

The rhetoric of Equal Opportunities

Equal Opportunities during 10 years of policy statements of the Flemish Government

Magda Michielsens

Paper prepared for the Athena-meeting, Barcelona, May 2005.

1. Aims

This study intends a rhetoric analysis of policy statements of the Flemish government as formulated since 1995. This does not involve an analysis of content, but concerns an analysis of the way the texts speak about 'equal opportunities for women and men'. We not only focused on policy statements by the Minister of Equal Opportunities, but also the policy statements of those Ministers able to strongly influence equal opportunities between men and women within their own portfolios were included as well - i.e. Minister of Labour, Minister of Welfare and Minister of Education. Equal opportunities should be implemented throughout all policy domains, and as a consequence we could have looked at every single policy domain in this study, but that would have carried the matter too far. Therefore we have narrowed it down to the policy statements on the mentioned domains (Equal Opportunities, Welfare, Education and Labour¹), those of the Minister-President and of the text of the coalition agreement.

The first policy statements investigated go back to 1995 when the first Flemish Minister of Equal Opportunities was appointed. At that moment the Flemish parliament was elected directly for the first time. From this moment on there exists a Flemish parliament that was elected directly and a government that can pursue a policy of its own, within the contours of the Belgian federal framework.

The study focuses on policy statements. With this we mean the documents written in the beginning of every legislature, for every policy area, in the name of the Minister, presenting the framework for the intended policy for the next five years, within the context of the coalition agreement. Every year a follow-up of that document is written. We studied the main statement and the yearly up-dates. This study does not want to include circular letters, laws, decrees, press releases, reports, and special plans. Policy statements leave room for the Minister's personal interpretation to a certain degree (laws and decrees do not). They clearly reflect the Minister's point of view, within the context of the government.

Policy statements are public. Nowadays they can be read by simply surfing on the world wide web. Every student or pupil, NGO-worker, pressure group, critical citizen, journalist or local politician can have them at their disposal. But most importantly, policy statements are informative documents for the purpose of other Ministers and the parliament. They enhance the coherence of the policy. The policy statement of

¹ Over the years the terminology has slightly changed. Employment, Labor, Work were the key terms.

every Minister and his or her policy area is presented and discussed in parliament. This is the most important moment in a paper's life cycle.

The report we provide here is only one element of a larger study that was commissioned by the Policy Research Centre on Equal Opportunities. The complete study examines the rhetoric of equal opportunities in general – i.e. equal opportunities for women and men, homo- and bisexuals, ethnic minorities, and the elderly. The study presented here exclusively concerns equal opportunities for women and men.

2. Methodology

2.1. The proces

We have examined to what extent the policy statements pay attention to women. Are women being mentioned separately? Are specific female problems named, as well as their possible solutions? Are differences between men and women indicated and solved in the short or long run? Is attention being paid to equal opportunities for men and women? How are those equal opportunities formulated? Are terms connected to 'equal opportunities' being used? In that case, why are those terms given preference to? Are equal opportunities stipulated as crucial to politics? What arguments dominate the equal opportunities f/m debate?

In a rhetorical analysis three aspects matter most:

- (1) the terminology being used;
- (2) the logic, arguments, and the construction of the discourse;
- (3) the persuasion instruments: the means (personal touch for example) that are being used to persuade.

'The rhetoric of equal opportunities' in this context does not equal lip service. It does not mean 'talking a lot, doing nothing'. It means: the way in which it is talked, argued, or kept silent about.

This is the procedure we followed:

- (1) close reading of the texts;
- (2) drawing up a list of terms relevant to the domain of equal opportunities;
- (3) screening of the texts looking for the terms of the list (from now on we will use 'coding list');
- (4) logical analysis of those passages that show a high density of terms from the coding list.

2.2. Coding list

First, we drew up an inventory of the terms which are known, based on scientific literature, to be connected to equal opportunities in general. We are talking about

terms such as: emancipation, empowerment, (non)discrimination, redistribution, social justice, social exclusion, underprivileged, diversity.

Then, we did a thorough (word-to-word) disentanglement of the most recent policy statement on 'equal opportunities'. This statement by Minister Kathleen Van Brempt of the Flemish Government dates from October 2004. Its relevant terms complete the list based on scientific literature.

Armed with this list we then scanned statements from former Ministers of Equal Opportunities. We used the electronic versions of these texts in order to provide an airtight analysis. Some of the old texts on the internet were being scanned, which made searching difficult. These texts were analysed manually.

The discovery of several terms in the first texts has led to the completion of our list. With this list we went through the younger texts again. The drawing up of this inventory was a recurrent process.

The final list of terms, in the way it originated from this process, was implemented on all the other texts. Every time a term occurred, we made a note with the necessary information: in which context and with which meaning the term was used.

The definite list consists of these terms:

Autonomy, career development, disadvantage, diversity, emancipation, empowerment, environment, equal opportunities, ethnic minorities/migrants, gender, homosexual, inclusive (policy), inequality, lesbian, LGB (Lesbian Gay Bisexual), mainstreaming, men, migrants, minorities, non(discrimination), portrayal, redistribution, social exclusion, social justice, target group, transversal (policy), underprivileged, women.

As can be seen, the list consists of terms connected to the typical policy process, terms that refer to target groups associated with equal opportunities and sociological terms.

3. Findings

We present our findings within three sections that portray the rhetoric of texts: the terminology, logic, and persuasion instruments.

3.1. Terminology used

3.1.1. The disappearance of women

Ten years ago it was common to pay special attention to women. 'Woman' was not a term that could be avoided in the policy's terminology that should strengthen the position of women. In the policy statements by the Minister of Equal Opportunities it certainly was a common term. Gradually however, women are talked about less and less. If something has to be said about women, 'gender' pops up, or a term for a specific target group such as migrant women, Islamic women, or elderly women. This does not imply that there is absolutely no equal opportunities policy towards women, in comparison with men, it rather means that women are disappearing from the word picture.

3.1.2. The rise of gender

The last five years we have seen a breakthrough of the term 'gender'. Gender refers to - as is generally taken for granted – the social construction of femininity and masculinity. To accept this term does not only imply a preference for a certain word, it also assumes a theoretical position. It cannot be readily deduced from the texts if this is the case. Another consequence of using the term 'gender' carries with it that one systematically talks about women and men. That is made clear in the texts. A policy that focuses on gender is not necessarily a policy that focuses on women and their needs. Men are gradually given more attention with regards to equal opportunities. However, this does not imply that there is not a equal opportunities policy that specifically supports women. Most of the formerly started engagements are continued, but women simply disappear from the word picture.

3.1.3. LGB are rarely mentioned

From the first statements of the Minister of Equal Opportunities on (1995), homosexual men and women are a target group. Later on the terminology 'LGB' (referring to lesbians, homosexuals, bisexuals²) was generally used. From the outset of the Flemish Equal Opportunities policy, a LGB policy is being pursued, in close touch with the midfield and pressure groups. In policy statements not a lot is mentioned about it, and there are no specific aims formulated for this target group. Even so in the period between 1999 and 2004, while much attention was being paid in practice, almost nothing was written down in the policy statements.

3.1.4. Migrant women become Islamic women

The older policy statements do not really provide thought about migrants, even so in periods when this can be called irresponsible. In 2004, migrant policy is given to a separate Minister and a policy domain for 'Civic Integration' is created.

In 2004, when the new Flemish Government steps forward, for the first time Islamic women are mentioned. Never before was Islam emphasised like this. Even other religions had not been named before in policy statements.

Often migration and Islam are being talked about in veiled terms. The veiling word is diversity. The texts pretend to discuss all sorts of diversity, (differences between women, differences between women and men, differences in religion, differences between being believing or unbelieving) but when the diversity discours is specified it becomes clear that it mainly concerns the difference between migrants and autochthons.

3.1.5. Diversity invades every sentence

The term 'diversity' was mentioned for the first time in policy texts during the policy period of Mieke Vogels³. Diversity policy was seen as a solution to provide equal opportunities to different groups. The problems with respect to content stemming from the concept are not solved in these texts. By analysing the term one considers diversity policy as a policy (policy, meaning a streamline, general measures) that

² No arguments are put forward about why bisexuals need a policy. We will not discuss the matter here. In addition to this, we will not get into a tussle with the term 'LGB'. We will use LGB (holibi, in Dutch) as a covering term, as it is generally used, being aware that no such thing as 'a LGB' exists.

³ Mieke Vogels was Minister of Equal Opportunity in the coalition of Liberals, Socialists and Greens, that was in power from 1999 till 2004. She stepped down in 2003, after a disastrous election result of her party in the federal elections of 2003. She was replaced by an other green Minister in the Flemish government, Adelheid Byttebier.

offers something different to different (kind of) people, adapted to their various needs and situations. Diversity policy aims at retaining and supporting differences, in complete freedom. These texts do not look for the difference between acceptable differences and differences that (by means of policymaking and other mechanisms) should be disposed of.

Even so the policy areas of Education and Labour are invaded and dominated by the term 'diversity'. Both policy areas seem to have lost a substance concerning actual education and labour. They both implicitly and explicitly concern ethnic minorities. Education is about the trailing behind at school of migrant children and the attempts of the educational sector to pursue a 'equal educational opportunities' policy. Labour is about the policy attempts to get migrants to work. It concerns diversity plans, the resources for those plans, the structures, and the efforts of Belgium's national employment agency RVA. Since 1988 Education is not a federal domain anymore, whereas Labour is implemented as both a federal and Flemish policy area. Labour in Flanders is a soft spot since most competences are on the federal domain. However, Flanders is entitled to several tasks such as remedy, management of unemployment, training and counselling.

3.1.6. The end of 'emancipation'

In the first texts of the first legislature (1995) the term 'emancipation' appears a couple of times. Initially the equality of women and men is connected to emancipation. Later on, it is not anymore. The policy texts do not show that the policy has ever aimed at the emancipation of women. In any case, it is not formulated as such. However, this does not mean that the policy has not taken steps that have improved the situation of women. It did, but the theoretical frame of reference does not mention it.

3.1.7. The combination of family (life) and work

In policy statements, the combination of family life and work is a popular theme. Recent texts still mention this issue, whereas other topics have faded into the background. Moreover, the 'combination of family life and work' does not only appear in policy papers about equal opportunities, it is also mentioned in conjunction with Labour and in the policy statement of the Minister-President. It is clear that this topic has been declared the universal problem of women, predominating all women's problems.

3.2. The logic and arguments used

3.2.1. No fixed format

It is striking that there is not a fixed format for policy statements (or yearly or long-range statements). What is written or not varies from text to text. Sometimes intentions are supported by budgets, sometimes they are not. Sometimes policy domains are clearly presented, sometimes they are not. Sometimes previous policy topics to be pursued are presented, sometimes they are not. Sometimes the yearly successions hark back to the initial plans, to what is realised and how this should be continued, sometimes they do not. This lack of historicity does not help a young policy domain such as equal opportunities f/m.

Over the years, policy statements have become much longer. This does not necessarily imply a stronger argumentation in connection with policy intentions and decisions.

3.3.2. No argumentation

Whether the texts are long or short, rarely (and certainly not in conjunction to equal opportunities for men and women) it is argued why equal opportunities should be enhanced and extended. This argumentation is supposed to be mentioned in the government policy statement and that of the Minister-President. When equal opportunities for f/m are concerned, this does not happen.

On the level of the specific competences of the Ministers one could argue why certain means to obtain equality between men and women are both necessary and useful. But this does not happen either. If something is said about it, it is in an affirmative way, and not well-founded. Some argumentation, however, can be found on diversity policy. But this appears as affirmative rather than argumentative statements. "Multiculturalism has added value" (in the policy statement of Minister-President Yves Leterme and Minister of Civic Integration Marino Keulen) is a statement, not an argument.

Policy papers are not scientific texts. They cannot be expected to contain research results and extensive scientific discourse. They are not expected to found, for example, that education needs to be provided. However, the discussion about the extent to which education is the responsibility of the government does belong to policy texts. The same goes for equal opportunities, and here it even counts more given the lack of tradition. As for equal opportunities in a broad sense (think of migrants and newcomers) it happens a little. When it comes to equal opportunities for women and men, it does not happen.

3.2.3. Transversality

The Minister of Equal Opportunities is not really autonomous. The function expects the Minister to act on different policy domains. He or she cannot push something, but rather has to make propositions, organise consultations, make clear the consequences of the equal opportunities policy towards other policy domains and make recommendations. The fact that equal opportunities crosses the border of the policy domain of one Minister implies a transversal or horizontal policy. Since the beginning (1995) this has been pointed out, but throughout the years the emphasis has become more clear. In the 2004 policy statement of equal opportunities there is a lot of attention for the policy process: more attention for the process than for the content.

The consequences of the transversal nature of the equal opportunities policy do not show in the texts by other Ministers. Without reference to the Minister of Equal Opportunities however, other ministries pursue equal opportunities policy. But this individual policy does not concern equal opportunities for women and men.

3.2.4. Continuity

Between 1999 and 2004 equal opportunities received a lot of attention. In this period Flanders had a coalition of liberals, socialists and greens, with a green Minister of Equal Opportunities (Mieke Vogels). Her ambition was to do something about equal opportunities in the broad sense. In real terms the policy did not reduce equal

opportunities between women and men, but in the logic of the policy papers there was little attention for the topic.

The green Minister of Equal Opportunities was Minister of Welfare at the same time. In the policy documents Welfare and Equal Opportunities are mixed. In that policy period this could have appeared theoretically responsible, but after this period another government period comes, with different competence distribution. Not treating equal opportunities autonomously was disadvantageous for its continuity.

Exactly because this period paid attention to the practical side of equal opportunities, it is a pity there were not created any steppingstones (conceptual, structure and logical) to guarantee continuity.

3.2.5. The process, and not the content

Even though there was no real underpinning with respect to policy decisions concerning equal opportunities, arguments were provided to clarify the way in which equal opportunities policy should be pursued. Since pursuing transversal policy is so difficult (the Minister has to interfere with the policy domains of her colleagues) the policy paper is used as a means to explain (also to these colleagues) how it should work. Initially this was not the case – at that time the difficulty did not show yet. In the liberal/socialist/green coalition Equal Opportunities were mixed with Welfare, Health and International Development, and a lot was done about equal opportunities within the domains of Labour and Education. In the next government, the process became the main concern of the new Minister's policy plan. Possibly, this is the answer to the lack of steppingstones of the former government.

3.3. Persuasive instruments⁴

3.3.1. 1995-1999: brief and to the point

In the first policy period two Ministers of Equal Opportunities were appointed: first, Anne Van Asbroeck, later on Brigitte Grouwels. The coalition agreement agreed to do so. Within this period policy statements appear brief and to the point. They do not speak in veiled terms. Just the subtitle of one document was frivolous, in an attempt to personalise the target groups first names were dropped. Policy is about people was the message. Other frivolities did not appear. In this period the texts are brief, official and informative.

3.3.2. 1999-2004: metaphors and ego culture

Mieke Vogels was Minister for Equal Opportunities from 1999 until 2003. Since the outcomes of the elections are bad for her political party, she resigns as Flemish Minister. She is succeeded by Adelheid Byttebier, who immediately communicates that she will pursue Mieke Vogels' policy and step down at the moment her term expires.

Compared to the former period, these Ministers use the first person: they are an 'I', being in the picture as an actor. Also, the texts are peppered with metaphors. It

⁴ We have only looked at the persuasive instruments of the Ministers of Equal Opportunities.

seems easier to use images than creating theories and arguments when it comes to equal opportunities.

3.3.3. 2004-...

The discourse in Minister Van Brempt's policy papers is permeated by metaphors about cycling. They are hard to understand and do not disclose any clarity about equal opportunities. Theoretically it is of great importance to accept that participants in the game of society need to make efforts, and to accept that competition plays an important role in that society. The view on performance and competition plays an important role to everybody who acquires or does not acquire a job, a title, a degree and so on. It is of general importance whether performances and merits are valued highly. Equal opportunities policy (if one adheres to it) should be defended against allegations that equal opportunities policy is larded with safety nets and that it takes away incentives to perform. If you compare live acts with cycling, it is important to make the message clear. The metaphors in the texts do not clarify a thing. On the contrary.

3.3.4. Infectiousness of competences

Mieke Vogels was Minister of Equal Opportunities and of Welfare. The texts about equal opportunities are mixed with Welfare jargon.

Kathleen Van Brempt is Minister of Equal Opportunities, and of Mobility. Her texts about equal opportunities are peppered with terms concerning 'accessibility', and incomprehensibly cycling metaphors.

3.3.5. Public

Throughout the years the public for the policy statements has broadened. In 1995 the documents were already open to the public, but the dissemination remained more limited than in 2005. Every policy paper can be read on the website of the Flemish Government. They are presented attractively, which makes reading them a lot easier. Chances are that the interested public, members of social movements, NGO-workers and sympathizers, researchers and politicians on every level read and/or use the texts in specific circumstances. This has influenced the texts. Readability has become a concern. Remarkably, Minister Van Brempt states explicitly that her statement is also meant for her colleague-Ministers. But, she also says she wants to keep it simple and explain things with examples.

4. Conclusions

We want to emphasise some earlier mentioned issues:

- 4.1. Equal Opportunities has beaten equal opportunities for women and men, and subsequently diversity has beaten equal opportunities. The terminology well-loved by women's organisations (emancipation, equal rights, autonomy, freedom and liberation) failed in policy texts by the Minister of Equal Opportunities as well as by other Ministers. Equal opportunities for men and women did not, when it was still relatively successful, radiate onto other policy domains (we are talking about the terminology, not the policy itself). Equal

opportunities in general however did succeed and diversity succeeded even more. Diversity can be found at every domain we looked into.

- 4.2. Only one women's issue was kept upright and even infiltrated domains outside the limited area of equal opportunities: the combination of family life and work.
- 4.3. In what way the interests of women could be found under the term diversity is not clarified in any of these texts. If examples are given, they concern religious or cultural differences, covered by the term diversity, not handling the differences between the sexes.

5. Discussion

The temptation can be strong to draw more conclusions than the study actually allows. This is an analysis of terminology, not an analysis of the policy. Let us not get caught in a trap. But exactly this study of terminology leads to questions about the contents of the policy that should be further investigated. This study could also continue with an analysis of why the participants concerned have arrived at exactly those decisions in the texts and an analysis of what – given our conclusions – they would decide in future policy texts.

These issues could be of importance for further investigation or discussion.

1. The situation which has been created is halfhearted. Can we really think that everything (except for the combination of family life and work) has been taken care of and therefore women do not need any specific attention by the policy? Let it be clear that this is not the case, since the practical side of policy shows the opposite. One of the results of this halfheartedness implies that people working on equality between women and men need to justify over and over why they are working on this matter, even within gremia dealing with equal opportunities.
2. Diversity is being used as a magic word. There are more problems in conjunction with migrants and newcomers than the word diversity is able to cover. This is being admitted in the texts in veiled terms, but by referring to other – less dramatic problems – with the same concept and by using that concept over and over again, the real problems nevertheless remain. On top of that, the term conceals that some differences are unacceptable.
3. If we accept that 'diversity needs to be', Flemish women may return to the stove. Cultural diversity between a so-called men's culture and women's culture may continue (or arise again), women may exclusively care (private world) and men will work (outside world). Why does it appear so absurd when it is stated for Flemish women and why should it be acceptable for immigrant women? In name of diversity? In the name of diversity everything goes, and a vision is lacking.
4. The EU has always been a strong ally for women over the world in working on equal opportunities for women and men. But we should be careful with this

statement because the tide can always turn. The European Commission has declared 2007 The Year of Equal Opportunities for All. What this slogan means is not immediately clear. It can be an empty catch phrase, it can be synonymous with democracy or it can be meant to be synonymous with communism. In any case, it does not sound very promising for women.

5. In heated discussions about women in Islam, (male) politicians in Flanders (and Belgium) like to state that equality between women and men is one of the main principles in our society. Those men are right and I love to hear them say this. I agree with them and am sure that they mean what they say. So we can ask the Ministers to repeat it loud and clearly, also in policy statements.
6. The rise of the term gender is not an innocent phenomenon. It becomes increasingly clear how much equal opportunities policy f/m can differ from a gender policy when it comes to contents. (Women's) emancipation policy, aiming at equal rights, equal opportunities policy m/f concern the consolidation of women's position within society. Gender policy could also do that, but not necessarily. It is e.g. possible only to give attention to mother- and fatherhood, tasks within the family, good relationships between men and women, the position of grandfathers within their family. Attention for gender does not automatically imply attention for the autonomy of women. On the contrary, gender is a relational concept. The constant relational dimension of thinking about women, and its impact on the creating of personality (gender socialization) is something the second feminist wave has fought against. The concept gender can be seen as a boomerang that will hit women in the face.
7. Since 1995 equal opportunities in the Flemish policy was not only considered as equal opportunities for women and men, but also for other groups (LGB, ethnic minorities, ...). Women were compartementalized with other 'minorities'. Increasingly the term equal opportunities does not denote the equality between men and women in the first place anymore; the emphasis is on a more general significance, ethnic minorities in the front row. This implies 'disadvantages, 'not be able to', 'not coming up to the mark', and 'needing a tolerant attitude towards shortcomings'. Towards women this is very inappropriate. When women started to demand equal opportunities they did so because they wanted to show that women could do the same things men were doing. The way in which the concept equal opportunities is applied nowadays has brought along the disappearance of those strengths of women. The way in which the terms equal opportunities and diversity are used is simply insulting for women. It is a mockery of what emancipation and women's rights have signified before.

=====

Addendum

Our case consisted of the following documents:

1. Concerning the policy domain 'equal opportunities'
 1. Anne Van Asbroeck - nr 155 - Beleidsbrief 'gelijke kansen' in Vlaanderen. 'Gelijke kansen' voor vrouwen en minderheden. Beleidsprioriteiten 1995-1999 - 9 november 1995
 2. Anne Van Asbroeck - nr 429 - Beleidsbrief 'gelijke kansen'. Beleidsprioriteiten 1997 - 15 oktober 1996
 3. Brigitte Grouwels - nr 809 - Beleidsbrief Gelijkekansenbeleid. 'Gelijke kansen' in Vlaanderen voor Els en Jan, Piet en Karel, Eva en Lies, Aïscha, Ali, (Marleen),... Beleidsprioriteiten 1998 - 10 november 1997
 4. Brigitte Grouwels - nr 1198 - Beleidsbrief Gelijkekansenbeleid. 'Gelijke kansen' in Vlaanderen. Langzaam? Maar zeker! Beleidsprioriteiten 1998- 1999 - 27 oktober 1998
 5. Mieke Vogels - nr 150 - Beleidsbrief Welzijn, Gezondheid en 'gelijke kansen'. Beleidsprioriteiten 1999-2004 - 12 januari 2000
 6. Mieke Vogels - nr 451- Beleidsbrief Welzijn, Gezondheid en 'gelijke kansen'. Beleidsprioriteiten 2000-2001 - 6 november 2000
 7. Mieke Vogels - nr 874 - Beleidsbrief Welzijn, Gezondheid en 'gelijke kansen'. Beleidsprioriteiten 2001-2002 - 25 oktober 2001
 8. Mieke Vogels - nr 1407 - Beleidsbrief Welzijn, Gezondheid en 'gelijke kansen'. Beleidsprioriteiten 2002-2003 - 31 oktober 2002
 9. Adelheid Byttebier - nr 1922 - Beleidsbrief Welzijn, Gezondheid en 'gelijke kansen'. Beleidsprioriteiten 2003 -2004 - 27 oktober 2003
 10. Kathleen Van Brempt - Stuk 98 (2004-2009) – Nr. 1 – Beleidsnota Gelijke Kansen, 25 oktober 2004
2. Concerning minorities and naturalisation
 1. parts of the notes and letters of Mieke Vogels en Adelheid Byttebier (Welfare)
 2. part of the policy note of Luc Martens (Welfare)
 3. Marino Keulen – Stuk 84 (2004-2009) – Nr. 1 – Beleidsnota Inburgering – 22 oktober 2004, 25 pp.
3. Concerning the policy domain Education and Training
 1. Luc Van den Bossche - nr 459 - Beleidsbrief 1997 - 24 oktober 1996 (only Education)
 2. Luc Van den Bossche - nr 811 - Beleidsbrief 1997-1998 - 10 november 1997 (only Education)
 3. Eddy Baldewijn - 1158 - Beleidsbrief 1998-1999 - 9 oktober 1998 (only Education)
 4. Marleen Vanderpoorten - nr 139 - Beleidsprioriteiten 1999-2004 - 11 januari 2000
 5. Marleen Vanderpoorten - nr 460 - Beleidsprioriteiten 2000-2001 - 6 november 2000
 6. Marleen Vanderpoorten - nr 903 - Beleidsprioriteiten 2001-2002 - 5 november 2001

7. Marleen Vanderpoorten - nr 1402 - Beleidsprioriteiten 2002-2003 - 31 oktober 2002
8. Marleen Vanderpoorten - nr 1906 - Beleidsprioriteiten 2003-2004 - 27 oktober 2003
9. Frank Vandenbroucke - nr 156 - Beleidsnota 2004-2009 - 4 januari 2005

4. Concerning the policy domain Labour

1. Theo Kelchtermans - nr 165 - Beleidsbrief Werken in Vlaanderen. Van werkgelegenheid naar tewerkstelling - 1995-1999 - 21 november 1995
2. Theo Kelchtermans - nr 445 - Beleidsbrief Tewerkstelling - 1997 - 17 oktober 1996
3. Theo Kelchtermans - nr 805 - Beleidsbrief Tewerkstelling - 1998 - 7 november 1997
4. Theo Kelchtermans - nr 1218 - Beleidsbrief Tewerkstelling - 1998-1999 - 4 november 1998
5. Renaat Landuyt - nr 155 - Beleidsnota Werkgelegenheid - 1999-2004 - 12 jan 1999
6. Renaat Landuyt - nr 904 - Beleidsnota Werkgelegenheid - 2001-2002 - 5 nov 2001
7. Renaat Landuyt - nr 1419 - Beleidsbrief Werkgelegenheid - 2002-2003 - 5 nov 2002
8. Renaat Landuyt - nr 1903 – Beleidsbrief Werkgelegenheid - 2003-2004 - 27 okt 2003
9. Frank Vandenbroucke - nr 97 - beleidsnota Werk - 2004-2009 - 25 okt 2004

5. Concerning Welfare

1. Luc Martens - nr 129 - Beleidsbrief Cultuur Gezin en Welzijn in Vlaanderen - 1995-1999 - 19 okt 1995
2. Luc Martens - nr. 425 - Beleidsbrief Gezin en Welzijn - 1997 - 9 okt 1996
3. Luc Martens - nr 801 - Beleidsbrief Gezin en Welzijn - 1998 - 7 nov 1997
4. Mieke Vogels - nr 150 - Beleidsbrief Welzijn, Gezondheid en 'gelijke kansen'. Beleidsprioriteiten 1999-2004 - 12 januari 2000
5. Mieke Vogels - nr 451- Beleidsbrief Welzijn, Gezondheid en 'gelijke kansen'. Beleidsprioriteiten 2000-2001 - 6 november 2000
6. Mieke Vogels - nr 874 - Beleidsbrief Welzijn, Gezondheid en 'gelijke kansen'. Beleidsprioriteiten 2001-2002 - 25 oktober 2001
7. Mieke Vogels - nr 1407 - Beleidsbrief Welzijn, Gezondheid en 'gelijke kansen'. Beleidsprioriteiten 2002-2003 - 31 oktober 2002
8. Adelheid Byttebier - nr 1922 - Beleidsbrief Welzijn, Gezondheid en 'gelijke kansen'. beleidsprioriteiten 2003 -2004 - 27 oktober 2003
9. Inge Vervotte - Beleidsnota Welzijn, Volksgezondheid en Gezin - 2004-2009 - 22 okt 2004

6. Coalition agreements

1. Regeringsverklaring van de Vlaamse Regering - nr 10 - 21 juni 1995

2. Regeringsverklaring van de Vlaamse Regering - nr 31 - 13 juli 1999
3. Regeringsverklaring van de Vlaamse Regering. Aanvullende Verklaring - nr 31 - 9 juli 2001
4. Regeringsverklaring van de Vlaamse Regering - nr 31 - 22 juli 2004