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Abstract

This research project examined four strategies to promote democratic governance, women’s rights and gender equality in the Anglophone Caribbean. First, women’s political leadership was explored for the extent to which it creates greater governmental will and capacity to more actively and effectively transform gender relations both within and outside of the state. Second, quota systems were assessed for their impact on effective women’s participation and leadership in representative government. Third, the usefulness of national gender policy documents for promoting gender equality was evaluated. Finally, the impact of feminist movement-building on women’s capacity to be effective transformational leaders within democratic political life was investigated.

Each of these factors have the potential to expand the spaces for realizing women’s rights and gender equality, create greater capacity (among women and men) to achieve transformed gender relations, and shift the gender ideologies that present resistances to women’s effective political participation and leadership. Together, they reflect a core set of historical struggles waged across the Anglophone Caribbean. This project therefore sought to document the history of struggle in five Caribbean nations. It focused on specific countries where these struggles appear to have been won. Trinidad and Tobago provided an appropriate case study for examining the impact of women’s contemporary political leadership, Guyana for exploring the impact of quota systems, Dominica and Jamaica for exploring the formulation and impact of national gender policies, and the Caribbean Institute for Women in Leadership (CIWiL) for evaluating the impact of feminist advocacy on women’s rights, effectiveness and representation in democratic governance in St. Lucia. These cases thus investigate four global strategies for advancing democratic governance, women’s rights and gender equality. They offer insights into transnational, regional and national alliances between states, international organisations, NGOs and feminist movements, and demonstrate the relevance of national case studies for understanding regional and global experiences. Indeed, we argue that both regional and national case studies are essential if we are to understand how democracy, the state and politics are and can be sites for renegotiating gender relations in different twenty-first century contexts.


Research Problem and Justification

It has often been argued that women’s participation in democratic political systems has enhanced the active pursuit of equality and social justice for all members of a society (WRC and IDRC 2009). Advocates of this position claim that “when women are involved in all aspects of political life,…societies are more equitable and democracy is both strengthened and enhanced” (IPU 2008, 2). Yet, as the Southern African case demonstrates, direct correlation cannot be assumed between women’s participation in politics and improved gender equality (Meintjes 2010). Thus, given global evidence that women’s political representation (WRC and IDRC 2009) and state commitment to gender mainstreaming have been increasing steadily, though still marginally, since the Fourth World Conference of Women in 1995, the mixed results of this move highlighted the need for further research into the relationship between strengthening democracy and struggles for women’s rights and gender equality. These struggles have taken several forms. A focus on four of them---women’s political leadership, quota systems, national gender policies and women’s advocacy for transformational leadership---offers useful entry points for evaluating the nexus of gender justice, women’s participation and leadership, democracy and governance, and feminist history in the Anglophone Caribbean.

The case studies explored whether the growing visibility and number of women in political leadership have translated into gains for women, both women leaders and those who currently occupy marginalized positions in societies. To what extent is their participation in democratic governance changing inequitable and undemocratic practices within governmental bodies and civil society? Have quota systems helped to increase women’s leadership and effective representation of women’s interests in democratic processes? To what extent have they transformed governance in political parties and state governance structures in ways that advance women’s interests and gender equality? Has the turn to policy solutions been productive for achieving these goals? In particular, what have been the effects of national gender policies on gender relations and struggles for gender justice, and what explains the nature of their impact? How has feminist advocacy empowered women leaders and how has this translated into transformed power relations? How are twenty-first century shifts in gender ideologies stimulated by women’s movements, shaping access to, exercise and redistributions of rights and power among women and men? What are the implications for a generation of younger women in terms of their perceptions of and approaches to both politics in the state and feminist politics? Finally, how does a focus on these questions point analysis beyond policy objectives to further thinking about strategies for their effective implementation?

The intersection of institutionalized masculinism and new exclusionary practices,
national gender machineries and policies, women’s rights advocacy and civil society mobilization suggests a framework for outlining the coherences and contradictions between democratic practices and women’s empowerment. The research assessed when, why and how governance is underscored by gender inequality. The Anglophone Caribbean provided an ideal region for conducting comparative research on these intersections. Five countries in particular, Trinidad and Tobago, Guyana, Jamaica, St. Lucia and Dominica, offered contexts where democratic governance, women’s rights and gender equality could be differently examined. Each brought specific experiences of female political leadership, uneven female representation at parliamentary and local government levels (despite Guyana’s quota system), limited success with implementing national gender policies, continued struggles to address women’s rights and power, and on-the-ground challenges to women’s organizing and advocacy on questions of good governance.

Overall, then, the research investigated the impact and effectiveness of feminist strategies to promote democratic governance, women’s rights and gender equality in the Caribbean. The problem of engendering democracy and governance was understood within the context of gender ideologies, masculinist resistances, historical, cultural and political-economic dynamics, institutional practices, women’s movement struggles and generational shifts in perceptions of power and politics.

This exploration of women’s understandings of politics, experiences of political contestation across state and civil society, and the possibilities for gender transformation in the Anglophone Caribbean, aimed to better inform strategic activities aimed at increasing women’s meaningful and influential political participation regionally, and the transformation of Caribbean societies into truly egalitarian spaces.

To this end, the research was guided by one main question:

*Have feminist strategies to engender democracy and governance, with particular attention to women’s political leadership, electoral quota systems, national gender policies and transformational leadership, effectively advanced women’s rights and gender equality in the Anglophone-Caribbean?*

The sub-questions that guided the overall research process were:

1. What is the impact of women’s political leadership on women’s access to and effective participation in parliamentary and local government systems? What has been the impact of elected female representatives at national and local government levels as well as those on
boards, commissions and other high level fora? How, and to what extent has women’s political leadership stimulated shifts in governmental approaches to women’s rights, and ideologies and practices regarding gender equality? What are the implications for the political participation of a younger generation of gender-conscious young women and men?

2. What is the impact of quota systems on women’s access to and effective leadership in parliamentary and local government politics? Where and how do the kinds of struggles, debates and resistances that continue to take place in relation to women’s rights, gender equality and democratic participation occur? What are the cultural norms, ethnic and gender ideologies, gender bargaining and political party dynamics that shape understandings and effectiveness of quota systems? What is the relationship between quota systems and women representatives’ contribution to legal and policy reforms as well as women’s movements’ inclusion in participatory democratic and governance processes?

3. What is the impact of national gender policies on state planning, legislation and programs that aim to increase gender equality and equity? How are the challenges and limitations that create disjunctures between policy, implementation and transformation of gender relations understood and negotiated? What impacts have women had on policy outcomes? How have age, ethnicity, class, religion and other intersecting identities shaped women’s approaches to and perceptions of policy level solutions?

4. What is the impact of feminist advocacy on women leaders in political and civic life? How has feminist advocacy empowered women leaders and transformed masculinist Caribbean political spaces so that both can advance gender justice? What is the nature and quality of links between female political elites and feminist movements? What do these links suggest about the significance of culture, notions of difference within and among women, and generational shifts in gender identities and relations?

5. How can a mixed method, gendered approach that includes historical and cross country comparison, national case studies, a region-wide case study, in-depth interviews and participant observation empower female and male leaders to transform gender relations, masculinist privilege, institutional hierarchies, structural inequalities, and both formal rules and informal relations, in order to make democratic participation enhance equality, equity and justice?
These questions brought together intersecting concerns with the power relations in political spaces and the gender ideologies that shape them; women’s investments in, as well as strategies for mitigating the costs of leadership; advocacy networks that combine state institutions, political parties and civil society organisations, particularly those struggling for women’s rights; and the opportunities for as well as resistances to transforming democratic governance within the state and political parties.

**Overview of Relevant Research**

Overall, the research engaged existing knowledge on women’s political participation and representation; the rule of law, human rights and women’s access to justice; the role of political parties and the state in advancing women’s leadership; and the implications of informal spheres, activities and relations for gender equality and equity. It built on common trends suggested by the global literature.

For example, it remains difficult for women to win political office, to champion changes that challenge the status quo and promote gender justice while there, and to negotiate the complex cultural dynamics of political party and civil society responses to women’s rights (Kazi 2010). Even where women are involved in political parties, male party members continue to play a significant role in determining their position, forms of participation, policy positions and electoral success, and women’s entry has not diminished male dominated power structures (Meintjes 2010). In this sense, male domination as well as resistance, both effects of masculinism, continue to shape political culture (Ashworth 1996, Fallon 2008, Goetz 2007). Concomitantly, women remain peripheral to the democratisation agenda and to political party agendas. Not surprisingly, therefore, young women’s leadership, and capacity of young women and men to transform gender injustice, remains underdeveloped.

There is uneven capacity and will among women political leaders to expand (particularly across class) women’s participation and decision-making in political processes. Further, female political elites’ lack of accountability for and to women and their interests (particularly over party interests) highlight the structural and relational challenges faced by women in and out of the state (Kazi 2010). Even where quota systems are in place, there has been slow progress in increasing women’s leadership in formal politics, suggesting that a range of complementary strategies, including incentives and enforcement mechanisms, are needed to address material and ideological relations of gender, and to make women’s physical presence and attendance translate into decision-making power (Peschard 2002). Gaps remain between legal and substantive equality despite legislation, public policy and gender mainstreaming, often because
these are poorly linked to planning and projects across national and local levels. Additionally, women’s influence over budgets and success in gaining allocations to fund women’s practical and strategic needs remains limited. These limitations are reproduced not only by gender relations in formal spheres, but also by women’s experiences of community and family contexts (Baden 2000, Hoskins and Rai 2007).

While noting these trends, the Anglophone Caribbean also provided a different political context from West Africa where, for example, questions of women’s political participation are affected by conflict and militarism. It also reflected a different economic context from the Middle East and North Africa, where women have extremely low economic activity ratios to men and where religiously defined spaces may be necessary to legitimize political participation. While the issues raised by the South Asian experience, such as inequality within the family and along class lines are also relevant, the high ratios of Anglophone Caribbean women with secondary and tertiary education as well as in professional occupations speaks to the different intersections of class, generation and gender that have to be taken into account.

The Anglophone Caribbean has an enviable record of research and activism concerned with women’s rights, gender equality and development. Indeed, the database provided on the region by the research of WAND has inspired feminist researchers around the world. However, this research has focused primarily on employment and education, providing crucial data for developmental questions and advocacy for improving women’s access to relevant training and employment in the region. Research on political representation, women’s rights and gender equality has taken second place to economic issues.

Nevertheless, in the last two decades the question of women’s political advancement has become a burning issue for feminists in the region as well as for some policy makers and NGOs. The emergence of female political leaders, quota systems, gender policies and NGO activism seeking to advance women’s rights and gender equality testifies to the growing concern with these issues. This local concern resonates with a growing international preoccupation with the persistent sidelining of women and gender equality in political processes around the world. Development agencies, particularly the United Nations, have sought to
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address this issue. Yet the progress of women around the world continues to be disappointingly slow. The Caribbean appears to be one of the leaders in this struggle, having already achieved some female political representation, a quota system in Guyana, gender policies in a number of states as well as an active feminist civil society. Nevertheless, we have little more than anecdotal evidence that these efforts are working, and indeed some suggestions that they are not.

Given the failure of Liberia’s female president to halt gender-based violence and the continuing epidemic of rapes in South Africa despite its impressive number of women parliamentarians, it is little wonder that development agencies as well as scholars and activists around the world are increasingly concerned with the effectiveness of existing efforts to engender democracy in ways that will advance women’s rights and gender equality. The Anglophone Caribbean, with its varied approaches to this problem, thus provide an exciting opportunity for comparative, in-depth research into four of the established strategies for enhancing women’s rights and gender equality, and the possibility for providing a deeper understanding to an ongoing, seemingly intractable problem. It offers important new insights into a key developmental priority in the region. Indeed, this is a worldwide problem.

Yet, the Anglophone Caribbean, because of its post-colonial political context, relatively high participation of girls and women in schooling and the labour market, and history of feminist advocacy and gender mainstreaming, provides a different lens to the global questions asked about democratic governance and gender equality. At the same time, gaps in understanding the pan-Caribbean experience of women’s political participation and leadership, struggles over institutional shifts (including quota systems and policy solutions), and the formal and informal impacts of women’s movements suggest the necessity of research on the subtle yet resilient forces working against gender equality and transformation in democratic processes. These remain a challenge to advocates of gender justice and women’s rights.

Primarily, this research project has sought to examine the subtle ways that established, generally masculinist, hierarchies have been able to integrate women and marginalized men into power structures, while neither losing their grip on power, nor seriously disturbing the common-sense link between hegemonic masculinity and power. Camille Samuel’s (2010) work on corporate turnaround leadership, using a combination of quantitative and qualitative research has uncovered mechanisms reinforcing this process. Gabrielle Hosein’s (2008) ethnographic study of public life and the state demonstrates the important political implications of everyday social interactions and their gendered processes, as well as the need to pay attention to the meanings democracy, politics and the state hold for women on the ground.
Drawing on this and other scholarship, the research project has produced a historical, regional and comparative analysis of four strategies to advance gender justice in the Anglophone Caribbean. It has additionally produced five ethnographic national case studies of the daily practices, collaborations, compromises and conflicts that emerge around efforts to enable the four strategies being studied---political leadership, quotas, gender policies and advocacy---to foster women’s advancement and gender equality. We believe this approach best reveals some of the subtle ways that women’s advancement through these various mechanisms is being undermined and fostered.

It is particularly important to move beyond the “numbers game”, wherein marginalized groups are brought into inner circles of power, but in ways that do little to alter established gender (as well as racial, ethnic, generational and class) hierarchies. The failures of a purely integrative approach to gender transformation, with simply adding women or also bringing in issues of diversity, demonstrates the need to move beyond numerical “solutions.” Representation requires more than just bodies in previously male-dominated spaces. It requires new ways of understanding the subtle, deeply felt and persistent assumptions and practices that undermine efforts at change by women and men.

Gender ideologies, masculinist resistances, historical, cultural and political-economic dynamics, institutional practices, women’s movement strategies and generational shifts explain the impact and effectiveness of engendering democracy and governance in the Anglophone Caribbean. Before detailing what the case study approach seeks to offer, an appreciation of the relevant commonalities and differences that define the region are necessary. These point to the regional relevance of the country-specific case study approach, even while national specificity is explored.

The Caribbean Context

Across the region and particularly for the three countries under study, certain commonalities and differences around women and politics emerge. The UNDP 2013 Human Development Report (HDR) Gender Inequality Index, which examines life expectancy, literacy, schooling and income, places the Anglophone Caribbean countries in a range from #61 (Barbados, down from 29 in 2005 and 30 in 2009), to Trinidad and Tobago (#50, down from 48 in 2005 and up from 53 in 2009), Jamaica at #87 (down from 75 in 2005 and 81 in 2009) and Guyana at #104 (down from 79 in 2005 and 96 in 2009). This is despite an increase in

women’s access to tertiary education across the region, placing women’s enrolment above that of males at all levels. As a consequence, women in the region are increasingly moving into better jobs. In 2013, the percentage of females in the professional and technical workforce is impressive. Women in Barbados are 52 percent of this workforce, Trinidad and Tobago report 55 percent, Guyana is 59 percent, and Jamaica, Dominica and St. Lucia have not provided statistics.

At the same time, the rise in access to higher education and professional/technical jobs has not closed the gap between male and female pay. In 2013, Barbadian males earned on average about US$22,779 to women’s $14,850; the Trinidad and Tobago ratio was $34,168 for males compared to females’ $19,286; and Guyanese men earned $4745 compared with $2047 for women. The divide in Jamaica is narrower, with men earning almost $8882 and women $5338. Thus the Anglophone Caribbean clusters at the bottom of the highly developed countries (Barbados), while most are in the high (Trinidad and Tobago, Dominica, St. Lucia, Grenada, Saint Kitts and Nevis) and medium (Jamaica, Guyana, Haiti) human development category. In 2013, none were in the lowest category (HDR 2005; 2009, 2013). Nevertheless, there are clearly challenges that need addressing, especially in regard to access more equitable pay and top-ranking professional employment.

These challenges require attention to gender equity in the workplace and education, but they also highlight the importance of increasing women’s participation and impact in the political arena. Women’s groups, feminist activists and scholars have long understood this, and the struggle to obtain women’s voting rights has a long history in the region. Women received the right to vote for the most part in 1940s and ’50s, but the gap between the right to vote and women’s entry into politics was depressingly wide. It was sixteen years in Barbados and Trinidad and Tobago for a woman to be elected to government, twenty-nine years in Dominica and eight years in Guyana. The only exception, Jamaica, elected a woman the year women gained the vote (ECLAC 2007, 7). Nevertheless, in the last twenty years, women have begun to enter political life in increasing numbers, at national, local and organizational levels.

Indeed, the HDR 1995, which focused on women, highlighted Guyana, Jamaica and Trinidad and Tobago as leading countries in women’s political representation. Guyana’s parliament was 20 percent female, Jamaica’s 12 percent and Trinidad and Tobago, 18 percent. Women at ministerial rank were 11 percent (Guyana), 5 percent (Jamaica) and 19 percent
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(Trinidad and Tobago). These figures contrasted with a world average of 10 percent in parliament and 6 percent in cabinet (HDR 1995, 442). The HDR figures for 2005 and 2009 continue to reflect that shift, although the trajectory is not always upwards. The percentage of women parliament members in Barbados moved from 17.6 percent (2005) to 14 percent (2009); Trinidad and Tobago moved from 25.4 percent to 33 percent; Jamaica moved from 13.6 percent to 14 percent and Guyana from 30.8 percent to 30 percent. In 2013, the proportion of seats held by women was 17% in Barbados, 13% in Dominica, 31% in Guyana, 13% in Jamaica, 17% in St. Lucia and 29% in Trinidad and Tobago. Women have also increasingly entered the ranks of legislators, senior officials and management, with Barbados ranking 12th, Trinidad and Tobago 11th, Guyana, 74th, Jamaica 1st. There is no data for St. Lucia and Dominica.

Yet numbers alone can only begin to paint a picture of women’s political participation. Policies, laws and programs aimed at assisting women’s entry into and effective participation in the political arena are also important. The region has a varied record in this regard. Quota systems are well-known in the Spanish speaking Caribbean and Latin America, but while attempted in Trinidad and Tobago in 2000 and being currently advocated for in Jamaica by the women’s NGO, the 51% Alliance Coalition, Guyana has the only quota system in the Anglophone Caribbean, which is for 30 percent representation in parliament. Gender policies have been put in place in the Cayman Islands, Dominica, Jamaica, Belize and the British Virgin Islands. Trinidad and Tobago commissioned a gender policy, which was developed by the Institute for Gender and Development Studies at the University of the West Indies, St. Augustine. However, its recommendation for reproductive rights and sexual choice soon ran aground in the face of public and institutionalized hostility. A revised version, without the offending clauses, is currently working its way through the system.

Table 3: Women representation in national parliaments in the independent Anglophone Caribbean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>World Rank</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Lower or Single House</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seats*</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>% Women</td>
<td>Seats*</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>% Women</td>
<td>Seats*</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Grenada</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Guyana</td>
<td>65*</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Saint Lucia</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Bahamas</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Saint Vincent and the Grenadines</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Dominica</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Antigua and Barbuda</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Saint Kitts and Nevis</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>Belize</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figures correspond to the number of seats filled in country parliaments on January 01, 2014.
This table comes from the chapter by Natalie Persadie, titled “Getting to One-Third? Creating Legislative Access to Political Space for Women in Guyana.”

With this regional picture in mind, the four case studies are discussed below.

**Case Study 1: Women’s Political Leadership in the Caribbean, with special attention to Trinidad and Tobago**

The first case study, focusing on Trinidad and Tobago, investigated the extent to which women’s political leadership has promoted democratic governance, women’s rights and gender equality.
As the global experience shows, women’s political leadership has had mixed results. In Asian countries such as India, Sri Lanka, Bangladesh and Indonesia, it has not translated into democratic processes more friendly to women’s leadership and participation, nor into more gender sensitive policy making (Waring 2010). However, in African countries such as Liberia, the picture is the opposite, but largely this is because of the exceptional leadership of women heads of state there (ibid). This is slightly different from the experience of Ghana and Tanzania, where key changes were supported by an active women’s movement in collaboration with other state and non-state actors. However, a key observation from African examples such as Malawi and Mozambique, and Asian examples such as the Philippines and Pakistan, is that female political elites can choose to advance women’s participation and rights or not (Meintjes 2010), and that ultimately a strong women’s movement with collaborative links with other NGOs, private sector organisations and state machineries is necessary for effective commitment by parties and states (IPU 2008). Within this nexus, the role of female political elites has been contradictory; in Latin America and the Spanish-speaking Caribbean, women’s presence among the visible political elite was part of wider, cross-class mobilization among women, but this kind of networking is far from the norm (Desposato and Norrander 200, Brasileiro 1996)\(^7\). Still, it has also been the route to successes in countries ranging from Peru, Argentina and Ecuador to Nepal. It is worth noting that even exceptional women’s leadership, for example in Rawanda and Liberia, has not been able to stop the epidemic of violence against women. Overall, however, this project builds on research agendas focused on women’s participation in formal politics and questions of their effective participation (Goetz and Hassim 2003) as well as the transformative roles that men can play.

There is some work on women’s political leadership in the Anglophone Caribbean (Barriteau and Cobley 2001, Barriteau 2003, Henry-Wilson 2004, Paravisini-Gebert 1996, Reddock 2004). The region has had mixed results from women’s leadership in three countries, Dominica, Guyana and Jamaica. While women have filled leadership posts at the highest levels, generally lower numbers of elected women in the lower house have been countered by higher levels of politically-appointed women in the upper house of parliament (Waring 2010). This has been the case in Dominica, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, St. Lucia, Haiti, Grenada, the Bahamas, Belize, Jamaica, Barbados and Trinidad and Tobago. However, not enough is understood comparatively about these experiences, and how they differ.

The experience from particular countries, such as Jamaica, suggests that the sexual

\(^7\) [http://www.pathwaysofempowerment.org/lamerica_projnewspolitics.html](http://www.pathwaysofempowerment.org/lamerica_projnewspolitics.html)
division of labour, women’s responsibility for the reproductive sphere and childcare, their lower levels of participation in elite corporate sectors, difficulties accessing informal male networks, the sexual double standard and the violence associated with politics continue to mitigate against women’s participation and leadership (Figueroa and Mortley 2008, 2009a, 2009b). This highlights the importance of paying attention to state and non-state factors (IPU 2008). This is similar to women’s experience in Malawi where women face challenges of lacking political experience, resources, education and connections as well as balancing productive, reproductive and community work, gender roles and personal, and home life (Tiessen 2008).

In relation to the Caribbean, four areas appear central to contemporary research on women’s leadership: the status of the regional feminist movement and its influence on representative politics; the impact of crime and violence, including in politics; the intergenerational shifts that have occurred in women’s political consciousness and involvement; and the impact of shifts in gender relations over the past two decades.

Currently, Trinidad and Tobago is the only Anglophone Caribbean country, besides Jamaica, to be led by a female head of state. A case study of Trinidad and Tobago therefore provides an ideal, contemporary moment when women’s leadership can be examined on its own terms and for its effects at different levels of political life, and compared to a history of women’s leadership at other periods, in other countries, across different political, economic, cultural and ideological contexts, and in terms of the status of the national and regional women’s movement at relevant moments. To this end, the research explores how greater governmental will and capacity to more actively and effectively transform gender relations within and outside of the state can be measured; the opportunities created and resistances met (in terms of skills, strategies, spaces, solidarities and ideologies); the role that political, economic, cultural and generational context plays; and the history of struggle on women’s political leadership nationally and regionally.

Case Study 2: Quota Systems in the Caribbean, With Special Attention to Guyana

The second case study explored whether quota systems have enabled more effective women’s participation and leadership in representative government.

Since 2008, constitutional or electoral law quotas have been present in forty-six countries (Waring 2010). Reserved seats and quota systems are seen as crucial to bringing more women into decision-making, but generally have had mixed results globally (Dahlerup 2005, Jayal 2006). For example, the experience of Uganda suggests that patriarchal structures
and institutions continue to limit the gains offered by affirmative action approaches\textsuperscript{8}. Similarly, the lessons from Burundi suggest that more widespread transformations in public and private life are necessary to increase women’s representation and the sensitivity of public policies and programs to women’s needs. The experiences of Ghanaian women similarly highlight that expanding women’s political participation requires countering cultural obstacles, familial pressures, discrepancies in financing secured by women candidates and more limited networks, and that the ultimate test of quota systems is whether the women who hold office are able to make substantial legislative, budgetary and strategic gains. Indeed, this raises the continued questions of whether 30% constitutes a critical capacity or whether 50% quotas are necessary, whether quotas for elected office are enough rather than these also being needed for boards, commissions and public offices, whether women can establish their own power without the patronage of powerful men in the party, and whether the women who do become elected are able to make legislative and policy gains translate into effective implementation without larger transformations to political structures.

The Costa Rican experience also suggests that quotas must be accompanied by sanctions. Yet, beyond the numbers, it is worth noting the case of Argentina, where in 2007, 40% of those elected to the lower chamber were women (a percentage mandated by law), but where implementation difficulties continued despite this record number. Rwanda probably offers the most stark examples of high levels of female participation, but limited legislative and budgetary gains. This differs from Ecuador where a legislated quota for women of 25% has translated into substantive constitutional provisions recognising women’s political, economic and sexual rights. Still, as with political leadership, quota systems function best when sanctions exist, quotas are for seats rather than candidacies, women’s movements are mobilized and capacity-building programs exist. This highlights the significance of understanding the intersections between women’s movement building, women’s leadership and political participation, as seen through examination of the CIWIL project in this study.

Quotas are generally, however, seen to be politically important and to reflect gains for women. Yet, it remains important to measure their impact in terms of specific legislative and policy outcomes (Goetz and Hassim 2003, Dahlerup 2006, Costa 2010). Particularly in relation to higher levels of political office, quotas are seen to be important because they threaten male dominance at the policy-making, rather than simply policy-implementing level. At the same time, they play the dual role of both subverting male dominance in political institutions and legitimizing

\textsuperscript{8} www.womensnews.org/story/the-world/060313/ugandas-pro-woman-program.
male dominated hierarchies and the consolidation of power amongst male and female political elites. Nonetheless, quota systems enable the securing of women’s greater political presence in representative institutions. This is the first step towards subverting gender imbalances in politics, policy-making and development agendas. Yet, as Kazi notes, quota systems do not address the class inequalities that fundamentally disempower women in political and civil life (Kazi 2010)

Traditionally, Caribbean countries have eschewed quota systems and in the context of high levels of female participation in schooling and the labour force, despite lower levels of political participation there may not be the climate for such electoral reforms. As with the case of Indonesia, enacting quota systems may be read as ‘discriminating’ against men (Waring 2010, 37) in a context where the myth of male marginalisation has influenced debates about women’s rights over the last two decades. Thus, the Anglophone Caribbean has only experimented with a formal quota system, at any level, in Guyana. Guyana currently has a system of legislated political party quotas requiring at least 30% of all electoral candidates be women. This has led to a rise in female representation in parliament, but little qualitative research exists on how this system functions and how women fare within it, or which women are involved and how they differ by class, ethnicity, sexuality, educational attainment or generation.

This presented an opportunity to study its impact in the period leading up to and following elections in that country. Guyana therefore provides the opportunity to use a national case study to examine quota systems in historical and contemporary perspective, to document the struggles that led to their inclusion in the constitution and the struggles that have followed, to explore whether they have expanded women’s participation and empowered them as leaders in democratic processes, and their impact on decision-making, policy formulation and representation by and for women in elections. The research also sought to explore the opportunities and resistances linked to quota system implementation within the specific political, economic and cultural context of Guyana, a relatively understudied country in terms of comparative Caribbean research.

Case Study 3: National Gender Policies in the Caribbean, With Special Attention to Dominica and Jamaica

The third case study examines the extent to which national gender policy documents have promoted gender equality, equity and justice.
National gender policies have had mixed results globally. Meintjes (2010) notes that despite extensive critique of such gender mainstreaming techniques, without these ‘paper rights’, substantial gains would not have been possible. Referring to the African experience, Mama (2002 in Meintjes 2010) points out that the development of legislation and policy has had the effect of depoliticizing important national issues within unelected policy-making state bodies, and that this reduces the influence of social movements.

The Caribbean has had a complex history of struggle over and toward the formulation of national gender policies. Such policies have been put in place in Dominica, the Cayman Islands, Belize and, in the form of women’s policies, in Antigua. Trinidad and Tobago is at a different stage in the formulation of such policies, and remains a key site for public deliberation on questions of gender justice across the region. However, far less research examines the effectiveness and limitations of such policies (ECLAC 1998).

On the one hand, national gender policies are a thread that connects struggles for women’s rights in governance processes across a range of Caribbean countries. Yet, as Dominica passed a policy since 2006, it presents the ideal site for a case study of national gender policy effects and issues of implementation in relation to historical, political, economic, cultural and institutional context. It also provides a possible picture into the future for other Caribbean nations seeking to pass and implement their own policies. A case study of Dominica therefore provides a contemporary moment when gender policies can be examined, and their strategies, resistances and impacts assessed. It also enables analysis of women’s movement struggles that cross-state and social spheres, and enables a sense of their commonalities and differences across the region. As with the other case studies, this one explores how the effects of policy formulation and implementation can be measured, as well as the opportunities and resistances that result from and respond to this process. As with the others as well, it pays close attention to a nuanced appreciation of the political, economic and cultural context. Over the period of the research, Jamaica passed its own National Policy for Gender Equality. Whereas the Dominica case study sought to explore the politics of policy-implementation, the Jamaica case study examined the text of the document itself to theorize about its connections with the politics of policy-making.

**Case Study 4: Feminist Advocacy and Transformational Leadership in the Caribbean, with Special Attention to CIWiL (The Caribbean Institute for Women in Leadership)**
The fourth case study focuses on exploring the extent to which feminist movement-building has expanded women’s capacity to be effective transformational leaders within democratic political life.

Women’s movements all over the world have long engaged the political process through providing support, resources and training to women in political life, across state and non-state spheres. Civil society and women’s movements have been the focus on gender and governance studies (Mutua 2009). Other studies have focused on how women’s organizations and women’s movements have engaged the state in order to promote women’s representation and gender equality (Albertyn et al. 1999, Ballington and Karam 2005, Bauer and Britton 2006, Fick et al. 2003, Hassim 2006, Lowe-Morna 2004).

A tremendous amount of feminist advocacy has been undertaken around the region over the last decades, but a contemporary assessment of their impact needs to be evaluated. This research needs to not only focus on the goals and strategies of women’s organizations’ struggles, but also the reactions and resistances of institutions and individuals, and the changing gendered and generational environment within which these take place. As Meintjes (2010) points out, research into “the intersection of masculinist state institutional culture, gender machinery, gender advocacy and civil society mobilization would provide new thinking on how a woman’s agenda might best be developed”.

The Caribbean has also witnessed at least two decades of feminist activism in support of women candidates in local and national government elections, as well as in areas such as union leadership. Campaigns have been waged during election periods and have included direct support of women candidates, the distribution of women’s manifestos, lobbying of and guidance to political parties, and efforts to get female politicians to identify with common interests across party lines. Given this diverse regional effort to expand the numbers of women in politics and to improve their effective leadership, as well as connected efforts to both theorize and train women as ‘transformational leaders’ (Barritteau 2001, Vassell 2001), the Caribbean Institute of Women in Leadership (CIWiL) Training Institute (here described as LTI) provides a contemporary moment when the impact of feminist support, consciousness raising, training and advocacy can be examined in relation to a diverse range of women, and a spectrum of political consciousness and action

The CIWiL aims to increase the number of women in politics, leadership and decision-making in the Caribbean towards 50 percent by 2015. Its objectives are to:

- Promote and strengthen gender equality and women’s rights;
- Advocate for transformative politics and policy-making;
• Stimulate research and contribute to increasing numbers and skills of women in positions of leadership in public life;
• Provide education and training to increase representation of women in politics and decision-making; and
• To support women in leadership, decision-making politics to hasten the transformation of politics and governance towards the achievement of sustainable development in the Caribbean.

The LTI brings together women leaders from political parties, social justice movements, media and NGOs across the region for ten days of capacity building. The impact of their efforts over the next year can then be explored at the national level and comparatively. This contemporary effort provides a view of feminist advocacy that seeks to ideologically transform leadership as well as empower women in the struggle for women’s rights and gender equality, through participation in democratic processes across the region. It therefore enables assessment of the strategies women employ as leaders, the resistances they face, the opportunities created and the impacts on the women and women’s issues they seek to represent. This focus also enables exploration of how the impact of feminist movement building, specifically around women’s transformational leadership can be measured, and the role of comparative political, economic and cultural contexts. For the national case study, CIWiL participants from St. Lucia were chosen as the main research participants, from whom life history narratives were sought. Along with Dominica, the focus on St. Lucia enabled the research project to include the Eastern Caribbean with more greatly researched sites of Trinidad and Tobago, Jamaica and Guyana.

Each of these strategies, women’s leadership, electoral quota systems, national gender policies and transformational leadership, has the capacity to create gains for women by increasing their political power in democratic processes and empowering larger numbers of women to participate in democratic leadership, and by transforming gender relations toward greater equality, equity and justice. Women’s leadership, quota systems and gender policies are contextualized within a regional history of struggle, and evaluated according to the implications and issues raised by a national case study of five sites. Feminist advocacy regarding all these strategies was examined regionally, creating a comparative picture of these strategies’ history. Together, these foci directly explore the twenty-first century context within which gender ideals and identities are being negotiated, new configurations of women and men’s gender consciousness, generational shifts in perceptions and experiences of politics, feminism and leadership, and the implications not only for marginalized groups of women, but for Caribbean
democratic governance overall. Together, these case studies complement and further ongoing research in the Caribbean on women, politics, leadership and gender justice.

Objectives

Looking at the case studies of four feminist strategies to advance women’s rights and gender equality, the objectives of the study were:
1. To identify the factors which facilitate or hinder women’s effective access to and exercise of democratic political leadership in parliaments in the Caribbean, with a particular attention to legislative, policy and program creation and implementation.
2. To identify the factors that enable quota systems to transform gender relations within political spaces and facilitate advancement of women’s rights and gender equality, through legislation, policy and programs.
3. To identify the factors that allow gender policies to assist women and men working within the state as well as in civil society to advance women’s rights and gender equality, with specific attention to the dynamics surrounding implementation of policy goals and action plans.
4. To identify the impact of feminist advocacy on women political leaders’ perspectives on quota systems, national gender policies, women’s political leadership, and their significance for the advancement of women’s rights and gender equality within their society.
5. To explore the experiences and understandings of women to determine the factors that enable or impede transformation of leadership and gendered power relations.
6. To detail advocacy strategies which should govern democratic practices, with a view to advancing women’s rights and gender equality across both state and non-state spheres.

Methodology

This research was focused on an assessment of how the dominant masculinist context of political locales within the Anglophone Caribbean shape the effectiveness of women’s political leadership. Thus, a central unit of analysis was specifically woman’s political leadership experiences and the ideological, material and gendered opportunities and resistances which emerge within relevant political spaces. We investigated the effectiveness of common feminist strategies such as the implementation of parliamentary quota systems; the institutionalization of gender policies; and women’s feminist activism, to determine their impact on advancing women’s rights and gender equity. The conceptualization of this project proceeded along two consecutive (yet iterative) phases. The first phase corresponded to the first year of the research
initiative (2011-2012), while the second phase occurred in the second year of the project (2012-2013). The first phase sought to generate regional and historical reviews of the four strategies. The second phase created national, often ethnographic, case studies of each. Each phase was guided by a Project Advisory Committee comprised of experienced feminist scholars and activists, as well as Caribbean political scientists. The committee met in 2011 and in 2012 and its members were Jane Parpart, who is also a Lead Researcher guiding the project, Eudine Barritteau, Patricia Mohammed, Selwyn Ryan, Cynthia Barrow-Giles, Rawwida Baksh and Linnette Vassell. Researchers primarily comprised early career Caribbean scholars, recent PhD and MSc graduates and IGDS graduate students. The project’s researchers for Phase 1 were Deborah McFee, Beverly Shirley, Shirley Campbell and Natalie Persadie. For Phase 2, the researchers were Denise Blackstock, Ramona Biholar, Iman Khan, Aleah Ranjitsingh, Maziki Thame and Dhanaraj Thakur.

Results

The following discussion presents summaries of the findings regarding each of the strategies being researched, followed by a conclusion. These results should be read in relation to each other. For example, while the structural and political resistances to women’s transformational leadership were explored in relation to the quota system in Guyana, it is through the individual, in-depth narratives that we encounter the nuances of women’s experience, their feelings, negotiations and dilemmas. While the draft national gender policy process was not fully explored in relation to Kamla Persad Bissessar’s leadership in Trinidad and Tobago, the case studies of Jamaica and Dominica provide greater insight into the way masculinism can shape policy-making and implementation. Together, the national case studies complement each other by differently examining issues of women’s campaigning for and later leadership in political office, the structural constraints within political parties and the state, the opportunities for as well as appropriation of women’s rights advocacy in national gender policies, and the individual stories of the women on the front lines of the struggle for gender justice in Anglophone Caribbean public life.

Similarly, the regional reviews of these strategies draw on original data to create historical contexts for each of the case studies, but do so in intersecting ways. Indeed, one cannot think about the history of struggles for women’s greater political representation without also understanding women’s movements’ efforts, particularly in the latter decades of the twentieth century, to secure change in the numbers, power and gendered ideologies of those
women who held office in one way or another. From another angle, the historical efforts to approve and implement national gender policies and quota systems for parliaments and other state entities should be seen as complementary and overlapping efforts to not only simply empower individual women and men to advance gender justice, but also to create greater institutional potential and protection for these efforts. The project’s approach to comparative data production was not to present two country case studies of a single strategy, for example transformational leadership, in relation to each other, nor to compare country experiences over history, but to demonstrate how a broad Anglophone Caribbean effort, led by feminists in civil society and the state, took different forms at different times and through different networks across the regional space. It is a multifaceted story told through a focus on these four strategies. The comparative approach adopted therefore examines parts of a whole, showing their interrelatedness while giving constituent elements, from discourses to processes, policies and individual narratives, more or less focus in one chapter or another. The chapters summarized below should be seen in this context.

Women’s Political Leadership

Beverly Shirley shows that women remain a statistical minority in the parliaments and in local government bodies across the Anglophone Caribbean. This significant gender bias in the Anglophone Caribbean reveals ideological and structural barriers that continue to powerfully influence political leadership. It is therefore not surprising that women who occupy the highest level of political leadership, the office of prime minister or president, have not significantly advanced women’s access to and effective participation in parliamentary and local government systems in the Anglophone Caribbean. Other elected female representatives at national and local government levels, as well as those on boards, commissions and other high level fora, remain largely unable to undermine and redefine masculinist power relations or inequitable and undemocratic practices within governmental bodies and civil society, despite the incremental but important growth in the visibility and number of women in democratic governance. Thus, the Anglophone Caribbean experience suggests that women’s political leadership has stimulated shifts in governmental approaches to women’s rights, and ideologies and practices regarding gender equality, but these are fraught at every turn with ideological, bureaucratic and other kinds of policy implementation confusion, drag and backlash, including resistance generated by popular belief in the myth of male marginalization. Although a few women have managed to slip through the tiny fissures in the glass ceiling, they do so at a very high cost, and face disproportionate public attacks that cast them as weak and incompetent. Sexuality and gender,
questions of class and ethnicity, and middle-class politics of respectability continue to be challenges for women in political leadership positions as well as for those seeking to be included within the structures of governance.

Aleah N. Ranjitsingh explores the issue of women and gender in political parties through her ethnographic case study of Trinidad and Tobago. Looking particularly at Trinidad and Tobago, whether in relation to cabinet and state board appointments, approval of the Draft National Gender Policy, gender-responsive national budgeting and legislation that challenges sexism and homophobia, Kamla Persad-Bissessar’s engagement with feminist issues has been uneven. She has expanded the social safety net, and made children’s health and education her cause celebre. Yet, the qualitative transformations or even interruptions of Caribbean gender systems, hoped for by feminists, remain elusive. The invoking of femininity and womanhood and the presence of a female body, in what has predominantly been seen as a male space, is powerfully inspirational and problematic as possibilities and limitations to women’s political leadership exist in difficult contradiction. The contemporary experience of Persad-Bissessar suggests that the internalizing of gender roles and the dominant ideologies which identify and allocate spaces for women and men is resilient enough to allow women to shift the discourse of women’s political leadership, creating historical cracks that are significant in their own right, while making it politically unpopular for these women to do much more than speak a language of women’s rights on paper or on political platforms. Individual women politicians are then blamed for what are seen as personal failures of leadership by publics that deny the significance of gender inequalities, which are tightly interwoven with state and political party structures, and the status quo.

**Electoral Quota Systems**

Natalie Persadie provides an overview of gender quotas and their impact on women’s political participation. She focuses on Guyana, the only Anglophone Caribbean nation that has adopted the quota strategy. She places the adoption of quotas in a larger move to revise the Guyanese constitution in the late 1990s and early 2000s, and reactions against many years of non-democratic rule (1964-1992) with its resulting concern with individual rights and democratic processes. The revised constitution addressed three main issues regarding women’s representation: extraction of women’s names from the list, the minimum proportion of female candidates to be placed on a party’s list and the maximum proportion of geographical constituencies in which a party may contest without a female candidate. The Elections Law, passed in 2000, adopted a candidate quota to ensure at least a third of female candidates on
each electoral list. The chapter focuses on the establishment of the quota system, particularly the struggles and resistances in getting to “yes” regarding women’s quotas. Like the NGP chapters, Persadie acknowledges the role of international forces, such as the Beijing Plan of Action, on the move towards a quota system. She discovered little influence from the quota systems in many South and Central American nations, arguing for the importance of national events in Guyana, particularly the local women’s movement and the push for democracy and constitutional reform. She points out that the push for women’s quotas came from a few women activists as well as the broader discussions about legislative guarantees for individual rights. While little immediate change has emerged from the quota legislation to date, Persadie regards the quota system as a critical step towards the feminization of parliament, which can provide a legislative basis for future activism around gender equality and gender justice.

Iman Khan has taken a more in-depth, ethnographic approach to the Guyanese quota system. She discovered that while one third of the total number of candidates in each political party’s national list are required to be women, the same percentage do not have to be extracted from the list and placed in parliament. Yet Guyana’s parties have consistently ensured that almost one-third of parliamentarians are women. Thus the quota system has been successful in increasing the visibility and embodied representation of women in parliament, as well as in potentially disrupting the discursive terrain of a masculinist institution. At the same time, the increase in women parliamentarians has not eliminated the impact of patriarchal norms, patriarchal state processes, and patriarchal state structures. Khan concludes that the quota system is grounded in a feminist system that equates women with gender. Consequently, it places women as the main category of analysis in a predominantly masculine dominated and controlled space. The focus is on getting women into parliament rather than challenging the gendered norms and relations that ensure patriarchal discipline and control despite the quota system. Women in the parliament are thus hemmed in by a patriarchal party system that complicates and undermines efforts to work as a group on gender justice issues. Women in parliament are left trying to negotiate the masculinist terrain of their parties while women’s rights activists criticize them for ignoring injustices against grassroots women and undermining efforts to empower women. This dilemma is still being worked out, and while Khan recognizes the limits of the Guyanese quota system, she nevertheless considers it is a potential platform for future struggles to ensure gender justice.

**National Gender Policies**

Deborah McFee analyzes the politics of constructing national gender policies (NGP) in
the Anglophone Caribbean. Her chapter provides insights into the politics of policy-making around the NGPs, which she sees as a process of brokering interests and controlling narratives about gender in various countries in the Anglophone Caribbean. She situates the process within the complex interplay of belief systems, resistances, actors and silences that exist within public policy related to women and gender in the region. Although the various cases demonstrate the considerable feminist activism in the region, the NGP process did not emerge from national concerns as much as from international pressures, particularly the United Nations. Most national gender policies in the Anglophone Caribbean grew out of an earlier concern with the position of women, rather than gender. They have consequently reframed the problem of women to be the need to achieve gender equality. McFee argues that while gender equality is an important goal, the politics of difference, concerned with the assertion of multiple identities and differences in the region, as well as the negotiation of the various norms of gender within and across differences, remains a completely uncharted policy space, and a concern for future national gender policies in the region.

Ramona Biholar explores the impact of masculinities on the practice of Dominica’s National Gender Policy, which was drafted and approved in 2005. She notes that the Dominican NGP gives equal consideration to women and men on the assumption that collaboration between women and men is essential for achieving gender equality. Based on extensive field research, the chapter focuses on the implementation of the national gender policy, with particular attention to the ways masculinities and femininities and their gendered power relations have shaped the practice of the NGP. The chapter initially focuses on the NGP’s definition and operationalization of gender, highlighting the benefits of moving the discussion beyond women to include men, the multiple and competing interpretations of women’s and men’s and gendered realities, and of the gender relations of power in the policy document and the public discourse. However, field research reveals that while women’s advancements are visible, the continuing hegemony of patriarchal ideologies and asymmetric power relations is often difficult to ascertain, yet it remains a powerful organizing forces in everyday life as well as the processes shaping access to economic and political power. Drawing on the concepts of gender negotiations and the politics of convenience, Biholar concludes that fixed understandings of gender as meaning women only and the failure to focus on masculinities, men and power, continue to hinder the national gender policy’s efforts to advance gender justice in Dominica.

Maziki Thame and Dharanaraj Thakur investigate the production and implementation of the National Gender Policy for Gender Equality (NGPE) approved by the Jamaican government in 2011. The chapter focuses on the NGPE as a statist and feminist strategy for challenging
patriarchal systems of governance and establishing an official vision fostering gender equality and equity across all aspects of public and private life. The chapter provides a critical reading of the NGPE, its aims, ideologies and approaches, and its place within the patriarchal Jamaican state. Drawing on documents as well as interviews with key informants, the chapter concludes that the deeply patriarchal nature of the Jamaican state has affected the policy process, both in its production and its implementation. For example, comprehensive consultations with various stakeholders across the nation produced some critical conversations about gender relations and power in Jamaica. Yet many of these discussions are reflected not in the policy document, particularly controversial notions about sexuality or women’s rights. The authors conclude that the NPGE was severely encumbered from its genesis, because it was insufficiently radical to challenge the patriarchal status quo and because as an instrument of the state, it was charged with changing the same organizations and institutions that were responsible for its implementation. While the policy is clearly a step in the right direction, given the patriarchal context from which it emerged, the authors conclude that while the policy is a start, it remains unclear what the next steps should be and where the momentum to create change beyond the NGPE may be found.

Transformational Leadership

Shirley Campbell shows how the Anglophone Caribbean search for an alternative transformational style of leadership emerged in the 1970s and 1980s. This search identified the need to transform the “content” and “conduct” of women’s leadership in the Anglophone Caribbean region. Some of the leadership issues identified were cultural and religious biases that view leadership as a male domain dominated by favoured kinds of masculinities, women’s reluctance to engage in political campaigns which require behaviours that are considered anti-feminine, women’s ambivalence about leadership, viewing it as inherently corrupt and authoritarian, higher levels of women’s unemployment and impoverishment, women’s unequal reproductive responsibilities, and the bypassing of women’s leadership in favour of male leadership. UNIFEM became involved in programs to not only increase the number of women, but also to create a critical mass of gender sensitive women who were knowledgeable, competent and committed to running for political and other public decision making leadership positions. They were also trained in taking appropriate action to influence gender sensitive policy making and implementation to advance gender justice. However, in spite of these interventions, the traction on women’s political leadership has not happened to the extent expected. After valiant efforts, the number of women in public leadership remains low. Though
women have found greater success in the micro-practices of their personal and professional lives, Campbell suggests that there needs to be a re-visioning of how to successfully intersect the feminist struggle for women’s rights within the broader rights of men, children and community.

Denise Blackstock pursues this argument in her discussion of two women identified by CIWiL as having transformational leadership potential, and trained to affect this type of transformational leadership in their personal and professional spaces. These women are Jeannine Compton-Antoine, a marine biologist, and Brenda Wilson, a social transformation officer in the Ministry of Social Transformation, Local Government and Community Empowerment, both natives of St. Lucia. Both women are described by colleagues, as well as themselves, as adopting a democratic leadership style that is consultative, networks, seeks consensus, is community-based, promotes teamwork and group ownership of ideas, and attempts to facilitate and engage others in the pursuit of individual and social transformation. This approach is different from customary practices under previous masculinist regimes, which were autocratic, hierarchical, divisive and disempowering. Gender and gender relations manifest themselves in different and sometimes contradictory ways in these women’s lives, for example in their conflicting viewpoints on whether there is place in society for gender roles or whether these should be discarded altogether because of the limitations they place on both sexes to achieve their full potential. Both women also identify the persistence of traditional gender stereotypes, resistance to a bottom-up approach to community development, personal struggles with balancing work and family life, and compromises to their physical and mental health as issues. Their narratives also suggest that continued training needs to focus on strategies for women transformational leaders to deal with gender-based discrimination directed at them even as they work to break down these barriers for others.

Questions for Conclusion

The regional, historical and ethnographic analysis of these four strategies suggests that gendered experiences of citizenship and democracy (Baksh and Vassell 2013), and current articulations of and resistances to feminism all point to the limitations of gender mainstreaming (Rowley 2011) and gendered policy-making (Mohammed 2013) for advancing women’s rights and gender justice. Formal protections are an incremental and necessary legislative and policy step for providing institutional, official recognition and protection. As well, expanded gender consciousness has meant that some women and men in the region are acting as change agents
to create new definitions of gender relations and hierarchies. Yet, masculinism, in the forms of male dominance and myths of male marginalization, its support from many women as well as the sexual division of labour in public and private spheres, continues to undermine these strategies’ potential.

Our research concludes that these four strategies are unmistakably worth the effort that has been invested in them by Caribbean feminist advocacy and organizing. Just as with the changing political economy, women’s participation in public life expands the bases for women and men working together, and women’s agency, even if they are not working in gender equal contexts. The way forward for both analysis and action is more robust analysis of how patriarchal forces undermine such agency, showing us the nitty-gritty ways that women leaders may come to be seen as failures, rather than ways of illuminating how statist policies and practices reinforce gender hierarchies. Just as there is a danger in treating gender as referring only to women, there is also a danger in shifting gender from women to men without an analysis of masculine power and a critique of the gender relations and hierarchies established between men, between women, between women and men, established in masculinist systems.

A number of questions are therefore suggested by these chapters. What can we learn about the limits of gender mainstreaming, and the kinds of new approaches needed? In what ways can the issues of men as gendered beings be incorporated in struggles for gender equality without undermining the struggle for women’s rights? This is a question that is acutely experienced in the Anglophone Caribbean. How can feminist efforts to transform the numbers and quality of leadership change gender and class imbalances not only between women and men, but also amongst women and amongst men? What are the strategies that can successfully pressure structures and institutions to change so that women leaders in politics and civil society are not individually or entirely blamed for their failures to be transformational? What are the possibilities for and limits on individual women’s agency? How can feminist movements of women and men advocating for gender justice continue to be strengthened? Finally, how does a focus on these questions point analysis to further thinking about strategies for their effective implementation?

These questions can be pursued in relation to some final observations. The struggle remains to integrate women into key decision-making institutions, but to also identify the forms of power that would facilitate and enable women’s ability to negotiate and exercise power while there. Getting women into political institutions, whether as prime minister or through a quota system, has not solved the problem of female disempowerment in political spaces. Consequently, continued efforts to promote a gender analysis among women and male allies of
domination and exclusion in political arenas is a crucial step towards gender equality. Such an analysis will enable an exploration of the role of material and ideological inequities in maintaining masculine hierarchies and provide new ways of thinking about altering this imbalance and transforming politics into more hospitable places for women and for gender equality. Global and regional feminist activism therefore remains paramount. Bringing men into the discourse of development, as seen in Dominica, has been a successful approach to policy implementation, but this needs to be enacted creatively and without disavowing a transnational gender analysis of state practice that reveals neo-liberal forms of global capital and development, and the ways these exacerbate inequalities and tensions related to class, religious, racialized and sexual difference, as lived and experienced in distinctive ways in nation-states in the Anglophone Caribbean region. Disjunctions and contradictions among policy, political leadership and transformation of gender relations remain difficult to negotiate, leading us to conclude that, as strategies, national gender policies, women’s political leadership, electoral quota systems and training of transformational leaders have not significantly advanced gender justice. However, they have expanded public deliberation over the meanings and significance of gender and its relationship to struggles for greater gender equality in political and other realms of power, and demonstrated the need to continue efforts to challenge masculinist and heteropatriarchal ideologies, even if in incremental ways. The four strategies may be insufficient, but they are a move in the right direction, one that has been crucial, necessary and is undeniably worth protecting.
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