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My paper speaks directly to the three concepts which this workshop seeks to explore: *institutions, change and gender*. In particular, I am interested in outlining the importance of developing a comparative approach toward gender and institutions which has the capacity to explain the dynamic interaction between these two forces to shape policy outcomes and opportunities for feminist activists seeking to engage with these institutions over time and place.

The paper considers the some of the ways in which the study of gender and institutions could be enhanced through comparative analysis and *vice versa*. I see a comparative approach to gender and institutions expanding our understanding in three distinct ways. First, it could provide the basis for a deeper understanding of the roles and experiences of men and women within political institutions. Second, it could contribute to an understanding of the policies, laws and norms which are the outcomes of these institutions and which fundamentally shape gender relations within society. Finally, it could assist in explaining the relationship between these institutions and social actors. Understanding this particular relationship is especially important for those interested in identifying the opportunities available to feminist activists pursuing a gender equality agenda through the state.

As well as outlining some of the advantages of developing a comparative politics of gender and political institutions, this paper also considers the question: in which direction might such a comparison proceed? Here I put forward some ideas about a multi-directional research strategy that encompasses *single country, cross country* and *international* studies as well as a *time* component. Such a strategy is essential for gathering the rich and detailed data necessary to capture the nuanced variations in the operation of gender within political institutions in different political settings. In turn, understanding these variations is necessary for testing theories and concepts related to women’s and men’s position within institutions, institutional outcomes and feminist-friendly political opportunity structures.

**Gender and Institutions**

If we want to better understand the intrinsic and extrinsic relationship between gender and institutions, we must undertake comparative analysis. It is only thorough such
analysis that we can determine what role gender plays in shaping the internal
dynamics of political institutions and how this influences institutional outcomes and
opportunities. But in undertaking any comparison it is impossible to avoid what van
Deth describes as the ‘tricky problem’ of establishing cross-nationally valid and
reliable indicators (1998, 2). It is essential to clarify key concepts and pay attention to
finding equivalent phenomena to measure across cases. However, doing this is more
easily said than done, especially when employing such contested and ambiguous
terms as institutions and gender.

Over the past 15 years or so, institutions have (once again) become the focus of
attention in the social sciences. A so-called ‘new institutionalism’ has evolved which
has sociological, economic and historical variants (see Adcock et al 2007). Each of
these is distinct from each other but each share the view that institutions are important
for shaping political outcomes (Lane and Ersson 2000, 9). According to Peters (1999,
18) although there exist competing definitions of institutions, these definitions share
some common attributes. These include an understanding that institutions:

1. Are a structural feature of the society/polity. This means they transcend
   individuals to involve groups in some sort of patterned interactions that
   are predictable;
2. Are stable over time but with some degree of mutability;
3. Are able to affect individual behaviour, usually through constraints;
4. Provide a sense of shared values and meaning amongst the members of
   the institution.

Moving from these general principles to the finer conceptual details, key differences
begin to emerge especially between those adopting a rational choice and those using a
sociological or historical perspective. For those pursuing a rational choice approach
an institution relates to a single rule – a norm that has been institutionalized – whereas
those using a sociological or historical approach view it as more complex system of
behaviour that is directed by a set of rules, i.e. as an organized activity (Lane and
Ersson 2000, 23). For rational choice advocates, an institution is understood as a norm
(or regulative principle) whereas for a proponent of the sociological or historical
approach, it is conceived of as an organization that is made up of a set of norms and is
an actor in its own right, such as a parliament, court or executive. Obviously, these
divergent definitions of institutions lead to different questions and different levels of
analysis in comparative research; it is important then to be clear about where one sits on this spectrum before undertaking such research. In my work, I apply an historical institutional approach to see how a particular set of institutional norms – those related to gender –shape expectations about men’s and women’s behaviour, and their position in society as well as how these norms can be challenged and altered through engagement with those seeking to change the normative status quo.

What do I mean by “gender”? I see gender as a set of social norms based on accepted ideas and practices about femininity and masculinity; norms that can be, but are not necessarily, aligned with and assigned to women and men. As Beckwith (forthcoming) argues:

[Gendered] meanings emerge from stereotypes about male and female behavior; from characteristics and behaviors conventionally associated with women and men; from normative assumptions about appropriate behaviors of men and women; from assumptions about biological difference; and from social structures of power and difference. Gender represents both the outcomes and processes of human actors and institutions in developing meanings about a range of femininities and masculinities which are not “natural” but are identifiable social and political constructions.

How men and women situate themselves in relation to masculine and feminine institutional norms is a dynamic political process. For example, female politicians may decide for reasons of political survival to display masculine forms of behavior all the time, or in relation to specific policy debates. Male politicians, on occasions, may choose to display an ‘emotional’ side, which is deemed a feminine trait, in order to appeal to certain supporters or pursue certain policies. But it is not just individuals who are the carriers of gender; institutions are also imbued with gender norms. As Connell (2005, 5) argues: “Organizations themselves institutionalize definitions of femininity and masculinity, arrange gender hierarchies, construct gender cultures and define gender-appropriate jobs.” As with individuals, these institutional gender norms are neither fixed nor permanent. Gender operates as a process within institutions. For Beckwith, this is “manifested as the differential effects of apparently gender-neutral structures and policies upon women and men, and upon masculine and/or feminine actors”. Moreover, the process is bi-directional: not only are institutions and politics gendered but they can be gendered; that is, as Beckwith notes, “activist
feminists…can work to instate practices and rules that recast the gendered nature of the political” (2005, 132-3). This notion of gender as a process is a particularly useful as it draws attention to change and the constantly shifting nature of gender power relations within institutions.

Focusing on gender and institutions this paper builds upon, but is different to, existing comparative work on women and institutions including through federalism and in parliaments, courts and bureaucracies. The women and politics literature has provided important (though still incomplete) data on where and which women have experienced the most success in having their interests represented. Collectively, this work has revealed the disadvantaged position and status of women within and in relation to political institutions. Given the ongoing inequalities between men and women’s access to political power in democratic and non-democratic systems the need to continue to with this research is critical. Building a research agenda on gender and institutions does not seek to replace the focus on women and politics but to extend it in a number of ways. By emphasizing gender, rather than a particular sex category, this work seeks to better explain the nature of the political environment in which institutional actors – both men and women - operate in order to understand their choices, opportunities and constraints. The challenge for each of us attempting to develop a comparative gender politics field is to ensure that we avoid the elision of the term ‘gender’ with ‘women’ which can so easily occur (see Vickers 2006, 14). It is essential that we do not lose sight of women as a category of analysis, because as Vickers reminds us, to do so leaves men in control of formal political institutions (2006). However, to better understand political outcomes we also need to look beyond the individuals who engage with political institutions to investigate the nature of these institutions themselves.

This paper looks at two sides of the gender process. The first section takes up the issue of gender in institutions while the second section focuses on gendering institutions; that is understanding how these arenas can be shaped by feminist actors who seek to challenge the taken-for-granted gender practices within existing institutions. The final section considers how different types of comparative research might broaden our understanding of both gender in and the gendering of institutions.
Gender in institutions

A feature of new institutionalism is sensitivity to the importance of *norms* in shaping institutions and their outcomes (Thelen and Steinmo 1992; Peters 1999). In March and Olsen’s classic work, *Rediscovering Institutions* (1989) norms - which are institutionalised rules and forms of behaviour - are central. In their view institutions are:

…collections of interrelated rules and routines that define appropriate actions in terms of relations between roles and situations...When individuals enter an institution, they try to discover, and are taught, the rules. When they encounter a new situation, they try to associate it with a situation for which rules already exist. Through rules and a logic of appropriateness, political institutions realize both order, stability and predictability, one the one hand, and flexibility and adaptiveness, on the other (1989, 161).

A ‘logic of appropriateness’ suggests that institutions constrain certain types of behaviour while encouraging others. Although this logic is not impermeable, it is difficult to unsettle as it is perpetuated by institutional actors who ‘embody and reflect existing norms and beliefs’ (McAdam and Scott 2005, 15) and who seek to maintain the rules.

While the mainstream institutionalist literature emphasizes the importance of norms, it has given surprisingly little attention to their gendered underpinnings. What this literature ignores is the processes whereby institutional norms prescribe (as well as proscribe) ‘acceptable’ rules and values which are underpinned by masculine and feminine characteristics. By contrast, feminist scholars have long been alert to the significance of gender norms in political institutions (Lovenduski 1998; Acker 1992; Stivers 1993; Savage and Witz 1992; Kantola 2006; Weldon 2006). These important works point out the way that institutional rules and norms privilege certain forms of behaviour and certain actors over others. They also demonstrate how an expectation about gendered behaviour becomes taken-for-granted within institutional settings.

According to Savage and Witz (1992, 37) gender operates within institutions at both a *nominal* and *substantive* level. With regards to the nominal gender aspect, they argue that men’s dominance within institutions, in terms of both their numerical strength and access to positions of power, is significant because they are able to use their
positions strategically to exclude women from improving their institutional standing (1992, 15). More important though is the substantive dimension, where gender is embedded in political institutions through ongoing practices, values and expectations of appropriate behaviour. The products of institutions – laws, policies and rules – are imbued with these internal values and come to shape societal norms and expectations which are then reflected back on to institutions; in this sense gender and institutional outcomes can be seen as mutually reinforcing.

For feminist political scientist, Joni Lovenduski institutions have distinctively gendered cultures and are involved in processes of producing and reproducing gender. She also makes the additional point that no single institution does this in the same way. In her view: ‘the successful application of the concept of gender to the investigation of political institutions must acknowledge not only the complexity of gender but also the nature of the particular institution and the kinds of masculinities and femininities that are performed’ (1998, 348). The argument that gender plays out differently in different institutions is a crucial one, because such variation shapes behaviour inside institutions, institutional outcomes, as well as opportunities for institutional engagement. I take up this point of institutional difference in relation to comparative research strategies further below.

The operation of the bureaucratic norm of *neutrality*, which is highly respected in Westminster bureaucratic systems, illustrates the point about the influence of institutional gender norms. This norm, which emphasizes the importance of individuals being able to detach themselves from situations and act with ‘dispassionate objectivity’, reflects traditional masculine traits (Stivers 1993, 40). Meanwhile, values such as emotion, sensibility or passion, that is those values that have been identified as ‘feminine’, are regarded as excessive and laden with bias (Stivers 1993, 41).

Unmasking the gendered foundations of neutrality is important for understanding the experiences of men and women inside these bureaucracies. It is a key variable to consider when explaining why women, who are seen to be imbued with emotion and have a lack of objectivity, have found it difficult to progress to senior positions in the civil service in Westminster systems. It also needs to be included in any analysis
about the types of policy preferences to emerge from Westminster bureaucracies; policies that tend to be more easily framed in quantifiable terms rather than in terms of an ethics of care or other emotionally-charged values. Identifying the masculine foundation of neutrality is also important for understanding the relationship of social movement actors with the bureaucracy, especially feminist activists who seek to use state feminism as a strategy to advance their equality claims. It could be hypothesized that the stronger the enforcement of this norm, the less chance there is for feminists to advance a gender equality agenda as it could be so easily construed as a ‘biased’ policy position. Initial comparative institutional research I have undertaken across three Westminster-style bureaucracies - in Australia, Canada and the UK - bears out this supposition. In Australia, where the norm is more weakly enforced, there has been a more positive political opportunity structure for feminist policy activists than in Canada or the UK (Chappell 2002a; Chappell 2002b).

A gendered logic of appropriateness is not confined to the bureaucracy. In recent years, feminist scholars also working within a Western liberal comparative framework have pointed to the gendered normative basis of other political institutions including legislatures (Lovenduski 2005; Childs 2001; Hawkesworth 2003; Phillips 1998), federal structures (Banaszak 1996; Chappell 2002a; Vickers 1994) and constitutional and legal systems (Dobrowolsky and Hart 2003). When combined, these analyses demonstrate the importance of gender norms in shaping the experiences of men and women within these structures as well as to the outcomes and opportunities they afford. Moreover, they warn against making assumptions about the operation of gender norms, even within similar institutions.

**Gendering Institutions**

If institutions are gendered in ways which privilege masculine norms, then what is the point of encouraging social actors, especially feminists who aim to challenge the gender status quo, to engage with them? The answer lies in another aspect of institutions identified in the neo-institutionalist literature: *institutional dynamism*. This notion relates to the proposition that although institutions tend toward stability and ‘path dependency’, they are not fixed, permanent or completely stable entities (see Steinmo and Thelen 2002, 16-7; Pierson 2004). This does not contradict the argument made above about the existence of a logic of appropriateness within political
institutions, but qualifies it to suggest that what is considered appropriate can alter over time (Katsenstein 1998, 35). Crises or shocks, such as a natural disaster, terrorist attack or an economic recession can induce an acceptance of different or new norms. But more commonly, institutional change comes about through an incremental or evolutionary process (Campbell 2005, 58). As Kingdon (2003), amongst others, has argued, such a process is often driven by ‘policy entrepreneurs’ or innovators working from within or outside institutions to change the rules.

A comparative politics of gender and institutions can contribute to a better understanding of normative institutional change and provide feminist activists with examples of successful strategies for advancing such change. Feminist scholars have already begun to highlight examples of feminist agency in relation to institutions. Katzenstein’s excellent comparison of feminists working through the Catholic Church and the military in the United States to bring about equality is a case in point. As she argues:

Less lawbreaking than norm-breaking, these feminists have challenged, discomforted, and provoked, unleashing a wholesale disturbance of long-settled assumptions, norms and practices (1998, 7).

Katzenstein’s analysis is similar to work on Australian femocrats (Eisenstein 1996; Sawer 1990) and that of Lee Ann Banazsak’s on women activists in the US bureaucracy (Banazsak 2005) both of which highlight the ability of gender equality activists to disrupt existing norms once they avail themselves of the opportunity to work from within. Equally, as Gelb’s (2003) comparison between the US and Japan demonstrates, and the chapters in Banaszak, Beckwith and Rucht (2003) on women’s movements in Western Europe and North America show, feminist actors working from ‘outside’ institutions have, under certain conditions, also enjoyed a degree of agency, enabling them to unsettle expectations about the role of men and women within institutions and to bring about shifts in policy, legislative and legal outcomes.

A good example of successful policy entrepreneurship can be found in the case of feminists working within the Canadian legal and constitutional system. Through lobbying tactics, feminists were able to influence the direction of debates over the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, and eventually ensured the entrenchment of sex-based equality clauses within it (Dobrowolsky 2003). Having achieved this much,
they were then able to engage in Charter litigation and introduce a gender perspective to Charter jurisprudence (Chappell 2002a).

These studies of ‘insider’ and ‘outsider’ activism demonstrate that the interaction between activists and institutions not only operates in a top-down direction (although this can occur) but also as a two-way street: that the relationship can be constitutive. In engaging with institutions, feminists have had some success in being able to recast their gender foundations and thereby create openings for further engagement. However, a note of caution should be sounded here as there is no guarantee that shifts within institutions are ever permanent. The task for those undertaking a comparative politics of gender and institutions is to identify the conditions under which gender norms can be disrupted and when, where and which institutions are most likely to be open to feminist demands.

**Gender and Institutions across time and place**

All institutions are gendered and can, under certain circumstances, be reconstituted in terms of their gender foundations. But as noted above, norms do not operate in the same way across all institutions and nor do they manifest themselves in the same way in similar institutions in different political environments. In order to fully comprehend the ways in which gender processes operate within institutions and the outcomes of these processes, I suggest that it is necessary to carve out a comparative research agenda which is multi-directional; one that moves vertically and horizontally within particular polities; cross-nationally and internationally as well as temporally.

A vertical research path takes as the unit of analysis a similar institution at the national and sub-national level of government in a single polity. The work of Jill Vickers and of Joan Grace discussed at this workshop are good examples here. An example drawn from my own research is women’s engagement with the bureaucracy at the Federal and state levels in Australia. Here I have shown that feminists have been able to make inroads into public service agencies at both levels of government because of an overall weak enforcement of particular gendered bureaucratic norms, especially neutrality. However, the success of the strategy of bureaucratic entrism (at least until recently) has also relied on the presence a left-leaning Labor Party Government (2002a; 2006a). The advantage of a vertical analysis is that it provides a
thick, contextualized account of the operation of gender norms within a specific institutional setting and can challenge existing assumptions; in this case, that Australian feminists face a similar POS within the public service across both state and federal levels of government. Furthermore, it highlights the fact that different levels of the state are, or may be, gendered in different ways.

A horizontal research agenda can build upon a vertical one. Accepting that gender processes and outcomes may vary within similar institutions in a particular context, a horizontal approach broadens the field of analysis to consider what differences exist across the array of political institutions within a single polity. In relation to advanced democracies, it involves the simultaneous examination of gender within legislatures and electoral systems, the bureaucracy and constitutional and judicial institutions. Using this approach to study women’s engagement with the Australian state, I found that the operation of masculine gender norms in certain institutions, Parliament and the judicial and legal systems in particular, made them hostile to the presence of women and lead to production of gender insensitive laws. By contrast, the bureaucracy has supported equality claims through public policies and has also been more open to the presence of internal feminist activists (Chappell 2002a). As with vertical studies, those that address the horizontal institutional axis also provide a thick and contextualized analysis; in addition they provide a deeper understanding about how gender operates across the political institutional spectrum which is especially beneficial for making an assessment about the POS available to feminist actors. Another advantage of such an approach is that is makes it possible to identify the independent effect that the pattern of interaction between various institutions within a given polity – for example, the interplay between political parties and the bureaucracy or a bill of rights and the judiciary - can have on shaping internal institutional norms, policy outcomes and opportunities for political engagement.

Undertaking vertical and horizontal research within a given polity raises questions about particularization. How far do conclusions about the operation of gender within a particular entity or set of institutions in one country reflect experiences in other countries? To find out it is necessary to undertake cross-national vertical and horizontal research. In a recent article, Katherine Tegthsoonian and I compared the demise of women’s policy machinery in the Australian state of New South Wales with
the Canadian province of British Columbia. In our analysis, we were surprised to find that there were many (negative) similarities in policy outcomes in both jurisdictions regardless of the presence or absence of governments of the left (Teghtsoonian and Chappell, 2008). Our findings challenge the conventional wisdom in my own and others research (see Chappell, 2002a; Bashevkin 1998; Mazur 2001) that new-leftist governments are more supportive of gender equity concerns – a conclusion that would not have been as apparent in a single case analysis. Cross-national horizontal studies are also important for revealing interesting similarities and differences. For instance, in a comparison of Australia and Canada – both federal, Westminster, common law states – I found significant variations between similar institutions. Compared with Australia, masculine legal norms within the Canadian constitutional and judicial system were much less prominent and the system was much more open to claims of equality seekers.

The application of a comparative politics of gender and institutions need not be confined to the level of the nation state. International institutions also have their own logic of appropriateness which is shaped by and shapes gender norms. Scholars have already begun to undertake research which compares different international arenas to reveal this logic. For example, studies which undertake a vertical comparison of the United Nations (UN) - which exists as a complex array of different agencies - demonstrate that despite a commitment to the principle of gender equality, most UN bodies, including human rights treaty bodies have failed to make gender a policy priority (see Freeman 1999; Gallagher 1998). Efforts to introduce notions of gender equality and gender mainstreaming into the treaty bodies have been met at best with misunderstanding and a lack of support and at worst outright hostility (Charlesworth 2005; Rahmani 2005). As a result, transnational women’s rights activists have found it difficult to engage with or influence these agencies. On the other hand, these activists have found other UN arenas, especially the series of international world conferences on women including the 1995 Beijing Conference much more dynamic and open to their demands (Friedman 2003). It is no surprise then that the locus of transnational women’s rights lobbying in the past 20 years has been these conferences rather than the Committee overseeing the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) or other UN treaty bodies.
Waylen and Rai’s (2008) collection on transforming global governance will be an important contribution to this literature, providing a different type of horizontal comparison that considers the operation of gender across international institutional areas including the UN, the World Bank, and the International Criminal Court. Other transnational comparative directions are also possible: for example, research on the role gender plays in shaping the policy outcomes of regional bodies such as the EU and APEC (Prugl 2007; True 2005).

Understanding the logic of appropriateness within and across international and regional institutions is important for explaining the choice of strategies used by transnational actors. It is also necessary for understanding the operation of domestic-level institutions. Diffused from the international level to the nation state, new norms can challenge and replace existing ones within institutions, including gender related norms (Keck and Sikkink 1998). Krook’s analysis of the diffusion of gender quota’s demonstrates this process very well (2006). Often, the carriers of these norms are national and transnational social movements. Thus it is important any future comparative research strategy also look at the role of such movements as they engage across countries and regions and with international institutions to challenge the gender status quo.

A final point concerning the direction for future comparative research of gender and institutions relates to the need to take account of the temporal dimension. Time is important to these studies in two senses. The first sense relates to the importance of historically grounding any study of gender and institutions. As Paul Pierson reminds us, history matters because ‘placing politics in time can greatly enrich both the explanations we offer for social outcomes of interest, and the very outcomes that we identify as worth explaining’ (2004, 2). Concentrating on the here and now does not capture the complexity of gender processes, the reasons why gender relations have evolved to their current state. In Nancy Burns’ view: ‘gender is easier to see over space and time, after the researcher does the work of adding up the many often-small wrongs through which gender inequalities are manifest’(2005, 140) . An analysis over time also makes it possible to see the dynamic nature of the relationship between gender and institutions in terms of outcomes or feminist engagement; in other words, to better explain gender processes.
It is only through retrospective analyses that we are able to identify how the gender foundations of an institution can be ‘reinscribed’ and what forces need to be in alignment to provide a positive opportunity structure. Such forces may include the presence of a responsive government, a ‘liberal’ court, and a reform-focused public service – but as activists know only too well, such alignments are not only rare but rarely permanent. The election of a different government, the appointment of new members of the judiciary or changes in personnel in the public sector can lead to a retreat back to an earlier logic of appropriateness or the creation of a new but equally restrictive one. For instance, as Australian femocrats have discovered in recent years, the election of a conservative federal government opposed to ‘special’ interest groups as well as state labor governments without an equality agenda, has led to the downgrading of their institutional status and position such that – for those willing to remain in the bureaucracy – their ability to shape policy is negligible (see Sawer 2004; 2007; Chappell 2006a). Comparing developments historically prevents the development of overly pessimistic or optimistic conclusions in regard to the outcomes of gender processes within institutions by reminding us that the dynamic relationship moves back and forward over time.

The second sense in which time is important to a comparative politics of gender and institutions concerns the issue of ‘newness’ – a concept that is starting to gain more attention in feminist political science. Beckwith has recently highlighted the significance of newness in relation to the election of women to legislatures for the first time and the significance of this variable for the substantive representation of women (2007). However, it is not just the newness of the actors involved in institutions that is important to advancing gender equality, but the newness of the institutions themselves. Kantola’s work on the way new institutions in Scotland after devolution provided new forms of engagement between activists and the state (2006, 140). In my work on the International Criminal Court (2006b; 2008), I suggest that the creation of the Court gave gender advocates an arena in which to state their claims that was free from the biases and vested interests, or the ‘congealment’ of norms, that can be found in existing institutions. Waylen (2008, 273) has also considered this point arguing that: “There is …some evidence to support the belief that the creation of new institutions can offer opportunities for gender concerns to be incorporated
more easily and fundamentally at the outset of an institution’s life than it is to ‘add them in’ at a later stage”. She gives as examples the new constitutions such as those in South Africa, and in the devolved institutions in Scotland and Wales. As we both argue, newness on its own is not enough to secure gender equality but alongside other variables including supportive advocates, and a favourable framing of gender issues, it seems newness can make a real difference.

**Conclusion**

It would be naïve to suggest that developing a politics of gender and institutions is without challenges. One of the most obvious relates to undertaking research within and between very different political contexts that involves complex methodological, conceptual and resource issues. This type of research is not one which I have engaged in, and it seems I am not alone. As Tripp (2006, 261) has pointed out, there are too few studies of this type; most gender and politics research is focused on those parts of the world where the data is the strongest – that is advanced industrialized nations, especially Europe and North America. But it is only through an understanding how gender operates within institutions in less advanced democracies and non-democratic systems that we can fully understand its effects both in terms of policy outcomes and opportunities for feminist actors.

A second issue, which has long been discussed in the literature, is how to address the intersection between gender and other identities within an institutional context (see Weldon 2006). Working out how to isolate, measure and encapsulate the complexities of identity across the various institutional levels, sites and time-frames will be task which requires careful thought, planning and patience.

These are big challenges but they are not insurmountable. With careful research design, and drawing on historical neo-institutionalist theory, it will be possible to extend our knowledge of gender and institutions. We already know that the gender processes are complex. They play out differently at different levels of the state, and can vary in similar institutions in different polities and in different institutions within the same polity. A future comparative politics and gender research agenda can build on this knowledge through further cross-time and cross-national studies and also by linking our knowledge of domestic institutions to those in the international arena. In
doing so, we offer to the study of institutions a more comprehensive and complete understanding of their normative foundations and dynamic nature at the same time as providing a new dimension to comparative research.
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