Gender as a category of analysis

Gender can be understood as a **category** with four analytical dimensions (DuerstLahti and Kelly, 1995: 41)

1. **Variable**

For example, female, male, feminine, masculine, femininity, masculinity, gender fluid; non-binary; gender neutral

2. Gender can be the **property** of an individual or organisation

3. **Set of practices** revealing gender in interactive behaviour, for example, masculinity

4. A **normative stance regarding appropriate behaviour**

Gender can be understood as a **process**

-> Practices and rules [can] recast the gendered nature of the political (Beckwith, 2005:: 132-133).

Gender can be understood as a **performance** (Butler)

-> it is something we 'do'

-> “The performative aspects of gender identity are lived by individuals in relation to the web of social practices in which they are enmeshed” (McNay 2000: 36).

-> Gendered logic of appropriate behaviour (March and Olsen; Chappell)

Challenging Gender Norms

(Nirmal Puwar 2004)

- Disorientation
- Amplification of numbers
- Super surveillance
- Burden of doubt
- Burden of representation
- Infantilisation
- Performative norms
- A fine balanced fusion of femininity and masculinity has to be enacted

Formal vs. Informal Rules

- Formal Rules - Rules of the Game: formal laws, rules and regulations
- Informal Rules - Rules in Use: the ‘dos and don’ts’ that one learns on the ground prohibits/permits/sanctions/enforces/incentivises/disincentivises‘ the way things are done around here’.

-> Can result in change, durability, robustness, resistance to change, and continuity, thus organisations are dynamic and it is best to view them as processes rather than static objects.

Rule-makers vs Rule-Takers

- Any set of rules are actively interpreted by rule-takers in such a way that the rules themselves become subtly altered overtime.
- Existing rules (rules in use) become the context within which future rule-making takes place
- Rule-makers are also rule-takers, while rule-takers themselves play a role in rule-making
- Individuals and institutions are mutually constitutive. Change is dependent upon the relationship between ‘institutional architects, institutional subjects and institutional environments’.

Importance of this Study

Louise Chappell (2010: 183):-

1. Such studies provide the basis for a deeper understanding of the roles and experiences of men and women within political institutions
2. Studies of this nature contribute to an understanding of the policies, laws and norms that are the outcomes of political institutions
3. Such studies assist in explaining the relationship between political institutions and social actors

Importance of this Study (cont)

relationship between political institutions and social actors

Masculinism

operates inside political institutions giving men and masculinity a privileged position in interpersonal, institutional and societal structures.

"The idealised separation of state and society parallels a division of labour that renders the contribution of women invisible” (Lovenduski, 1998)

-> the division between public and private

Gender Power

Gender is a power construct, and male gender power permeates politics, shaping its rules of access and engagement, as well a the outputs of the policy process.

Gender Power generates and sustains practices of inequality that advantage men and disadvantage women. Embedded in organisational rules, routines, and policies, gender power normalises male dominance and renders women, along with their needs and interests, invisible (Mary Hawkesworth)

Feminist Institutionalism (FI)

critiques and seeks to overcome the gender blindness of existing scholarship in the field, to include women as actors in political processes, to ‘gender’ onstitutionalism, and to move the research agenda towards questions about the interplay between gender and the operation and effect of political institutions (Mackay, Kenny and Chappell, 2010).

Sponsored by **CrosswordCheats.com**
Learn to solve cryptic crosswords!
http://crosswordcheats.com

Old vs New Institutions

'Old' and 'New' Institutions frequently co-exist -> can result in processes of conversion and layering:
- An old institution can be converted by the new institution
- old and new institutions will co-exist and the new norms of behaviour developed in response to the new institution will be layered into
existing behaviours
Old is not necessarily informal and new is not necessarily formal
Old and Formal -> e.g. electoral system
New and Formal -> e.g. gender quota
Old and Informal -> e.g. candidate selection practices
New and Informal -> processes to undermine the effectiveness of gender quota's
Rather than old/new, we should consider the temporal aspects of institutional dynamics:
- Sequencing: the order things happen
- Timining: the point something happens within a sequence
- Pace: how quickly things happen

Gender and Institutions

Gendered institutions describes those organisations where “gender is present in the processes, practices, images and ideologies, and distribution of power in the various sectors of social life” (Acker, 1990: 567)

Duerst-Lahti (2005) observes that organisations become gendered due to: associations between gender and an organisation’s function; and the ‘socio-demographics’ of those ‘who founded, populated and developed them overtime'

Gender and Institutions (cont)

Duerst-Lahti (2005) argues that in the process of organisational foundation and development, institutions create formal and informal structures, rules, norms and practices in reponse to the "prefences" of their founders and most influential incumbents throughout their histories. -> these incumbents set the terms of power relations according to those preferences; these preferences inevitably adventage those who are in a position to set them because people prefer that which is comfer-tavle and favourable for them

Duerst-Lahti (2005) observes that because men established political institutions, masculine frames of preference and ‘domination’ are embedded in, and associated with, politics

Jillson and Wilson (1994) observe that political institutions remain “remarkably sticky” to their past.

Escobar-Lemmon and Taylor Robinson (2009) observe that “gendered political institutions have traditionally placed women in a subservient position…The practices and routines of an institution, be it a legislature or a cabinet, may sustain or even produce gendered stereotypes”

Inside vs Outside institutions

There is a pressuposition that there is a distinction between the inside and the outside of a political institution.
-> as there is a need to differentiate between organisations and institutions:
- institutions: rules of the game
- organisations: individuals who occupy the institution -> the players within that game
political institutions do not operate in a vacuum -> Innovation can then be bounded; sometimes it can reproduce or re-inscribe gendered expectations

Inside vs Outside institutions (cont)

There is no clear inside/outside; there is an intersection of between the inside and outside.

Feminism and Politics

Feminist claims are made on the basis of (1) equality and (2) difference (Lovenduski, 2005)
In relation to politics this refers to:
◦ Equality: equality based claims stress women’s entitlements to be in politics on the same terms and in the same numbers as men (‘liberal’ feminism)
◦ Difference: difference-based claims (sometimes termed ‘socialist’ feminism) imply that women have particular characteristics or interests that entitle
them to representation
there is a tension between the two positions -> "the equality
position suggests that women’s claims for political representation will, if successful, turn them into political men. By contrast, the difference position implies that, in sufficient numbers, the presence of women representatives will change the practice and nature of politics”
“Equality is needed if difference is to be compensated and difference must be recognised if equality is to be achieved”

Sponsored by **CrosswordCheats.com**
Learn to solve cryptic crosswords!
http://crosswordcheats.com