhan et al., 2017). Hegre et al. (2020) noted that governments, organizations, and scholars need to be able to know, estimate and coordinate such interactions between SDGs.

A growing body of research, on the other hand, has explored the degree to which the SDGs have been implemented in individual countries through time-series-based analyses (Dello Strologo et al., 2021; Firoiu et al. 2019; Boto-Álvarez & García-Fernández, 2020).

Explorations of how policy interacts with the SDGs have also been offered. Kroll and Zipperer (2020) identified that government performance concerning the pursuit of SDG5 correlates with the likelihood of being re-elected.

Several authors have indicated that it is appropriate to provide prioritization of the SDGs as it could help the pursuit of sustainable development. Weitz et al. (2018), found that progress in SDGs 16.60, 12.10 and 08.40 generate, compared to the others, a greater positive influence on the SDGs, confirming the interdependencies between Goals. In a different vein, Hepp et al. (2019), building on the study by Taukobong et al. (2016) that analyzed the interconnections between gender inequality and the other SDGs, argue that eliminating gender inequality would enable improved performance in all other SDGs.

Also, in light of the numerous national and international initiatives aimed at pursuing gender equality, there has been a growing stream of studies on this topic, which, although there is no universally accepted definition of gender equality, for our purposes can be referred to as the commitment of a society to minimize gender differences by promoting equality (House et al., 2004).

With reference to the 2030 Agenda, numerous studies that have addressed the issue of gender equality have focused on the transition from the MDGs to the SDGs, analyzing the efforts made by feminist organizations to increase the international commitment on the issue (Esquivel, 2016; Razavi, 2016) and to understand why the MDGs had failed by analyzing the factors that were and are at the root of gender inequality (Sen, 2019).

Björkdahl and Somun-Krupalija (2020) addressed SDG5 at the local level noting that achieving it requires, along with awareness, support, and political will, adequate funding and sharing of knowledge, and resources, between local governments and different partners.

Indeed, some authors argue that to achieve gender equality, it is not enough to seek economic and social development; Song and Kim (2013) found that the gender gap may not narrow even where economic and social development has been achieved.

Furthermore, Esquivel and Sweetman (2016) indicated that the 2030 Agenda, with particular reference to SDG5 did not provide guidance on the tools and policies needed to achieve the target. Therefore, it seems necessary that further studies are carried out on policies that enable good results concerning the SDGs in general and SDG5 in particular.

3 Research Method

A mixed method was used to achieve the research objective. Using quantitative analysis, the best-performing eurozone countries were determined with regard to SDG5. Qualitative analysis, on the other hand, is used to identify and analyze the policies implemented by the best-performing countries. The use of a qualitative methodology in addition to the quantitative one was a logical choice because the aim is to gain an in-depth understanding of the policies that deliver the best results in terms of SDG5.

For the quantitative analysis, we used data provided by Eurostat (2020) for the last decade as official statistical sources constitute a productive empirical basis for very convincing results (Corbetta, 2014).

EU countries were analyzed for their primary role in the abolition of gender inequalities and the implementation of the SDGs (Salaris et al., 2020) and implementation of the SDGs by providing statistics and indicators to assess and forecast the extent to which a country can achieve the goals of the 2030 Agenda. The forecast value of the SDGIs at 2030, consistent with previous literature, was determined through the use of the FORECAST.ETS function of Excel software that allows the identification, based on historical data, of the future value of a variable by automatically choosing the most correct value for a given dataset (Dello Strologo et al., 2021; Held et al., 2018; Hyndman & Athanasopoulos, 2019).

This function makes it possible to overcome the main limitation of trend analysis algorithms, for which future values follow past trends, as it assigns decreasing weights to values observed over time, thus giving more strength to recent data. It is therefore considered that the methodology adopted, in line with the best literature on the degree of implementation of the SDGs, is the most suitable for the pursuit of the objectives of this study, also taking into account the ease of reproduction (Canela et al. 2019).

Furthermore, to measure the value of individual SDGIs between two different periods, and thus the trends of individual countries, a dynamic index (DI) based analysis technique was used. The DIs, for each SDGI, have been calculated using the formula below (Firoiu et al., 2019):

$$I_i = \frac{Y_n}{Y_1} \times 100$$

where Y_n is the value of the indicator at a specific point in time (2030) and Y_1 is the value of the same indicator in the period used for comparison, 2015, the year in which the Agenda was signed.

For each SDGI, the value at 2030 and the DI value were determined based on historical data and based on the results obtained, and an increasing numbering was applied where the value one was assigned to the country that had the best score for each SDGI.

To carry out the qualitative analysis, according to Eisenhardt and Graebner (2007), the case studies were analyzed to identify those that were most representative of the research objectives.

In order to obtain the most relevant information for literature and practice, the country with the best 2030 results and the country with the best DI results will be the subject of the qualitative analysis; Iceland and Portugal, respectively.

For each country, the data search was carried out through institutional documents searched on the internet.

In fact, according to Corbetta (2014), the field of politics is particularly suitable for this type of research as institutional documents constitute a valid empirical basis.

Furthermore, secondary data from previous studies analyzing individual cases related to gender differences in individual countries were used. For this purpose, we followed the recommendations of Ruggiano and Perry (2019).

To determine the best-performing countries, SDGI 5.1 was excluded as the Eurostat data only showed values as of 2012. Besides, countries for which the

2030 forecast value or the value of the DIs could not be determined were excluded from the analysis. The procedure adopted resulted in a sample of 30 EU countries.

4 Result

The results obtained are summarized in Table 1, in which the ranking associated with the 2030 forecast and the DIs is shown for each country.

In view of the fact that the best-performing nations are Iceland and Portugal, respectively, for results to 2030 and for increases in individual indicators (determined through DI), Table 2 shows the milestones on gender equality achieved by the two nations.

Below, we briefly describe the main policies adopted by Iceland and Portugal extrapolated through qualitative analysis.

Iceland Iceland has been proclaimed ‘The most feminist place in the world’ (Cochrane, 2011); according to GGG 2020, it closed 87.7% of the total gender gap (WEF, 2020).

To understand how Iceland achieved such recognition, it is worth taking a step back. As early as 1850, women were granted equal inheritance rights, and in 1894 the first women’s rights organization was founded. It was also thanks to the latter that women gained suffrage quite early: in 1920, all women gained national suffrage (Johnson et al., 2013).

Through women’s lists outside the political parties, women began to enter politics early; in 1909, they obtained the right to stand for election in local elections and in 1922, they were elected to the national parliament.

The 1970s, however, are of particular relevance to our study. In 1975, women activists planned the ground-breaking Women’s Day Off in which about 90% of the female population went on strike from work and domestic activities. By bringing Iceland to a standstill, women demonstrated that their work was essential to the functioning of society (Johnson et al., 2013). Within a year of the strike, the first Gender Equality Act was discussed and passed.

In 1981, women activists relaunched the women’s list, which was transformed into the Women’s Alliance, a political party with an agenda to eliminate gender differences (Dominelli & Jonsdóttir, 1988).

In 2009, Icelanders chose a female prime minister, and the number of women in parliament increased to 40%, and a 40% gender quota was imposed on corporate boards (Axelsdóttir & Einarsdóttir, 2017).

The high participation of women in the labor market (confirmed by the results in SDGI 05.40 and 05.60 see Appendix 1) can be partly explained by the numerous initiatives to improve public childcare.

Of particular note is the Parental Leave Act of 2000, which introduced a model of a leave period consisting of three months maternity, three months paternity and three optional months. The non-transferability of leave has promoted gender equality within families (Ellingsæter & Leira, 2006).

Table 1 Rankings for SDG5

Country	SCORE2030	SCORE DI	RANKING2030	RANKING DI
Portugal	110	108	3	1
Greece	216	135	23	4
Norway	112	212	4	28
Lithuania	150	199	12	21
Spain	141	124	10	2
Belgium	138	177	8	17
France	128	169	6	11
Netherlands	122	146	5	5
Croatia	221	200	26	22
Austria	139	128	9	3
United Kingdom	132	155	7	8
Finland	156	219	13	29
Latvia	170	202	16	24
Slovenia	157	209	14	27
Poland	204	201	20	23
Iceland	89	174	1	15
Serbia	181	170	18	13
Cyprus	216	178	23	18
Luxembourg	149	163	11	10
Estonia	192	169	19	11
Germany	159	152	15	6
Italy	217	174	25	15
Denmark	175	205	17	25
Sweden	106	206	2	26
Ireland	209	190	21	19
Czechia	246	191	30	20
Malta	209	155	21	8
Bulgaria	231	241	28	30
Romania	231	173	28	14
Slovakia	225	154	27	7

Also, places in kindergartens have been increased. Already in 2014, about 96% of children from 2 years old had a place in kindergarten, and 86% of these were there full-time (Statistics Iceland, 2014).

Iceland's self-image has positively influenced the willingness of Icelandic governments to take further measures. An example is the Equal Pay Standard of 2018, in which the employer has to prove that the company wage system is fair (Institute for Social Research, 2018).

Although these achievements are very impressive, several studies (Einarsdóttir, 2020; Júlíusdóttir et al., 2018) have critically analyzed the pursuit of gender equity in Iceland, noting that inequalities stem from factors such as traditional social roles that welfare policies have failed to abolish. Júlíusdóttir et al. (2018), for example, found that networking, especially after working hours, influences career progression in

Table 2 Main policies adopted by Iceland and Portugal on gender equity

Year	Iceland	Portugal
1850	Equal inheritance rights	
1882	Widows and single women gain local suffrage	
1908	local suffrage and the right to hold local office	
1908	The first women's list participates in local elections	
1910		Introduction of divorce by mutual consent
1911	Equal rights to grants, study, and civil service	
1915	Women over the age of 40 gain national suffrage and the right to hold office	
1920	All women gain national suffrage and the right to hold office	
1922	The first woman elected to the Icelandic Parliament, from a women's list	
1931		Women with at least a high school diploma are eligible to vote
1957	The first female mayor in an Icelandic municipality	
1961	Equal Pay Act approved by parliament	
1970	First female Cabinet Minister	
1974		Universal suffrage of women
1976	The first Gender Equality Act and the Gender Equality Council is founded	90 days of mandatory maternity leave
1977		The CIG is formed
1979		First female First Minister elected
1980	The first nationally elected female president in the world	
1986		The Lei de Bases do Sistema Educativo has stressed the need to guarantee equal educational opportunities for both sexes.
1995	Equal rights of women and men stated in the constitution	
1997	Fathers get an independent right to two weeks paid parental leave	Global Plan for Equal Opportunities
2000		Domestic violence becomes a punishable criminal offense
2003	Fathers get an independent right to three months of paid parental leave	
2004		The constitution provides for the role of the state in promoting the reconciliation of work and family life
2007		Introduction of gender quotas in electoral lists

(continued)

Table 2 (continued)

Year	Iceland	Portugal
2009	The first female prime minister in Iceland	New reform for parental leave 5 months to be divided between the parents and if they take both you add a month
	The first government with equal number of men and women	
	A law banning the purchase of prostitution	
2010	A full ban on strip clubs is approved	
	Companies are obligated to have minimum 40% women or men in their boards	
2011	The government approves a three-year plan on implementing gender budgeting.	
	A law authorizing the removal of a perpetrator from a home when domestic violence is suspected.	
2017		National Strategy for Equality and Non-Discrimination 2018-2030 Portugal +Equal (ENIND)
2018	Icelandic Equal Pay Certification Act	

organizations but that male executive, unlike their female counterparts, have partners who provide the necessary support for their spouse's career progression.

Portugal The 1974 coup d'état put an end to the dictatorship and equality and non-discrimination as the basis of the democratization process. Until the revolution, women were precluded from playing an active role in society (Santos, 1995) except for employment as from 1960, there were labor shortages in the nation resulting from strong male emigration (Tavora & Rubery, 2013).

While in most Eurozone countries, it was the expansion of the service sector and part-time employment opportunities that facilitated women's labor integration, Portuguese women entered full-time work before the growth of the service sector (Charles, 2005). In 1987, the female employment rate was well above the EU average.

Although Portuguese women have had access to employment in the absence of a supportive welfare system, governments have provided significant responses by promoting the dual-income couple model (Aboim & Vasconcelos, 2012).

In the last forty years, Portugal has removed sex discrimination from legislation, made an international commitment to the gender equality agenda and has what is considered a favorable legal framework (Monteiro & Ferreira, 2016).

The fight against gender inequalities in Portugal has followed its path; the impetus for change has not come from feminist movements but rather from the government, which has set up bodies to fight inequalities as opposed to the integrated EU approach, adopted by many states, based on a single body (Squires, 2007).

Between 1997 and 2017, Portugal, pressed by the European commitment to gender equality, adopted five national plans for the promotion of equality, an

instrument that governments use as an expression of their commitments. Its relative importance is extreme as a point of convergence of the dynamics of gender equality public policy construction (Amaral et al., 2018). A quota system for women on electoral lists was introduced (2007), the law on assisted procreation (2006) and cohabiting relationships outside marriage were recognized. Also, domestic violence has become a criminally punishable offense (Torres et al., 2013).

Since 2017, two additional national strategies, aligned with Agenda2030, have been launched to combat discrimination: the National Strategy for Citizenship Education and the National Strategy for Equality and Non-Discrimination 2018–2030 “Portugal + Equal,” which includes three national action plans on gender equality, the one for equality between women and men, the one aimed at combating violence against women and the one aimed at hindering discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity.

Portugal has also adopted an efficient childbirth leave system. Parents have 5 months’ leave to share, and if they do, they are granted an extra month. Besides, parents benefit from the most generous leave in Europe for caring for a sick child. These provisions, aimed at supporting mothers’ continued employment, are placed alongside an efficient welfare system. Already in 2010–2011, 87% of 3–6-year-olds attended full-time pre-school (Wall et al., 2013).

The positive results are also reflected in the 35th position in the GGG, which is expected to increase further in the face of the latest regulatory forecasts (WEF, 2020).

5 Discussion

Analyses have shown that reducing gender inequality has required long-term governmental commitment mainly in three areas: education, employment, and empowerment. Although these areas are interrelated, it cannot be taken for granted that good education automatically leads to good levels of employment. It is important that guidelines set by central governments are implemented at a local level, and cooperation at all levels of government is crucial (Björkdahl & Somun-Krupalija, 2020).

Portugal and Iceland seem to have followed a similar path: they have moved from a single-income household model to a dual-income one and have similar current levels of SDGI 04.50, 05.20, 05.30 and 05.50, and for both the projections to 2030 indicate that SDGI 05.20 and 05.60 will be completed (see Appendices 1 and 2).

It is important to note that both countries do not just reduce gender inequalities but combat them more broadly.

Iceland and Portugal, following their respective peculiarities, are pursuing gender equality through different instruments but with a common thread. Legislation promotes women’s access and permanence at work and creates a welfare system that does not displace them when children are born, redistributing responsibilities within the family. The plans to divide the period of parental leave and the increase of places in crèches and the extension of their hours have proven very important.

Although the labor market in both countries is favorable for women, gender asymmetries remain and cannot be reduced by equal pay alone, as in Iceland.

Numerous studies have found that gender differences mainly result from social conventions that have not yet been overturned. For example, the traditional division of labor in the home remains (Tavora, 2012), and even workmen continue to occupy the dominant positions (Aboim & Vasconcelos, 2012; Einarsdóttir, 2020).

A further reflection is in order; gender equality is measured based on several indices, including the GGG and SDG5. These indices differ in the way they are calculated, and the choice to consider one index rather than another should be carefully justified to make their use meaningful (Van Staveren, 2013). Of all of them, the most comprehensive appears to be SDG5 as, although it neglects social norms, it considers gender-based violence, which is undoubtedly an issue that needs to be measured, monitored, and countered (Jakobsdóttir, 2018).

6 Conclusion

Currently, there are several ways to identify the direction of economic development, but as governments are shifting their focus towards welfare criteria, social justice policies are becoming more prominent.

Although campaigns for women's equality require efforts in economic terms for nations, regulations aimed at reducing the gender gap have the potential to change the composition and rules of the game of both the public and private spheres (Jakobsdóttir, 2019).

Despite numerous publications on gender inequalities and the degree of implementation of the SDGs, there is no research that proposes the analysis of policies adopted by nations to achieve the goals set by SDG5.

The objective of this study was to determine the status of implementation of SDG5 in Eurozone countries to identify the best-performing countries by 2030 and study the policies they have implemented to outline a path for governments to adopt in the future.

The literature on the SDGs, in fact, agrees that to achieve the goals set by the 2030 Agenda, a prioritization must be provided to the individual SDGs and, in this perspective, SDG5 has been indicated as the one that has the greatest number of interrelationships with the other Goals.

Therefore, knowledge of the gender equality implementation processes in countries makes it easier to plan future activities, identify areas that require urgent action and monitor the progress of adopted policies. Using a mixed qualitative and quantitative method, the best-performing states in the Eurozone were identified with regard to SDG5 and the policies that enabled them to achieve these results were examined.

Analyses showed that the interventions that enabled Portugal and Iceland to achieve good gender equity outcomes were those that supported access to the labor market and, most importantly, welfare provisions aimed at encouraging a

reshuffling of childcare commitments between parents. Although these countries may represent models to follow, it should be noted that significant gender differences remain. It is, therefore, useful to review organizational practices and gender power relations in families and organizations as women continue to be underrepresented in positions of power even in those countries such as Iceland and Portugal that have managed to significantly reduce the differences (Minelgaite et al., 2020; Schouten, 2019).

Indeed, addressing gender inequalities requires a proper delineation of their causes to define applicable strategies and, in this perspective, the example of the best-performing nations regarding SDG5 can and should be a model to follow.

The authors believe that the study makes numerous contributions to the debate on gender inequality, the policies adopted to eliminate it and, more generally, the pursuit of the SDGs: the ten-year period covered by the analysis makes it possible to evaluate the initiatives implemented by states and provide useful ideas for identifying countries that can be defined as “best in class.” In addition, a number of systemic indicators were considered in the analysis to analyze various aspects of gender inequality.

The results of this study could provide European governments with a deeper insight into the effectiveness of current policies in pursuing gender equality and are relevant in the context of SDG5 as eliminating gender inequality will also enable states to achieve the other SDGs as the outcomes of the individual goals are interconnected (Hepp et al., 2019). In addition, this study outlines the path that other nations can follow in achieving gender equity by tenting the relative shortcomings identified so as to amplify the positive effects of future strategies from an integrated perspective

Governments and businesses, as key players in the equality challenge, must be enabled to evaluate the effectiveness of the measures they have taken.

Although the study makes many contributions to the existing literature by analyzing for the first-time policies that achieve good results in terms of gender equity determined on the basis of the pursuit of SDG5, it has some limitations that need to be considered.

First of all, the article focuses on the implementation of SDG5 (As it is more comprehensive and an integral part of the 2030 Agenda) but does not consider additional indicators that determine the level of gender equity in nations. In the future, studies could conduct further analysis to consider these indicators to view adopted policies in light of a broader spectrum of indicators.

In addition, in conjunction with the use of public statistics, scholars could conduct their research on the basis of survey questionnaires designed to understand citizens’ perceptions of adopted normative and perceived daily benefits. Through such an analysis, it would be possible to understand which regulations achieve the best concrete and perceptible effects in terms of gender equity.

In conclusion, although the results obtained are considered to be of great value to policymakers and scholars in the field, it is hoped that future studies will continue to analyze in greater depth the underlying elements of gender inequality to discover its causes while monitoring the progress of more recently introduced laws.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Iceland

SDGI	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2030	i2030	Ranking 2030	Ranking DI
Early leavers from education and training by sex [SDG_04_10] (% of population aged 18 to 24)	19.00	17.10	16.50	16.40	13.60	12.40	15.60	12.70	14.50	10.80	4.29	0.35	18	13
Tertiary educational attainment by sex [SDG_04_20] (% of population aged 30 to 34)	47.50	53.10	51.20	52.20	52.60	55.00	55.80	65.70	63.60	65.70	86.64	1.58	3	10
Employment rates of recent graduates by sex [SDG_04_50] (% of population aged 20 to 34 with at least upper-secondary education)	82.00	87.80	83.80	86.80	89.10	91.30	95.40	93.80	92.70	90.20	105.09	1.15	2	23
Gender pay gap in unadjusted form [SDG_05_20] (% of average gross hourly earnings of men)	17.70	17.80	17.70	19.00	16.70	17.50	15.80	15.30	13.70	8.62	0.52	-	11	11
Gender employment gap [SDG_05_30] (percentage points)	5.50	5.40	5.30	6.50	6.30	6.30	6.70	6.00	6.30	5.60	7.00	1.11	16	24
Inactive population due to caring responsibilities by sex [SDG_05_40] (% of inactive population aged 20 to 64)	12.20	9.90	10.60	7.70	11.40	9.90	8.40	6.20	8.30	9.80	4.50	0.45	3	3
Seats held by women in national parliaments (source: EIGE) [SDG_05_50] (% of seats)	41.30	38.70	39.70	41.00	41.30	46.00	47.60	38.10	38.10	38.10	39.33	0.85	16	32
Seats held by women in national governments (source: EIGE) [SDG_05_50] (% of seats)	40.00	40.00	50.00	33.30	33.30	40.00	50.00	36.40	45.50	45.50	49.19	1.23	12	21
Positions held by women in senior management positions: Executives (source: EIGE) [SDG_05_60] (% of positions)	:	:	7.90	15.20	15.30	17.00	16.30	21.40	23.70	20.40	41.90	2.46	6	17
Positions held by women in senior management positions: Board member (source: EIGE) [SDG_05_60] (% of positions)	15.80	20.50	36.20	48.10	44.80	44.20	44.60	43.00	45.70	45.90	74.77	1.69	2	20

Appendix 2: Portugal

SDGI	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2030	i2030	Ranking 2030	Ranking DI
Early leavers from education and training by sex [SDG_04_10] (% of population aged 18 to 24)	24.00	17.70	14.00	14.30	14.10	11.00	10.50	9.70	8.70	7.40	-9.22	-0.84	1	2
Tertiary educational attainment by sex [SDG_04_20] (% of population aged 30 to 34)	29.90	31.30	31.00	35.70	38.90	40.10	41.60	40.40	42.50	42.50	59.82	1.49	21	12
Employment rates of recent graduates by sex [SDG_04_50] (% of population aged 20 to 34 with at least upper-secondary education)	79.10	73.60	64.60	66.60	69.70	70.90	71.40	79.50	80.60	79.20	88.66	1.25	21	11
Gender pay gap in unadjusted form [SDG_05_20] (% of average gross hourly earnings of men)	12.80	12.90	15.00	13.30	14.90	16.00	13.90	10.80	8.90	4.79	0.32	0.02	8	8
Gender employment gap [SDG_05_30] (percentage points))	9.80	8.60	6.80	6.40	7.10	6.70	6.80	7.50	6.80	7.20	5.02	0.75	10	13
Inactive population due to caring responsibilities by sex [SDG_05_40] (% of inactive population aged 20 to 64)	32.80	24.40	22.10	20.90	20.70	21.30	22.00	22.00	22.50	23.70	18.08	0.85	10	11
Seats held by women in national parliaments (source: EIGE) [SDG_05_50] (% of seats)	30.40	29.10	29.10	31.30	31.30	34.30	34.30	35.20	36.40	40.40	51.91	1.51	5	15
Seats held by women in national governments (source: EIGE) [SDG_05_50] (% of seats)	18.20	16.70	14.30	14.30	14.30	33.90	32.20	32.80	36.10	35.70	67.75	2.00	3	9
Positions held by women in senior management positions: Executives (source: EIGE) [SDG_05_60] (% of positions)	:	:	9.60	8.00	8.50	12.20	10.60	9.00	10.00	14.60	18.39	1.51	27	26
Positions held by women in senior management positions: Board member (source: EIGE) [SDG_05_60] (% of positions)	5.40	5.90	7.40	8.80	9.50	13.50	14.30	16.20	21.60	24.60	69.02	5.11	4	1

References

- Aboim, S., & Vasconcelos, P. (2012). *Role of men in gender equality*. European Commission.
- Amaral, I., Daniel, F., & Abreu, S. G. (2018). Policies for gender equality in Portugal: Contributions to a framework for older women. *Revista Prisma Social*, 22, 346–363.
- Axelsdóttir, L., & Einarsdóttir, P. (2017). The realization of gender quotas in post-collapse Iceland. *NORA—Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research*, 25(1), 48–61.
- Björkdahl, A., & Somun-Krupalija, L. (2020). Gender equality and local governance: global norms and local practices. In S. Cheema (Ed.), *Governance for urban services. Advances in 21st century human settlements*. Springer.
- Boto-Álvarez, A., & García-Fernández, R. (2020). Implementation of the 2030 agenda sustainable development goals in Spain. *Sustainability*, 12, 2546.
- Canela, M. Á., Alegre, I., & Ibarra, A. (2019). Holt-winters forecasting. In *Quantitative methods for management*. Springer.
- Charles, M. (2005). National skill regimes, postindustrialism, and sex segregation. *Social Politics*, 12(2), 289–316.
- Cochrane, K. (2011) Is Iceland the best country for women? *The Guardian*. Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2011/oct/03/iceland-best-country-women-feminist>
- Corbetta, P. G. (2014). *Metodologia e Tecniche della Ricerca Sociale* (2nd ed., pp. 283–316). Il Mulino.
- Dello Strologo, A., D’Andrassi, E., Paoloni, N., & Mattei, G. (2021). Italy versus other European countries: Sustainable development goals, policies and future hypothetical results. *Sustainability*, 13(6), 3417.
- Dominelli, L., & Jonsdóttir, G. (1988). Feminist political organization in Iceland: Some reflections on the experience of Kvinnuframbóttid. *Feminist Review*, 30, 36–60.
- Einarsdóttir, P. (2020). All that glitters is not gold: Shrinking and bending gender equality in rankings and nation branding. *NORA—Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research*, 28, 140–152.
- Eisenhardt, K. M., & Graebner, M. E. (2007). Theory building from cases: Opportunities and challenges. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(1), 25–32.
- Ellingsæter, A. L., & Leira, A. (2006). *Politicising parenthood in Scandinavia: Gender relations in welfare states*. Policy Press.
- Esquivel, V. (2016). Power and the Sustainable Development Goals: A feminist analysis. *Gender & Development*, 24(1), 9–23.
- Esquivel, V., & Sweetman, C. (2016). Gender and the sustainable development goals. *Gender and Development*, 24(1), 1–8.
- Eurostat, SDG indicators: Goal by goal. (2020). Available online: <https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/sdi/indicators>
- Firoiu, D., Ionescu, G. H., Băndoi, A., Florea, N. M., & Jianu, E. (2019). Achieving sustainable development goals (SDG): Implementation of the 2030 agenda in Romania. *Sustainability*, 11, 2156.
- Gennari, F., & Fornasari, T. (2020). Gender diversity in nomination committee: A way to promote gender balance on board? In P. Paoloni & R. Lombardi (Eds.), *Gender studies, entrepreneurship and human capital* (IPAZIA 2019. Springer Proceedings in Business and Economics). Springer.
- Hegre, H., Petrova, K., & von Uexkull, N. (2020). Synergies and trade-offs in reaching the 10.51 sustainable development goals. *Sustainability*, 12, 8729.
- Held, B., Moriarty, B., & Richardson, T. (2018). *Microsoft excel functions and formulas*. Mercury Learning and Information.
- Hepp, P., Somerville, C., & Borisch, B. (2019). Accelerating the United Nation's 2030 global agenda: why prioritization of the gender goal is essential. *Global Policy*, 10(4), 677–685.
- Heß, P. (2020). SDG 5 and the gender gap in standardization: Empirical evidence From Germany. *Sustainability*, 12, 8699.

- House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (2004). *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 Societies*. Sage Publications.
- Hyndman, R. J., & Athanasopoulos, G. (2019). *Forecasting: Principles and practice*. OTexts. Institute for Social Research. (2018). Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/329371051_Certified_Equality_The_Icelandic_Equal_Pay_Standard
- Jakobsdóttir, K. (2018). How to build a paradise for women. A lesson from Iceland. *World Economic Forum*. Available online: <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2018/11/iceland-paradise-for-women-katr%C3%ADn-jakobsdottir/>
- Jakobsdóttir, K. (2019). Building an inclusive economy. *Finance & Development*, 56(1), 12–13.
- Johnson, J., Einarsdóttir, Þ., & Pétursdóttir, G. (2013). A feminist theory of corruption: Lessons from Iceland. *Politics & Gender*, 9(2), 174–206.
- Júlíusdóttir, Ó., Rafnsdóttir, L., & Einarsdóttir, Þ. (2018). Top managers and the gendered interplay of organizations and family life: the case of Iceland. *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, 33(8), 602–622.
- Kroll, C., & Zipperer, V. (2020). The political economy of the sustainable development goals (SDGs): Does performance on the SDGs affect re-election? *Sustainability*, 12, 6445.
- Minelgaite, I., Sund, B., & Stankeviciene, J. (2020). Understanding the Nordic gender diversity paradox. *TalTech Journal of European Studies*, 10(1), 40–57.
- Monteiro, R., & Ferreira, V. (2016). Women's movements and the State in Portugal: A State feminism approach. *Sociedade e Estado*, 31(2), 459–486.
- Pradhan, P., Costa, L., Rybski, D., Lucht, W., & Kropp, J. P. (2017). A systematic study of sustainable development goal (SDG) interactions. *Earths Future*, 5, 1169–1179.
- Razavi, S. (2016). The 2030 agenda: Challenges of implementation to attain gender equality and women's rights. *Gender & Development*, 24(1), 25–41.
- Ruggiano, N., & Perry, T. E. (2019). Conducting secondary analysis of qualitative data: Should we, can we, and how? *Qualitative Social Work*, 18(1), 81–97.
- Sachs, J. D., & McArthur, J. W. (2005). The millennium project: A plan for meeting the millennium development goals. *Lancet*, 365, 347–353.
- Salaris, S., Pereira, E. T., & Marinò, L. (2020). Do gender quotas lead to gender equality? In P. Paoloni & R. Lombardi (Eds.), *Gender studies, entrepreneurship and human capital* (IPAZIA 2019. Springer proceedings in business and economics). Springer.
- Santos, M. (1995). *Women's studies in Portugal* (pp. 1–31). Centro de Estudos Sociais de Coimbra.
- Schouten, M. (2019). Undoing gender inequalities: insights from the Portuguese perspective. *Insights into Regional Development*, 1(2), 85–98.
- Sen, G. (2019). Gender equality and women's empowerment: Feminist mobilization for the SDGs. *Global Policy*, 10, 28–38.
- Song, J., & Kim, E. M. (2013). A critical review of gender in South Korea's official development assistance. *Asian Journal of Women's Studies*, 19(3), 72–96.
- Squires, J. (2007). *The new politics of gender equality*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Statistics Iceland. (2014). Available at: <http://hagstofa.is/?PageID=2604&src=https://rannsokn.hagstofa.is/pxis/Dialog/varval.asp?ma=SKO01102%26ti=B%F6rn+%ED+leisk%F3lum+eftir+kyni%2C+aldri%2C+landsv%E6%F0um+og+lengd+vi%F0veru+1998%2D2013%26path=../Database/skolamal/lsNemendur/26lang=3%26units=Fj%F6ldi>
- Taukobong, H. F. G., Kincaid, M. M., Levy, J. K., Bloom, S. S., Platt, J. L., & Henry, S. K. (2016). Does addressing gender inequalities and empowering women and girls improve health and development programme outcomes? *Health Policy and Planning*, 31(10), 1492–1514.
- Tavora, I. (2012). The southern European social model: Familialism and the high rates of female employment in Portugal. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 22(1), 63–76.
- Tavora, I., & Rubery, J. (2013). Female employment, labour market institutions and gender culture in Portugal. *European Journal of Industrial Relations*, 19(3), 221–237.
- Torres, A., Coelho, B., & Cabrita, M. (2013). Bridge over troubled waters. *European Societies*, 15(4), 535–556.

- United Nations. (2015). *Transforming ourworld: The 2030 agenda for sustainable development*. Division for Sustainable Development Goals.
- UNWomen. (2020). World conferences on women. Available online: Women. Available online: <https://www.unwomen.org/en/how-we-work/intergovernmental-support/world-conferences-on-women#:~:text=The%20United%20Nations%20has%20organized,1985%20and%20Beijing%20in%201995.&text=The%201995%20Fourth%20World%20Conference,global%20agenda%20for%20gender%20equality>
- Van Staveren, I. (2013). To measure is to know? A comparative analysis of gender indices. *Review of Social Economy*, 71(3), 339–372.
- Wall, K., Cunha, V., & Marinho, S. (2013). *Negotiating gender equality in conjugal life and parenthood in Portugal: A case study*, Workingpapers ICS N° 3, Lisboa: Instituto de Ciências Sociais.
- Weitz, N., Carlsen, H., Nilsson, M., & Skånberg, K. (2018). Towards systemic and contextual priority setting for implementing the 2030 Agenda. *Sustainability Science*, 13, 531–548.
- World Economic Forum – WEF. (2020). *The global gender gap report*. WEF.