

CPE

CPE.nomos.de

Culture, Practice & Europeanization

1 | 2026 11. Year

Editors: Prof. Dr. *Monika Eigmüller*, Europa-Universität Flensburg, Germany, Jun.-Prof. Dr. *Vincent Gengnagel*, Otto-von-Guericke-Universität Magdeburg, Germany, Prof. Dr. *Klarissa Lueg*, University of Southern Denmark (SDU), Denmark

Contents

Articles

Appendix "Is the ideal political leader still a man?"	
Appendix 1: Information on the qualitative interviews	1

Impressum

Editors:

Prof. Dr. Monika Eigmüller, Europa-Universität Flensburg, Germany, Jun.-Prof. Dr. Vincent Gengnagel, Otto-von-Guericke-Universität Magdeburg, Germany, Prof. Dr. Klarissa Lueg, University of Southern Denmark (SDU), Denmark

Editor in Chief:

Prof. Dr. Monika Eigmüller, (V.i.S.d.P.), Europa-Universität Flensburg, Seminar für Soziologie, Auf dem Campus 1b, 24943 Flensburg, Germany, E-Mail: cpe@nomos-journals.de

Editorial Support:

Svea Fischer, Europa-Universität Flensburg, Germany

Associate Editors:

Stefanie Börner, EAH Jena, Sebastian Büttner, University of Nürnberg-Erlangen, Daniel Maul, University of Oslo, Iris Rittenhofer, Aarhus, Denmark, Christof Roos, University of Flensburg, Bernd Sommer, TU Dortmund University, Steen Bo Frandsen, University of Southern Denmark, Iulia-Karin Patrut, University of Flensburg

Please use only OJS on the journal's website (www.cpe.nomos.de) to send submissions:

Submissions | Culture, Practice & Europeanization

Manuscripts and other submissions:

All submissions should be sent to the above-mentioned address. There is no liability for unsolicited manuscripts that are submitted. They can only be returned if return postage is enclosed. Acceptance for publication must be made in text form.

With the acceptance for publication, the author transfers the simple, spatially and temporally unlimited right to reproduce and distribute in physical form, the right of public reproduction and enabling access, the right of inclusion in databases, the right of storage on electronic data carriers and the right of their distribution and reproduction as well as the right of other exploitation in electronic form for the duration of the statutory copyright to Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft mbH & Co.KG. This also includes forms of use that are currently not yet known. This does not affect the author's mandatory right of secondary exploitation as laid down in Section 38 (4) UrhG (German Copyright Act) after 12 months have expired after publication.

A possible Creative Commons license attached to the individual contribution, or the respective issue has priority in case of doubt. For copyright, see also the general notes at www.nomos.de/copyright.

Unsolicited manuscripts – for which no liability is assumed – are considered a publication proposal on the publisher's terms. Only unpublished original work will be accepted. The authors declare that they agree to editing that does not distort the meaning

Copyright and publishing rights:

All articles published in this journal are protected by copyright. This also applies to the published court decisions and their guiding principles, insofar as they have been compiled or edited by the submitting person or the editorial staff. Copyright protection also applies with regard to databases and similar facilities. No part of this journal may be reproduced, disseminated or publicly reproduced or made available in any form, included in databases, stored on electronic data carriers or otherwise electronically reproduced, disseminated or exploited outside the narrow limits of copyright law or beyond the limits of any Creative Commons license applicable to this part without the written permission of the publisher or the authors.

Articles identified by name do not necessarily reflect the opinion of the publisher/editors.

The publisher observes the rules of the Börsenverein des Deutschen Buchhandels e.V. on the use of book reviews.

Advertisements:

Verlag C.H.BECK GmbH & Co. KG, Anzeigenabteilung, Dr. Jiri Pavelka, Wilhelmstraße 9, 80801 München

Media-Sales: Phone: (089) 381 89-687, E-Mail: mediasales@beck.de

Publisher and overall responsibility for printing and production:

Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft mbH & Co. KG, Waldseestr. 3-5, 76530 Baden-Baden, Phone: 07221/2104-900, www.nomos.de

Geschäftsführer/CEO: Thomas Gottlöber, HRA 200026, Mannheim

Sparkasse Baden-Baden Gaggenau, IBAN DE05662500300005002266, (BIC SOLADES1BAD)

Frequency of publication: biannually

Customer Service: Phone: +49-7221-2104-222, Telefax: +49-7221-2104-285, E-Mail: service@nomos.de

Cancellations: Cancellation of the subscription is possible with a notice period of six weeks to the end of the calendar year.

Change of Address: Please notify us of any changes in address as soon as possible. When doing so, please indicate the new and old address next to the title of the magazine.

Note in accordance with Art. 21 (1) EU-GDPR: In the event of a change of address, Deutsche Post AG may notify the publisher of the new address even if no forwarding order has been placed. An objection to this can be lodged with Post AG at any time with effect for the future.

ISSN 2566-7742

www.cpe.nomos.de



Nomos

Appendix “Is the ideal political leader still a man?”

Appendix 1: Information on the qualitative interviews

1.1 Documentation of the interview process

The qualitative evidence builds on the analysis of 32 semi-structured in the five countries. For the purpose of this paper, 1 interview was excluded as the respondent was not asked the relevant question on their depiction of a good minister. We conducted roughly seven interviews per country (see Table 2). Interviews in Belgium and Denmark were conducted in English. Interviews in Germany, Austria, and Spain were conducted in German or Spanish respectively by a native speaker. All interviews were conducted either personally or via web conference except of one Danish interview that was conducted in written. The interviews were conducted between September 2023 and July 2024.

1.2 Interview questionnaire

The interview questionnaire included questions along 6 major issues: (1) MPs’ formal oversight activities (Questions 1 to 2), (2) MPs’ informal oversight activities (Questions 3–4), (3) competency perception of men and women ministers (question 5), (4) external sources of differences in the competency perception of men and women ministers (Questions 6–7), (5) oversight and the sex of MPs (Question 8), and (6) the characteristics of ideal ministers (Question 10). An overview of the interview tree is provided in Table A1.1.

Table A1.1: Interview tree

No.	Topic	Question	Follow-Ups
1	Formal oversight	Why do you pose written and oral questions?	<u>If oversight is not mentioned:</u> You did not mention controlling the government. Does this play a role? <u>If only oral/written questions matter:</u> Do similar motives apply for written/oral questions?
2	Change in questions	We have observed that MPs pose a higher number of questions to some ministers and more or less tough questions to some ministers than others. If you think about your own motives, why do you use questions differently when addressing some ministers compared to others?	I am particularly interested in the change from A to B in term X in portfolio Z. Do you remember that you changed your questioning behavior as this change took place? If so: Why did you do this?
3	Informal oversight	Now I would like to move away from formal oversight mechanisms like questions and talk about informal ones like getting in touch with people in the ministry. Which informal means to control the government do you use?	When do you use informal means over formal means?

No.	Topic	Question	Follow-Ups
4	Change in informal means	Again, I am interested in the change from A to B. Do you remember whether you changed your informal oversight activities as this change took place?	If so: Why did you do this?
5	Competency perception	What did you think of the work of the man minister during that term? Why? What did you think of the work of the woman minister during that term? Why?	<i>Optional Follow Up:</i> Who do you think performed more successfully? <i>Must:</i> How did that assessment of minister's work impact your use of informal and formal means to oversee them?
6	Media/voters	What do you remember about the public perception of Minister A and B?	<i>If something:</i> How did that impact your behavior?
7	Administrative support	Do you also remember something about the standing of Minister A and B in the ministry? Were they well-liked and supported?	
8	MPs' sex	Now I am interested in your knowledge of your parliamentary party group colleagues. Do you have the impression that they assessed Minister A or B to be more successful?	Did certain groups of MPs stick out in this regard for example because of their background (e.g., the district they run in) or personal attributes such as education, experience or sex? If sex not mentioned: Did men and women MPs adapt their behavior in different ways?
9	Other	Is there anything else you would like to mention about dynamics of oversight and the case of A and B?	
10	Ideal minister	Now we come to an end, and I have a different kind of question. What do you think are the most important attributes of a good minister?	

Source: Own Source

1.3 Case study character of the interviews

To enhance the comparability of the responses, we asked respondents to consider a specific ministerial replacement including a man and woman minister when responding to our questions. The selected ministers are listed and described in Table A1.2. The respective replacement was selected based on three criteria: (1) The reason for the ministerial replacement was exogenous, thus including reasons such as health problems of ministers or their spouses or larger reshuffles in government (that are not due to scandals related to the ministers and ministries). This procedure essentially excludes extremely high- and low-performing ministers, making MPs' assessment of their performance more comparable. (2) The original and replacement minister hold similar levels of previous experience in executive office, which we expect to be an alternative explanation. From the few cases per country that fulfil these criteria, we created a sample characterized by maximum variation concerning the portfolio, levels of previous political experience of both appointees, and the

order in which the gender of ministers changed (men-women, women-men). This sampling strategy ensures some representativity of the results despite the small-N character of the study.

We applied three different strategies to ensure the high quality of the interview data (following van Soest 2023): First, a description of the specific ministerial replacement and the MP’s committee membership was included in the interview invitation, in the briefing immediately before the interview, and in the relevant interview question. This ensured that the interviewee was reminded of the context, making recall easier. While some MPs declined to participate due to limited memory of the ministers, others felt confident in their ability to contribute. In some cases, MPs pointed out during the interview if they could not recall the specific case and made use of other examples. Second, only MPs who were members of the committee of the ministry in which the ministerial replacement took place were selected. Committees are the primary arena in which MPs engage with policy (Longely & Davidson, 1998; Siefken & Rommetvedt, 2022). Ministers leading the associated portfolios are therefore central to committee members’ work. This increased the likelihood that the ministers of the case study were significant and memorable to them. Third, interview partners varied in terms of gender and party affiliation to capture multiple perspectives on the replacement. This helps reduce potential bias stemming from an MP’s individual position or characteristics and allows us to cross-check accounts for consistency. Beyond these strategies, we chose to conduct all interviews in a semi-structured way to ensure that all participants were able to share their memories beyond the scope of the pre-defined questions.

Table A1.2: Oversight of the case studies surveyed in the qualitative interviews.

	Austria	Belgium	Denmark	Germany	Spain
Name (gender) / (time in office)	Pröll (m) (12/2008–04/2011) ↓ Fekter (w) (4/2011–12/2013)	Jamar (m) (10/2014–09/2015) ↓ Wilmès (w) (09/2015–12/2018)	Christensen (w) (04/2009–02/2010) ↓ Stig Møller (m) (02/2010–10/2011)	Gabriel (m) (12/2013–01/2017) ↓ Zypries (w) (01/2017–03/2018)	Cabrera (w) (04/2008–04/2009) ↓ Gabilondo (m) (04/2009–12/2011)
Portfolio	Finance	Finance	Culture	Economy & Energy	Education
Reason for replacement	resigned due to health problems	resigned to become provincial governor	deselected in an attempt to renew the government’s image through a larger reshuffle	became Minister of Foreign Affairs	deselected in an attempt to renew the government’s image through a larger reshuffle

Source: Own Source

References

- Longley, L. D., and Davidson, R. H. (1998). Parliamentary Committees: Changing Perspectives on Changing Institutions. *The Journal of Legislative Studies*, 4 (1): 1–20.
- Siefken, S. T., and Rommetvedt, H. (2022). *Parliamentary Committees in the Policy Process* Abingdon: Routledge.
- von Soest C. (2023). Why Do We Speak to Experts? Reviving the Strength of the Expert Interview Method. *Perspectives on Politics*, 21(1):277–287.

1.4 Selection of interviewees

The interviewees were selected based on party membership and knowledge of the specific ministerial replacement. First, we ensured that the sample covers MPs from at least three different parties, including always government (except Denmark) and opposition members. This criterion ensures that the responses take different perspectives on the working of government ministers. Second, we ensured knowledge of the specific case of ministerial replacement by interviewing MPs that either displayed large numbers of questions to either the man or women minister or were members of a committee working on the portfolio relevant for the ministry of the case study. For a few smaller parties, no MP that fulfills these criteria was willing to participate in the interview. In such cases, we opted to interview any other MP that was in parliament during the respective legislative period that belongs, thus prioritizing party diversity.

1.5 Transcription of the interviews

Audio records of the interviews were automatically transcribed using the tool f4x (<https://f4x.audiotranskription.de>). The resulting preliminary transcripts were double checked and, where necessary, corrected by the interviewee or student assistants. This two-step process ensured that the written transcripts accurately capture the spoken word in the interview. Afterwards, the interviews were anonymized as far as possible to avoid clear identifications of the interviewees.

1.6 Data protection strategy

Even though the interviews were anonymized as far as possible during the transcription process, the examples and anecdotes that respondents use to elaborate on their responses may give away their identity. For this reason, we do not publish the interview transcripts or complete lists of coding at the individual level. We are happy to respond to any inquiries about the content of the interviews on a bilateral level.

Appendix 2: Information on the qualitative content analysis of the interviews

The transcripts were coded using qualitative content analysis. The transcripts of the interviews conducted with German, Austrian, Danish and Belgium MPs were coded in the original language. The Spanish interviews were translated to English using ChatGPT 3.5 and the translations were double-checked for correct meaning by a Spanish native speaker familiar with the interview set-up. We used the categories ascribed to aggregative and integrative leadership styles by Erikson and Josefsson (2023). Additionally, we also coded other traits and characteristics ascribed to good leaders that are not clearly assigned to either of the two leadership styles using an inductive approach. The software QCA Map (<https://www.qcamap.org/>) was used for the coding. All interviews were coded by two independent coders.

Overall, we have 28 deductive (7 leadership traits for each of the two leadership styles, coded as both positive and negative references) and 17 inductive additional categories capturing further traits and characteristics of good leaders.

Table A2.1 shows a cross-tabulation of all coder judgements for the 45 categories. The table indicates the sum of how often both coders agreed on absence (0/0) or presence (1/1), and how often they disagreed (0/1 or 1/0) for all interviews and categories. This descriptive overview of the joint coding frequencies indicates that most coder decisions fell into the 0/0 cell (89.5 %), reflecting the relative rarity of positive codings across categories. This insight is also mirrored by the observation that 10 of the 28 categories of the deductive coding scheme are not found by either coder in the interviews. In such imbalanced distributions, Cohen’s κ and Krippendorff’s α tend to be deflated. To address this, we calculated Gwet’s AC1, which provides more stable estimates under prevalence imbalance. The results of the inter-coder reliability tests for each category are displayed in Table A2.2, which shows average agreement, Gwet’s AC1 and Krippendorff’s α . All values of Gwet’s AC1 are larger than 0.8, suggesting a very high reliability of the coding.

Table A2.1: Cross-tabulation of coder judgements

	0	1
0	1318 (89.5 %)	20 (1.4 %)
1	26 (1.8 %)	108 (7.3 %)

Source: Own Source

Table A2.2: Results of intercoder reliability tests for all categories showing average agreement, Gwet's AC1 and Krippendorff's α

Category	% agreement	AC1	alpha
1- Assertive, negative	1.0	1.0	1.0
2- Controlling, negative	1.0	1.0	0.8
3- Individualistic, negative	0.9	0.9	0.7
4- Forceful, negative	0.9	0.9	0.8
5- Efficient, negative	1.0	1.0	0.0
6- Power-Seeking, negative	1.0	1.0	1.0
7 – Hierarchical / Formalistic, negative	1.0	1.0	1.0
1- Assertive, positive	1.0	1.0	0.9
2- Controlling, positive	1.0	1.0	0.7
3- Individualistic, positive	1.0	1.0	1.0
4- Forceful, positive	0.9	0.9	0.6
5- Efficient, positive	0.9	0.9	0.7
6- Power-Seeking, positive	1.0	1.0	1.0
7 – Hierarchical / Formalistic, positive	0.9	0.9	0.5
1- Affectionate, negative	1.0	1.0	1.0
2- Cooperative, negative	1.0	1.0	1.0
3- Interpersonally Sensitive, negative	1.0	1.0	1.0
4- Listening, negative	1.0	1.0	1.0
5- Inclusive, negative	1.0	1.0	1.0
6- Striving for the Common Good, negative	1.0	1.0	1.0
7- Context-Sensitive / Receptive, negative	1.0	1.0	1.0
1- Affectionate, positive	1.0	1.0	1.0
2- Cooperative, positive	0.8	0.8	0.7
3- Interpersonally Sensitive, positive	1.0	1.0	1.0
4- Listening, positive	1.0	1.0	0.9
5- Inclusive, positive	0.9	0.9	0.4
6- Striving for the Common Good, positive	0.9	0.8	0.6
7- Context-Sensitive / Receptive, positive	0.9	0.9	0.6
Other 1- Expertise	1.0	1.0	0.9
Other 2- Authenticity	1.0	1.0	0.0
Other 3- Hard-working	1.0	1.0	1.0
Other 4- General notion of leadership or managerial skills	1.0	1.0	0.9
Other 5- Having visions	0.9	0.9	0.6
Other 6- Intelligence	1.0	1.0	1.0
Other 7- Moral integrity	0.9	0.9	0.6
Other 8- Politically experienced	0.9	0.9	0.5
Other 9- Politically talented	1.0	1.0	1.0
Other 10- Selecting a knowledgeable team	1.0	1.0	0.8
Other 11- Moral authority	1.0	1.0	1.0
Other 12- Ability to hide bad personal characteristics	1.0	1.0	1.0
Other 13- No expertise	1.0	1.0	1.0

Category	% agreement	AC1	alpha
Other 14- Politically knowledgeable	1.0	1.0	0.7
Other 15- No lack of political talent	1.0	1.0	1.0
Other 16- No bad personality	1.0	1.0	0.0
Other 17- Good personality	1.0	1.0	1.0

Source: Own Source