Summary Review of the FRS Annotated Bibliography
by Hana Nasser and Eileen Ying
for the
The University of Michigan
Feminist Research Seminar

**Opposition to the Political Participation of Women and Gender Justice Advocates:
Building a Feminist Research Agenda**
Co-convened by Jennifer M. Piscopo and Denise Walsh
October 19 - Sunday, October 22, 2017

The annotated bibliography on opposition to the political participation of women and gender justice advocates consists of a total of 81 sources that include a variety of scholarly articles and policy-oriented reports, the latter often commissioned or prepared by national or supranational governments or by international non-governmental organizations. Many of the sources deal with opposition to women in formal politics; there is a robust literature examining electoral procedures, party practices, and the antagonisms and obstacles that women face once they enter elected office. Far less research exists on informal politics (i.e. political interactions that occur outside conventional state institutions and political parties). The opposition faced by gender justice advocates and women activists consequently receives little attention when compared to that paid to the obstacles faced by women politicians.

The literature is also limited in its analytical lenses and geographical scope. Of the roughly 25 sources focused on the United States, only six take intersectionality into account. Of these six, only three – Aoki (1995); Bedolla, Tate and Wong (2014); and Hawkesworth (2003) – focus *primarily* on the intersection of different systems of oppression. Notably, all three analyze race and gender. None of the sources investigate how sexual orientation, gender identity, class, or ability affect modes and degrees of opposition.

Comparative case studies and cross-national analyses, too, are sparse. Those studies looking beyond the United States tend to focus on the Global North and, more recently, Latin America. For reference, approximately 49 percent of the total sources focus on the Global North (with the United States making up over 60 percent of that subset), and about 14 percent focus on Latin America. Only a handful of articles and reports are situated in Africa, the Middle East, and South Asia (India is an exception); hardly any address East Asia or Eastern Europe.

Looking across sources, a divide appears between the language of "backlash" and that of "violence." Backlash-centered analysis seems to manifest mainly in European and American contexts, whereas "violence" features more heavily in the Global South. This difference could be purely semantic or linked to a tendency to distance the Global North from violence. Although the two terms refer to slightly different phenomena – as Mansbridge and Shames write, backlash is a *reaction* to lost power through coercive action (2008) – there are several cases in which acts of backlash in the Global North could be categorized as violence, but are not. For example, Sanbonmatsu (2008) identifies "male hostility toward women legislators" as one possible manifestation of political backlash, but does not go so far as to label it, as Bardall (2011) might,

"socio-psychological" violence. The focus on "violence" in the Global South might also be strategic: by highlighting violence against women *in politics*, for instance, academics and activists can build on the networks, campaigns, and policies formed to address violence against women more generally (Piscopo 2016).

Scholars as well as policy analysts writing for governmental or non-governmental organizations have devised frameworks for understanding terms such as "backlash" and "violence." There is clearly a push to understand various oppositional phenomena in a big-picture sort of way; we see a proliferation of definitions, classifications, categorizations, typologies, and scales. Bardall (2011, 2013, 2015) attempts to distinguish between electoral violence and violence against women, Krook and Restrepo Sanin (2016) engage Piscopo (2016) in an intellectual debate over the nature of violence against women in politics (VAWIP), and Mansbridge and Shames (2008) propose a general theory of backlash, to name a few. While some scholars advocate policy responses that hinge on electoral reform, others locate solutions outside of formal politics, such as strengthening criminal regulation of VAWIP, increasing workplace protections, and expanding the definition of "violence" within legal codes (e.g., Piscopo 2016, Restrepo Sanin 2016). However, there is currently no indication of a unified or singular approach, neither in terms of theories, concepts, and categories nor in terms of policy responses.

Some points of broad consensus exist, and there are common themes that run through the literature. Most of the sources – at least most of the sources that attend to formal, electoral politics – argue that corrective measures like quotas and affirmative action do not necessarily remedy gender imbalances in political institutions, that they certainly do not shield women from opposition, and that these corrective measures themselves are susceptible to backlash. For instance, gender quotas are easily delegitimized without sufficient political will (Krook 2016, Clayton 2015). On a more general note, scholars largely agree that the deepest and most pressing causes of opposition lie at the systems-level and that backlash in response to the political participation of women and gender justice advocates is rooted in these systems. Thus, structural change (rather than, say, greater representation of women) is imperative for an end to all forms of opposition that emerge against the political participation of women and gender justice advocates.