Davituri, Sopio (2016) *Women's participation patterns in the public sphere in contemporary Georgia* [MRes.]

http://endeavour.gla.ac.uk/129/

Deposited: 7 December 2016

Postgraduate Coursework Coversheet

Student Number: | 2 | 1 | 8 | 5 | 4 | 7 | 6 |

Course Title: Sociology Dissertation

Essay/Assignment Title: Women's Participation Patterns in the Public Sphere in Contemporary Georgia

Course Co-ordinator: Dr Robert Gibb and Dr Matt Dawson

Date of Submission: 30.08.2016

Word Count: 14,661

I confirm that I have uploaded my electronic copy to the course Moodle before handing in this paper copy	✓

Abstract

In contemporary Georgia, which received a heavy legacy from the Soviet Union in terms of promoting gender equality, women are excluded from the public realm. The dissertation aims to explore women's participation patterns in public space in Georgia. The literature review outlines the debate of public/private and links it with the work/family conflict. Afterwards, it reviews Soviet and post-Soviet gender orders, and contemporary market economy. Finally, it focuses on the neotraditional gender ideology and gender negotiation strategies of women. The literature review aims to explore how these concepts and processes influence women's participation patterns in the public realm. In order to understand women's experiences, qualitative, semi-structured online interviews were used. In total, ten interviews were conducted with women active in movements for greater gender representation in Georgia. Overall, the findings suggest that contemporary gender order in Georgia may be characterised by the neotraditional gender ideology and, in a sense, can be influenced by both traditional as well as Soviet gender regimes. The impact of contemporary market economy was also highlighted in the participants' accounts. Thus, the findings of this study are in accordance with the wider sociological literature focusing on the post-Soviet gender order. The research contributes to the field of gender studies in the post-socialist countries.

Acknowledgements

Firstly, I would like to thank my supervisors Dr Robert Gibb and Dr Matt Dawson for their support. Thank you for encouraging me and giving me advices throughout this process.

Secondly, I would also like to thank the participants of this study. Thank you for sharing your experiences and being generous with your time.

Finally, I would like to thank International Education Centre for their scholarship program, which enabled me to study at the University of Glasgow.

Contents

Chapter 1. Introduction

The process of transformation from the state socialism to capitalism had a different influence on men and women in post-Soviet countries (Johnson & Robinson, 2007). Men have more benefits from the transition, since they are richer (ibid.) and more active in economic or political realms (Shevchenko, 2007). Women, on the other hand, have become "depoliticized and are largely left out of the government, political parties, and the official public sphere" (Ishkanian, 2003, p. 476). In post-socialist countries, gender is not constrained by the state anymore, as it was in the Soviet Union, and gender multiplication is possible (Johnson & Robinson, 2007). In this dissertation I use gender as socially constructed identities, which men and women 'do' every day (West & Zimmerman, 1987). As far as gender relations "are characterised by both change *and* continuity" (Crompton, 2006, p. 1), it is important to focus on where changes and continuities can be seen in gender relations in the post-socialist Georgia.

Georgia received a heavy legacy from the Soviet Union in terms of promoting gender equality. Since the latter's dissolution the country has undergone the political, social and economic transition to capitalism, which reconceptualised gender relations and specifically, women's gender roles in public and private realms. Although the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women was adopted in 1994, the Law on Gender Equality - in 2010 and Law on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination - in 2014, gender inequality remains one of the most important problems in Georgia. Despite the adopted international conventions and laws, most of the reforms and initiatives about gender relations have more formal than substantial role, in the sense that they could not bring significant changes in women's lives. Discrimination at the workplace or in the family, limited access to justice,

education, or property rights are few examples of gender inequality that Georgian women face every day.

Participation of women in the public sphere is problematic for Georgia. Women's and men's income and positions significantly differ from each other. The dissertation aims to explore women's participation patterns in public space in Georgia. The research questions are the following: How are women represented in the public sphere in contemporary Georgia? How do images of femininity influence the women's participation in the public space? How is the gendered public space in contemporary Georgia influenced by the socialist past? This dissertation also intends to empirically explore how the concept of neotraditionalisation influences women and how 'gender negotiation' is experienced by them in the public realm.

In order to address research aims and questions, at the beginning of the dissertation, gender equality issues in Georgia will be outlined. It will describe women's exclusion from the public realm based on the international and local reports, and quantitative studies. This will be followed by the discussion about public/private debates in the contemporary feminist scholarship, in order to situate the dissertation in context; the production/reproduction divide will be employed to conceptualise the public realm, which is addressed in this dissertation.

In order to be able to connect Soviet past to the contemporary Georgian context, the Soviet and post-Soviet gender orders, and their core characteristics will be reviewed, informed by the works of Ashwin (2006a, 2006b). Afterwards, the characteristics of contemporary market economy will be considered in order to understand the gender-related changes that took place in Georgia. Based on the work of Johnson and Robinson (2007), it will be followed by the discussion about the concept of neotraditionalisation, which is claimed to be present in

post-Socialist states (Ibid.). Finally, the notion of 'gender negotiation' will be introduced in order to link gender ideology to the women's participation patterns. Women negotiate their gender roles when participating in the public realm and such negotiation strategies are influenced by the gender ideology and gender regimes (Johnson & Robinson, 2007). Here gender ideology also implies the impact of the state socialism. These theoretical approaches will be used to explore women's experiences in regards to their participation patterns in public space. They will make it possible to link together contemporary gender ideology in Georgia, Soviet legacy and gender-role negotiation strategies of women.

In order to explore women's experiences in the public realm, and address the research questions, semi-structured online interviews were used. The study methodology and the epistemological and ontological stances of the researcher is described in chapter three. The following chapter presents the research findings. It also focuses on the connections between the theoretical discussions about the above described topics and the research findings. Overall, the findings suggest that contemporary gender order in Georgia may be characterised by the neotraditional gender ideology and, in a sense, can be influenced by both traditional as well as Soviet gender regimes. The impact of contemporary market economy is also highlighted in the participants' accounts.

The public/private divide and gender in post-Socialist context have been widely discussed in the academic community. The influence of Soviet gender order has been examined in relation to many post-Soviet countries. However, little is known about the case of Georgia, studies about the above mentioned topic are non-existent. Most of the researches available about women's participation in the public realms in Georgia mainly focus on the quantitative measurements of women's participation in the labour market. There is a lack of empirical

qualitative analysis of this issue and this dissertation will address the above mentioned gap. Analysing the case of Georgia will contribute to the broader discussions on the post-socialist gender relations.

Chapter 2. Literature Review

Firstly, the literature review will outline issues of gender equality in the contemporary Georgia. This part will be based on the findings from different studies and national statistics. Given that this dissertation wants to address the distinction between private and public spheres in post-socialist gender studies and how this distinction helps to make the gender regimes visible, I will then outline the main debates around the public/private divide.

As different reports about gender relations in Georgia show, women are excluded from public life. In the second part of the literature review, three main reasons for such exclusion will be analysed: the socialist 'gender regime' and its legacy, contemporary market economy and the 'neotraditional' gender ideology. Finally, the concept of 'gender negotiation' will be introduced. The aim of the literature review is to discuss the above mentioned concepts in order to explore how these concepts and processes influence women's participation patterns in the public realm.

2.1. Background: Gender Inequality in Georgia

In the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Gender Inequality Index (GII) (which focuses on dimensions of health, empowerment and labour market), Georgia is ranked 77 among 155 countries (2014). According to the Global Gender Gap Report, Georgia is ranked 82 in the total of 145 countries (2015) in the global gender gap index (WEF, 2015). The Global Gender Gap report includes not only the general index of global gender gap, but the distribution of countries by several sub-areas: economic participation and opportunity, educational attainment, health and survival and political empowerment. In these parameters Georgia has the highest rank in the educational attainment (ranked 31). In economic

participation and opportunity it is ranked 60. This criterion itself consists of several indicators, amongst which Georgia has the lower ranks in labour force participation (83) and estimated earned income (110). By the third criterion – health and survival, Georgia is ranked 120 and by the last one – political empowerment – 114 (WEF, 2015). These rankings indicate that gender inequality is more problematic in relation to political empowerment, estimated earned income and labour force participation.

These are some of the few of the reports available about gender relations in Georgia and they underline the overall situation of gender equality. Aside from international rankings, the gender asymmetry is also visible from the statistics of the National Statistics Office of Georgia: women's monthly salary is 617.9 GEL and men's – 980 GEL (2014). The gender segregation is obvious not only from the pay gap but from women's economic participation and employment. 58.9% of the total share of women is economically active in Georgia, with the employment rate of 52.9% and the unemployment rate of 10.2%, while 78.1% of men are economically active, with 67.6% of employment and 13.5% of unemployment rates[1] (National Statistics Office of Georgia, 2015). These rates indicate, that more men are economically active than women and at the same time, more men are employed than women. It should be also noted that women's and men's employment, unemployment and economic activity rates did not change significantly over 15 years (from 1998). As mentioned above, women's political participation level is also low in Georgia. Only 11% of parliament members are women (National Statistics Office of Georgia, 2015) and only one head of the district is a woman (CEC,

---

[1] National Statistics Office of Georgia uses the notions of 'economic activity' and 'employment' based on the International Labour Organisation's definitions. According to the ILO, "the economically active population comprises all persons of either sex who furnish the supply of labour for the production of goods and services during a specified time-reference period" (ILO database on labour statistics), while employment is defined to comprise of persons above a specific age who where in a paid or self-employment for a specific period of time (Ibid.)

2014). The above reviewed statistics indicate that women in Georgia are particularly disadvantaged in relation to political activity (below the income group average according to the Global Gender Gap, 2015) and economic activity (employment, pay gap).

The nature and extent of gender inequality in Georgia is also obvious from local studies. According to the study Men and Gender Relations in Georgia, 78% of respondents agree with the statement that "man should have the last say in the family" (sample size was 2402) and 89% of the respondents agree with the statement "the main responsibility of the women is to care for the family" (UN Women, 2014). The importance of family for a women is also visible from the national statistics of households, where it is indicated that in 67% of cases man is considered to be the head of the household. Women are heads of the households mainly when it consists of one member (the remaining 33%) (National Statistics Office of Georgia, 2015).

The aim of this dissertation is to identify the reasons behind the unequal participation of men and women in the public realm. It will review the role of women in the Soviet Union, then discuss the contemporary situation of women in market economy and identify whether women are negotiating gender ideologies, returning to the traditional gender regimes or following the Soviet gender regimes. In order to conceptualise the public realm and to locate the topic of the dissertation in relation to contemporary debates, I will firstly address theories about the public/private distinction. The distinction between public and private spheres is of crucial importance to Gender Studies, especially when analysing gender relations in the post-socialist states.

2.2. Theorising Public/Private Divide

In order to discuss women's place in the public sphere, it is important to conceptualise the public sphere itself and to put it in the context of the public/private distinction. The latter has been a key concept for analysing the economic, political, domestic and social lives of women and has been widely discussed in social theory and in feminist research.

Defining 'Public' and 'Private' Realms

Before conceptualising the feminist perspectives on distinction between public/private, and applying it to Soviet and post-Soviet contexts, I would like to draw attention to the discussions of 'public' and 'private' in Western social theory. The distinction between "public" and "private" was applied as a conceptual tool to order different aspects of everyday life (Weintraub, 1997). There have been different variations of the meaning of the dichotomy itself and it has been used in a range of social and political theories. At first, the significance of the "public sphere" and political action was discussed, among others, by Jurgen Habermas (1989) and Hannah Arendt (1958). Although, it should be noted that it is hard to find a definition for these spheres in the literature. There have been attempts to contextualise these terms, from ascribing "private" to the family life and "public" - to the political (Pateman, 1988), to Goffman's distinction between "interaction order" and individual self (Goffman, 1972).

Weintraub differentiates four ideal-typical ways in which the distinction between public and private is analysed in social and political thought. He lists the liberal-economic approach (where state administration is divided from the market economy), the republican-virtue approach (political community and citizenship/market and state administration), a third approach, where the "public" realm is considered to be fluid sociability, and finally a feminist

perspective, where the emphasis is on the distinction between the family and larger institutions, including state, politics and market economy (1997, p. 7). These categories are not exclusive, they are interrelated, overlapping and there are also many variations in each of these categories. Other authors emphasise different categorisations and meanings of the public and private realms. However, what is characteristic of the liberal-economic and republican approaches in this model and other early categorisations as well, is that if "private" was considered to be both private property and civil society, than women were excluded not only from the "public" but from such understanding of "private" as well. Another characteristic of such approaches is that they focused on the conceptualisation of the 'public' sphere only (Weintraub, 1997). However, in feminist scholarship, the importance of the private life was underlined and often the emphasis was on the interdependence of these two spheres (Lister, 2003).

Feminist Approach to Public/Private Divide

Feminist approach conceptualises the 'private' sphere and the relation between public/private (Lister, 2003). It often formulates the distinction as "domestic/public" (Weintraub, 1997). Feminists have emphasised power and the hierarchical nature of the divide (Lister, 2003), and its gendered nature, where the public sphere is ascribed to man and considered to be superior on the private realm. Such an approach implies that division between public/private is asymmetric in terms of gender (Rosaldo, 1974). However, the dichotomy of public/private spheres is problematic in the feminist approach as well. One of the important criticisms of the feminist distinction between public/private comes from the feminist scholarship itself. For example, MacKinnon argues, that separation between public/private should be abolished (MacKinnon, 1989). Fraser, on the other hand, argues, that

its conceptualisation should be more complex and the public sphere in feminism should not be limited to "the state, paid employment and "arenas of public discourse" only (1990, p. 57).

What is significant and characteristic of the distinction is that, as Weintraub emphasises, it has different connotations and meanings in varying contexts (1997, p. 3) and, therefore, is bound in time and space. Lister notes that the contemporary context, which consists of "direct and indirect state regulation of the family; easy male passage between private and public spheres and the, albeit more difficult, entry of growing numbers of women into the public", requires the reformulation of the dichotomy (Lister, 2003, p. 120). However, there are efforts to reformulate this division and target not the meaning of the distinction, but its gendered nature and characteristics (Lister, 2003). In the process of such reformulation Lister suggests to recognise the changing boundaries between public/private and acknowledge how they are interdependent (Ibid.). In the contemporary context, market economy changes the borders of public/private, where "private domestic labour of women" and "public or wage labour" are differentiated from each other (Sacks, 1975). Thus, as Slater formulates, the public/private division in modernity can be coded as division between production and *re*production (Slater, 1998, p. 139). Such conceptualisation underlines that in modern societies, or in market economy, only the production is considered to be 'work' and in this context, domestic space is "simultaneously feminised and socially marginalised" (Weintraub, 1997). Although women's participation is dependent upon context and the rates of participation in the public realm increases, women are still excluded from the public sphere and in addition, the domestic labour division has not changed (Hochschild, 1997).

Private/Public Divide: Conceptual Tool for Post-Soviet Gender Studies

Gal and Kligman see the private/public distinction as an aspect of ideology "that requires historical contextualisation" (Gal & Kligman, 2000, p. 37). They discuss the distinction between public and private from the semiotic perspective, while focusing on "the meaning-making properties of the dichotomy" (Gal & Kligman, 2000, p. 40), how actors understand and experience this division. They do not use it as specific places, domains, institutions and interactions but understand it as a "discursive distinction that, once established, can be used to characterize, categorize, organize, and contrast virtually any kind of social fact: spaces, institutions, groups, people's identities, discourses, activities, interactions, relations" (Gal & Kligman, 2000, p. 41).

Thus, Gal and Kligman underline the two assets of the dichotomy: it is dependent upon specific context and it is a fractal distinction, which means that it can be reproduced repeatedly and applied to other contexts (both narrower and wider). This argument leads to the discussion that both divisions may have its subdivisions repeatedly (2000). In addition to this, Gal and Kligman argue that beyond the semiotics and its philosophical meaning, the distinction has more 'practical' meaning, responding to the work-family divide in the industrialisation process in Western countries (Ibid.).

Such an understanding of the public/private divide makes it possible to use it as a conceptual tool, especially employing it in the analysis of socialist past of Georgia. In Soviet studies and, especially, when discussing gender in the context of post-Socialism, the division between public and private plays a central role.

This dissertation will use both semiotic and feminist approaches to the public/private divide: On the one hand, it will be based on a feminist approach, which differentiates production and

reproduction as public and private realms and focuses on its gendered and hierarchical nature; On the other hand, it will focus on the context and its fractal nature as well. The combination of the two will enable me to use the distinction with more practical meaning. It should be also underlined that the goal of the dissertation is not to analyse the 'public' realm separately, without emphasizing the importance of the "private" sphere. I will discuss public/private distinction in relation to each other, since the distinction is not "a single paired opposition, but a complex family of them, neither mutually reducible nor wholly unrelated" (Weintraub, 1997, p. 2). In this dissertation, the concept of "public" is understood as "one element in a paired opposition" (Weintraub, 1997, p. 4). Consequently, while this dissertation focuses on the "public domain" and the meanings it acquires in the post-Soviet Georgian context, it does not disregard the importance of "private" or the interdependence of these two domains of social life. In order to refer to the context of the given dichotomy for the purposes of this dissertation one should review the socialist past of Georgia, as the historical context of the country.

2.3. Soviet and Post-Soviet Gender Order

The 'gender order' is defined as a historically constructed pattern of power relations between men and women and definitions of femininity and masculinity (Connell, 1987, pp. 98-99) and refers to the issue of how gender ideology impacts behaviour. The gender order explains why women's conditions vary in different societies even when they "face the same institutional constraints" (Ashwin, 2006b, pp. 32-33). In this dissertation, I strive to explore whether Soviet gender order still has an influence on women and men in Georgia and in order to see this, the Soviet and post-Soviet gender orders should be reviewed. In the end of this part women's in

the labour market will be reviewed, in order to understand women's participation patterns in public realm in modern market economies, and thus, in contemporary Georgia.

Soviet Gender Order

The Soviet system is argued to be a system in which state controlled both 'private' and 'public' life. This is the first main characteristic of the Soviet gender order Johnson and Robinson speak about, which is significantly different from the Western states (2007, pp. 6-9). The women's issues were included in social agenda; however the equality of women either in "public" or in "private" spheres could not be granted. Definitely, gender politics and regimes varied by countries and times in the Soviet Union (Johnson & Robinson, 2007, p. 6). However, the general trends can still be detected and I will review some of its crucial characteristics.

1) Gender essentialism: In regards to gender differences, the Soviet regime had an essentialist viewpoint. Thus, the primary aim of the "woman question" was "how to accommodate women's innate differences to the ideal of the New Soviet Man (Johnson & Robinson, 2007, p. 7). In this context, women were seen as "natural" caretakers and the everyday life was structured by the distinctions between feminine and masculine spaces, which consisted of, for instance, the "feminisation of school-teaching and agriculture" (Gal & Kligman, 2000).

2) Dual burden (Einhorn, 1993) on women or the Soviet superwoman: In the Soviet gender order the roles of women and men were defined by the state and in this definition work had crucial role. Employed work was a duty of both women and men, however women also had reproductive duties. In other words, women were expected to be both workers and mothers. Men's role was more limited, but their status was higher (Ashwin, 2006b, pp. 33-34). Women were balancing between the domestic and work-related spheres; however, men were primarily breadwinners in the family (Lyon, 2007, p. 27). Furthermore, it is considered that

women were less dependent on men's income as they had their own income and were employed (Ibid). Crompton characterised the socialist family model to be "dual-earner/state-carer" model (Crompton, 2006). However, it would be unfair not to mention that "female carer" also applies to the model (Motiejunaite & Hohne, 2008).

3) Limited personal agency and neutralisation of gender difference in the public realm: Another characteristic of the Soviet regime was "the limited personal agency for citizens to negotiate gender" (Johnson & Robinson, 2007, p. 8). The most notable in the relationships between state and gender was that the state veiled the differences between genders, in order to hide it from the public realm (Johnson & Robinson, 2007, p. 8). Thus, women were treated as women at home, or in the private space, and "in public, even as more and more women worked in female-dominated occupations at lower wages, women were treated as male workers except when pregnancy, childbirth, childcare, and leadership intervened" (Ibid). In this sense, equalisation of women's role in the public sphere with men's role was regarded as emancipation. In parallel to such "gender neutralisation" (here I use the term used by Johnson & Robinson, 2007) in the public realm and possible alternative gender constructions, the private sphere was highly gendered. This 'doublethink' about women meant that gender and sex were not distinct for the Soviet regime (Johnson & Robinson, 2007, p. 7).

> Under socialism, as in other contexts, women (and men) also negotiated around gender. Sometimes women would choose to play up their similarities to men in order to get better jobs. Other times, they would play upon their idealization as mothers in order to get more time to do whatever needed to be done for their children, their husbands, their families (Johnson & Robinson, 2007, pp. 6-7).

The reason why gender and sex were not differentiated from each other is considered to be the issue of the absence of the notion of 'gender' itself beyond grammar. This particular argument is also important for the Georgian context: 'gender' does not have equivalent word in the Georgian language and instead, the English word 'gender' is used (*genderi*).

Gender Regime in the Transition period

The transition period from state socialism to market economy was not less significant for women and men. The transition period is described to be more unfavourable to women than the previous gender regime (in Soviet Union) or the next (in the context of market economy) (Attwood, 1996; Einhorn, 1993). This period had different impacts on men's and women's lives. Men became required to provide for the family; however, they were unemployed or had relatively low wages. Drug consumption and alcohol-related problems were also present. In addition, there was a Georgian Civil War in the 1990s and more men left their families. Thus, men had two strategies of coping with the transformation process: either they were demoralised and dependent on women, or dominant in the market economy. As Ashwin argues, the household became a field for economic activity and it resulted in the increased importance of women in family. However, in Georgia (as in Russia, according to Lyon, 2007), men were unemployed and women took the responsibility of providing for their families. Thus, the transition had a double effect on men, while "women are the heroic survivors of transition while men are the primary casualties" (Ashwin, 2006a, p. 4)**.** The increased employment did not bring the increased participation in the public life for women. As Johnson & Robinson argue, men benefited more from the transition than women; they have more political power and economic opportunities (Johnson & Robinson, 2007, p. vii). Ashwin later concludes that the absence of gender agenda in the process of transformation resulted in

past norms shaping post-Soviet gender relations (2006b, p. 32). As Ishkanian argues, in post-socialist societies "the category of women was and continues to be an ideological site for political, religious, and economic projects." (2003, p. 476).

Market Economy and Women

Georgia shifted from socialism to market economy after the dissolution of the Soviet Union. Capitalist market economy, as outlined by Crompton, "is dominated by market relations" (2006, p. 2). She argues that the division of labour is composed of two important inputs (among others), such as capitalist relations of production and market forces. Their impact is "mediated by other factors ... and amongst the most important … will be gender" (Crompton, 1989). The different positions of men and women in labour market are characteristic not only to the post-Soviet, but Western states as well. As Acker points out, today higher positions in labour market are not completely occupied by men as they were in in the past; however, gender still plays an important role (2006). In Crompton's words, there have been major changes in the labour market; the modern world is characterised by 'feminisation of the labour force', which is "the most universal form of the division of labour" (1989, p. 571). However, the notion of 'feminisation of the labour force' is challenged by Hakim's argument suggesting that changes in the women's full-time work and in married women's employment did not take place (1995). Whether the latter is the substantial change or not, the labour market in the Western world is characterised by gender asymmetry (Acker, 2006), or by the vertical (women have the lower level positions in the labour market) and horizontal segregation (women and men have different occupations) (Bradley, et al., 2000). As Hakim points out, these segregations are independent of each other (1995) and both are experienced by women. Some of the theorists point out the significance of vertical

segregation since it is connected to power relations (Acker, 2006), when women's possibilities to occupy the higher positions are limited.

Thus, in market economy women's and men's participation in the labour market is asymmetric. Dual system theorists, who put emphasis on the patriarchy as well as on the capitalism (for example, Walby, 1990), state that one of the reasons women are experiencing vertical and horizontal segregation is that they are primary child carers (Correl, et al., 2014). Family is itself a place of segregation between family members (Goldthorpe, 1983), which affects the segregation of labour market. In relation to domestic labour division, more patriarchal societies are characterised by the 'male breadwinner' model, while less traditional societies have a dual earner model (Crompton, 2006). In accordance with the division of labour, it is important to focus on the division of care in household, which in most countries is the responsibility of a woman. As Hakim argues, 'feminisation' of the labour market is not followed by the changes in the division of domestic labour (1995).

Besides the structural reasons of labour market segregation, orientation to work is also important (Hakim, 1995; Acker, 2006). Individuals are expected to be dedicated to paid work (Acker, 2006), or in Hakim's word, to be committed to it (1995). In market economy, women are required to prioritise work over childcare, because market economy prioritises the paid work (Acker, 2006). By being involved in the household care and the work, women have difficulties of reconciling employment and household work (Lewis, 2006). However, Acker's emphasis is challenged by Goldthorpe who focuses not on the type of economy, but on the patriarchal societies, which he believes requires from women commitment to household (1983) and childcare. Thus, women are required to be both the ideal workers as well as committed to households. Women have pressure of "the triple shift" in the market economy

since they are expected to be responsible for childcare, domestic work and paid work (Fraser, 2009).

2.4. Neotraditional Gender Ideology

In contemporary post-Soviet countries women's issues are not central to the state regulations anymore. The gender order is now dictated by the market, which, as Johnson and Robinson argue, makes everyone equally vulnerable (2007). However, in the post-socialist context there are new gender opportunities and other sources of power than state (Johnson & Robinson, 2007). With the new opportunities, new gender ideologies emerge.

Some theorists expected that after the collapse of Communism, women should have left their jobs and returned to domestic space (Einhorn, 1993), since they had the choice of being unemployed. In post-socialist gender studies, the issue of such retraditionalisation (if it is actually taking place or not) is widely discussed (Gal & Kligman, 2000). Some studies have even indicated that five out of seven post-socialist counties had "motherhood-centred" tendencies (Treas & Widmer, 2000), while, on the other hand, there are studies which emphasise the decreasing trend on traditionalisation (Motiejunaite & Hohne, 2008). However, Ashwin states that the predicted 'return to the home' did not happen (2006b, p. 34).

Instead of speaking of retraditionalisation, some theorists (Johnson & Robinson, 2007) focus on neotraditionalist gender ideology, which enabled re-feminisation and re-masculinisation. It is not only based on the pre-communist gender order, but includes Soviet legacy as well. It can be described as the model of men-breadwinners and women-mothers. The neotraditional gender ideology in the Georgian model can also mean the existence of Caucasian traditions in relation to gender. Such gender ideology caused that men became more dominant in the

public realm, especially, politics. Furthermore, it "justifies" women's disadvantaged social and economic conditions relying on the essentialist positions (Shevchenko, 2007, p. 130). It is also characterised by the revival of nationalism and religion, which both see women's place 'at home' (Kay, 1997). As Shevchenko argues, neotraditional gender ideology focuses on the women's reproductive functions in the context of the birth rate decline and, in this way, limits not only their participation in the public sphere, but the mainstreaming of non-traditional gender politics (2007, p. 130). 'Neotraditional' is sometimes seen as a backlash against Soviet gender models and gender 'neutralisation' in the public sphere (Lyon, 2007). Thus, 'neotraditional' gender ideology includes four main parameters: 1) male-breadwinner household; 2) prevalence of pre-socialist gender ideology; 3) male-dominance in public realm; 4) revival of nationalism and religion.

However, this is not the only gender ideology that exists in post-socialist countries. Gender multiplication, or the increased number of gender ideologies was also observable. As Johnson and Robinson indicate, in contemporary context there also exists the place for other gender ideologies, for example, feminist gender ideologies, "in which women can make a place for themselves in public, act collectively to extend and protect their interests, and act individually by negotiating the meaning of femininity, masculinity …" (Johnson & Robinson, 2007, p. 11).

Negotiating Gendered identities

In the context of a market economy and capitalism, there are new spaces for individuals and groups to negotiate their gender strategies (Johnson & Robinson, 2007, p. 12). Women have a "wider range of gender models to choose from" than men, who have a more limited range of role models and flexibility, their role of provider is relatively fixed (Lyon, 2007, p. 29). Consequently, Johnson and Robinson state that it is women's turn to use the opportunities

imposed on them by capitalism along with the power structures, which, at the same time, disadvantage them (2007, p. ix). Such gender multiplication leaves space for individual and collective agency, which means that actors are more enabled to negotiate their gender roles.

As Swidler argues, gender systems can serve as cultural 'toolkits', from which it is possible to choose different variations of gender (1995 cited in Johnson & Robinson, 2007, p. 3). These tools may help to overcome the binary system in gender constructs. It makes it possible to "shift" between oppositional consciousness based on culture, sex, and class, moving "between and among" ideological positions" (Sandoval, 2000, p. 58). As this approach of "shifting" proposes, women can also negotiate these ideologies of different gender roles. In the frames of existence of the public space (in contrast from the socialist past), gender can be negotiated in the public realm; however, the choices still are limited (Johnson & Robinson, 2007, p. 12).

Summary

From the literature review chapter it can be seen that the women's participation rates in labour market and politics in Georgia are relatively low. The state fails to respond to such statistics with the gender mainstreaming. The current situation of male-breadwinner household and dual functions of women are deeply rooted in the Soviet past and current gender ideology. In contemporary Georgia, women have more freedom to negotiate the gender roles and ideologies; however, this freedom is mostly applicable in the public realm, to the extent that private sphere is much more limited in terms of choices and opportunities. As in the Soviet Union, where women had double role in public and single role in private space, gender negotiation is harder in the latter realm. Similarly, women have more freedom

to negotiate gender on the public realm, however their strategies and tactics are structured

due to the prevalent gender ideology (neotraditional gender ideology) and the Soviet past.

Chapter 3. Methodology

Building on the literature review discussed in previous part, this chapter focuses on methodological framework for the empirical research. After clarifying the epistemological and ontological stances, this chapter discusses the position of researcher and feminist research ethics. Finally, these are linked to the research methods and analysis. The study addresses the existing gap in the literature outlined in the previous chapter and aims to explore women's experiences in the public realm in Georgia.

3.1. Research Paradigm and the Qualitative Approach

In order to address the research questions and the gap in literature, the perspective of Georgian women is of crucial importance. The research paradigm, or the set of beliefs (Guba, 1990) this study is based on, is rooted in feminist perspective. In general, the latter stands on three assumptions: 1. women have been excluded from many areas of human activity (Narayan, 2004) and thus, their voices have also been lost; 2. Women's place in the world challenges "the male bias of existing perspectives" (Ibid, p. 213); and 3. Women share common experiences, however these experiences are dependent upon social contexts (Stanley & Wise, 1995). It focuses on women's experiences, perspectives and voices in the research carried out by, with and for women (Stanley & Wise, 1995).

However, there are different approaches to feminism itself and, therefore, different epistemologies (Lykke, 2010). Harding classifies three major epistemic positions: feminist empiricism, feminist standpoint epistemology and postmodern feminist epistemology (1986). The advantage of feminist standpoint epistemology in relation to the other stances is that it

focuses on the diverse nature of individual experiences and social contexts (Naples & Gurr, 2014).

However, unlike the classic standpoint feminism, my ontological stance is not 'strong objectivism', but 'partial objectivism', as Haraway suggests (1991). Due to its ontological position, this approach is founded on the critical realist philosophy (Lykke, 2010). My feminist position is not to emphasise the performative reality, but similarly to the revised standpoint approach, to focus on situated knowledges and contexts (Lykke, 2010; Stanley & Wise, 1990).

Due to the standpoint theory's emphasis on the women's experiences in social contexts, third world and postcolonial feminists have often conducted the research from this perspective (Naples & Gurr, 2014). In the framework of this study, which focuses on post-socialist Georgia, such epistemological position will enable me to give women chance to express their viewpoints and voices. However, this study focuses not only on women's individual experiences, but on their collective experiences as well. In this dissertation I will link these micro and macro levels of experiences.

The specific methodology and methods I use in this dissertation are also rooted in the feminist standpoint epistemology. Gaining information about women's interpretations, viewpoints and intersubjective meanings is possible through qualitative research methods (Skeggs, 2001), the main advantage of which is to give rich description of the phenomena (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Qualitative research enables women to "speak for themselves" (Letherby, 2003, p. 85). Besides, in feminist studies it allows the research to reduce the exploitation of women by reciprocity; to avoid treating women as objects; to employ the emancipatory principles of feminism (Bryman, 2008). These characteristics of the qualitative research and

the revised feminist standpoint epistemology enabled me to address the research questions and focus on women's individual as well as collective experiences.

3.2. My Position as a Researcher

Although the aim of this research is to represent women's voices, the central questions here are "how participant's voices are to be heard, with what authority and in what form" (Olesen, 2005, p. 252). In this context it is important to situate myself as a researcher between the insider-outsider statuses. I identify myself as a woman and as a Georgian. According to Smith, being female enables me to understand women's perspectives better than male researchers (1992). Being Georgian, and therefore, sharing the post-Soviet context, makes me understand both the social and political context and the local culture. During the research process, as an "insider", I was able to establish connections with participants and find the shared experiences. However, I do not consider myself to be an activist and in this sense, I am an 'outsider' who is curious about the women's condition in public sphere in Georgia. This was a barrier in some cases, when research participants avoided deeper discussions about specific issues and assumed that I knew the women's experiences in the public sphere (for example, "we all know what the conditions of women in workplaces are"). Being both 'outsider' and 'insider' situates me in "the space between" of these statuses (Dwyer & Buckle, 2009, p. 60). This enabled me to take the strengths of both insider and outsider status and to be more flexible in the research process. However, as Merriam et al. note, this dichotomy is "too simple" and requires additional parameters such as positionality, power and representation (2001), which will be discussed later, in the section of ethical considerations.

3.3. Methods of Data Collection

In order to address the research questions and aim, the online semi-structured interviews were conducted through the computer-mediated communication (CMC) programs (in most cases, Skype). The study strives to explore women's collective and individual experiences and their perspectives, which would be better grasped in the semi-structured interviews. This method is in accordance with the feminist standpoint epistemology.

The semi-structured interview method allows the researcher to be flexible and to receive rich and detailed information (Bryman, 2008). The Interviewing process allows both researcher and the researched to co-construct data for the research (Roulston, et al., 2003). The semi-structured method offers some control from the interviewer of the interview process, while still being open to the new question that may arise. As Hesse-Biber suggests, it is a tool for exploring a subjugated knowledge (2014).

The semi-structured interview method is widely used in feminist research (Letherby, 2003). From the feminist perspective, this method proposes high levels of rapport and reciprocity between the researcher and the participant. It also attempts to establish non-hierarchical relationship between them (Bryman, 2008). Particularly these assets had the major significance for this research, which will be reviewed in thoroughly below in the section of ethical considerations.

As mentioned above, the semi-structured interviews were conducted online. Although online interviews are more similar to the onsite interviews in the sense that conversation arises spontaneously (O'connor, et al., 2008), it still creates additional difficulties. As Hesse-Biber argues, setting interviews online makes it more difficult to "establish rapport with the participants, and the researcher loses the impact of visual and verbal cues" (2014, p. 192).

However, this was only partly problematic to this research, because most of the interviews were conducted through the video call option in the CMC (except one interview, which was conducted through the audio call only). Technical problems may also occur during interviews through CMC, which can also affect the rapport between the participant and the researcher. Such encounters were present during the interviews in this study and it will be discussed later.

3.4. Sample

The participants for this study were recruited using the online recruitment method. The first participants were recruited from the Facebook group '25 November and more' consisting of more than 1000 members (exclusively women). Most of the members are women's rights activists and some of them are working in the Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) in the field of gender relations. Since this dissertation strives to focus not only on the individual, but also on the collective experiences of women, this particular target group was chosen for this research. This target group served as key informants for the study, who had relevant knowledge and experience about women's participation patterns in public life in Georgia. Thus, their importance for this study was twofold: they were key informants that could share other women's experiences and they were women themselves who are active in the public sphere in Georgia.

I am a member of the Facebook group '25 November and more' and invited participants for this research by writing the post with a clear information about the research. However, after posting the information only three participants responded and agreed to take part in this study. Other participants were recruited using snowball method: I asked the participants to recommend other activists or NGO representatives for this study. Due to the limited time and resources, only 10 participants were recruited. Seven participants are working in Non-

Governmental Organisations and their work is connected to the women's rights. Other participants consider themselves to be activists without working experience in the field of gender relations. Three of the participants have been engaged in activism since 1990s (after the dissolution of Soviet Union). I decided to include activists from the older generation, in order to receive the information about the post-Soviet experiences.

3.5. Interview Process

Prior to the interviews, participants were provided with the Plain Language Statement in Georgian language, emphasizing on the crucial elements of the research: research objectives, sampling, interview proccess and confidentiality. I made clear that participation in this research was voluntary and they could withdraw from the research. In the Plain Language Statement it was mentioned that some of their direct quotes would be used in the dissertation (see appendix 1, Participants Information Sheet). They also were notified that due to the limited number of members of the Facebook group "25 Novermber and more", some information could potentially be identifiable. However, their names and other information were not recorded and instead, were changed to pseudonyms for the dissertation.

After this step, participants were provided with the Consent Form in Georgian Language. Their consent was obtained verbally and it was audio recorded. The research instrument was a semi-structured interview guide, which consisted of the general themes, based on the literature available about the post-Soviet gender studies. However, in the interview process spontaneous follow-up questions were also asked. Since all the participants' native language was Georgian, the interviews were conducted in Georgian. The average duration of the interview was about 40-60 minutes. As a result, I had more than 8 hours of data. All the

Interviews were audio-recorded. In addition to the audio recordings, I also took notes during the interviews. Interview files were stored in my password protected personal computer in the password protected folder.

There were several problems during the interviews. Firstly, it was harder to plan the interviews because of the time differences between the United Kingdom and Georgia. Secondly, conducting the interviews online made it difficult to establish rapport with the participants in some cases, because there were technical problems during the interviews when the internet connection was weak. Sometimes it happened when the participants were talking about their experiences and their speech was interrupted. In these circumstances, I called back the participants; however, it certainly created inconvenience.

3.6. Ethical Considerations from the Feminist Perspective

Bryman writes that there are four major ethical principles researchers should consider: no harm to the participants, informed consent, and avoidance of deception and of the invasion of privacy (2008). All of these principles were addressed during the interviews: participants were not asked personal questions directly; their names are changed and I use pseudonyms instead of names. The study was approved by the College of Social Sciences Ethics Committee.

For me, as a feminist researcher, standards of feminist research ethics is also important. For standpoint feminists, epistemology and ethics are inseparable (Lykke, 2010). Feminist research ethics lays the emphasis on the role of the researcher, the relationship between the researcher and the researched, and the reflexivity of the researcher (Letherby, 2003). Feminist researchers strive to minimize power difference between the researcher and the participant (Bell, 2014) during the interview process, which is characterised to be a field of power relations (Kvale, 2006). As a researcher, I tried to minimize the question of power and

authority between myself and the participants and to 'break down research hierarchies' (Letherby, 2003, p. 85). In order to overcome this asymmetry, I used open-ended questions and neutral probes. I also engaged in the conversation and shared my own experiences when it was relevant. During the interviews I recognised that establishing trust and connectedness between the participants and the researcher was crucial (Reinharz, 1992). In such configuration, when the participants and the researcher share more or less similar background, the question of potential bias often arises. To overcome this, I focused more on the participants perspectives and stayed neutral in the process of interviewing.

3.7. Data Analysis

Data was transcribed verbatim and then was translated from Georgian to English. Data was analysed thematically. This method was chosen due to its flexibility and compatibility with many epistemological stances (Braun & Clarke, 2006), including the standpoint feminist perspective. Translated transcripts were imported from Microsoft Word into Nvivo. In a parallel manner the notes were also imported into Nvivo as memos. The data was read and reread and the key phrases were identified and coded. On the next level codes were transformed into themes or thematic nodes. After the nodes were created the data was reread and then sub-themes or child nodes were identified. The main challenge here was to maintain connection between the participants' words and the themes (Eatough & Smith, 2006); for this purpose, the themes and the subthemes were created based on both, participants' interpretations as well as the literature. Thus, the identified themes were both data-driven/inductive (Gilbert & Stoneman, 2016) and deductive (in the sense that data was reread in order to find linkage with the literature). The main themes and experiences that participants discussed during the interviews will be presented in the next chapter.

Summary

Based on the feminist standpoint approach, the research focuses on women's participation patterns in Georgia. It strives to explore women's individual and collective experiences and to represent their voices through qualitative research methods. In order to address research aims and questions, ten online semi-structured interviews were conducted with activist women in Georgia. They were recruited using the online recruitment method. Data was recorded, transcribed and analysed thematically.

Chapter 4. Findings and Discussion

Most of the themes discussed in this chapter are in accordance with the theoretical debates around gender relations in the post-Soviet context. Participants focus on how women's representation in the public sphere is limited. By emphasising on women's participation in labour market, the participants argue that women's work is mostly undervalued and they do not have access to decision-making process and power. On the other hand, according to the participants, private realm or family is considered to be women's space, they are primarily ascribed to family life, however they are still deprived of power in family and the 'head of the household' is a man. Such gender dispositions indicate that in Georgia there is an "essentialist view of women as fundamentally, biologically, and thus socially, different from men" (Sandoval, 2000, pp. 56-57), which is influenced by Soviet and pre-Soviet gender regimes. Besides the essentialist approach, the participant's accounts pointing to the growing trend of religion and nationalist ideology relates to the notion of neotraditionalisation. In such gender ideology women's 'gender negotiation' strategies may have been influenced by the state socialism.

4.1. Women and the Public Realm

Almost all participants emphasised the women's exclusion from the public sphere (*sajaro sivrtse*). Magda notes that as a woman she is alienated from the public space, it does not matter what is implied – education, employment or any other spaces.

When participants were speaking about women's participation patterns in public realm, they primarily focused on women's economic participation where they are also excluded from. As Gvantsa notes, the major barrier for women is that they are not economically independent

and cannot live by their own terms. Magda gives an example of how hard the economic conditions of women are by noting that family's economic property is almost never passed on women, the question of inheritance is almost always decided in favour of man. Thus, "women are in unequal conditions from the beginning" (Magda).

Participants' accounts indicate that they differentiate domestic and public spaces, where "both the state and civil society, as well as the world of work, can be seen as a public sphere populated largely by men" (Slater, 1998, p. 139). By drawing attention to how women are excluded from the public world, participants see the "traditional gendered construction" (Lister, 2003, p. 119) behind the division of public/private. Their emphasis on the women's economic participation makes it possible to focus on the modern economic relations, which is the core of this distinction, since "social value, status and power depend on work … which is 'productive' and … paid" (Slater, 1998, p. 143).

Women in the Labour Market

Participants discussed the current patterns of women's economic participation in Georgia. Khatuna stressed that women's employment rates are quite low, whilst their education rates are higher. However, participants still highlighted some problems in the education system such as segregation of specialisations in the higher education systems and as Irina points up, frequent gender discrimination at schools or universities. She says that women are seen to be less intelligent than men. If a woman is smart, she continues, people say it is because she has a "man's brain". She adds that such discriminative attitudes are characteristic to the lecturers and teachers as well. Gvantsa's account is corresponding to Irina's words: "I remember a lecturer saying that ten stupid boys are still better than one smart girl".

As mentioned above, participants say that women disappear from the public realm after the education and in Nona's words, this is especially visible when comparing women's and men's incomes to each other. She says that men have more income than women unless the salary on the particular position is regulated. She stresses that the situation in the private sector is much worse in this sense than in non-governmental or governmental sectors. Nona's account underlines this inequality:

> A company where I previously worked was mostly run by men. It was a kind of laboratory and in the lab, almost all workers were women, they were scientists, professors. And they had much lower income than me. They worked there for years and probably work there today because they also think their salary is enough for them. I remember our boss said that women do not need much money or career because her husband will provide for her.

Khatuna gives an example of how salary can be gendered and how it can determine women's employment patterns. She says that previously in Georgia waitress was almost always a woman, which changed over times and men entered this position. She points out that this happened because the profits of the restaurants increased and higher salaries were available on this position. "When there is a normal salary on some position it is almost always dominated by men", she adds.

Lela clarifies, that women's and men's salaries differ from each other because women's and men's positions are different at the workplace. She says that almost all positions that are dominated by women are low-income jobs, except for the non-governmental sector, which is also feminised. Participants point up that medical sphere and education (mostly, school teaching) are mostly dominated by women. However, it is not the same for the higher

education. As Gvantsa argues although she wants to have an academic career, she does not have enough support:

> I want to work in academia, however boys of my age have lot more support and encouragement than I do. You know, I mean all kind of support, it is easier for them to achieve something. Generally, there is no space in Georgia for academic activities for no one but if there is some it is dominated by man.

To illustrate how men and women have different positions at the workplace, Ana gives an example of one of the Georgian regions, where she currently lives:

> I am living in the village and can say that women in village rarely go outside their houses. There is a category, for example teachers and employees of local governments, I mean City Hall and City Assembly that are dominated by women. However, the problem is different: women are mostly working in the spheres of culture or public relations but not in the finances for instance.

The participants emphasise not only on how women and men have different fields of work, but on how hard it is for women to achieve high positions at their jobs. In Khatuna's words, "no one will tell you they do not employ women, but in reality when it comes to managerial positions they certainly do not". She gives an example of her friend who had been trying to be the head of one of the organisations for years and she could not achieve it, despite the fact that the organization head was due to change once in every several years.

Some participants mentioned that there are some spheres where it is harder for women to enter and they point to the police and the politics. As Lela argues when it comes to politics women have support neither from government and the population, nor from their colleges:

We all remember when one of the members of parliament [male] humiliated young

women [also members of parliament] by saying that they were in parliament for

different reasons rather than professionalism, hinting on their intimate relationships.

Or the recent events when someone uploaded the videos of women parliament

members having sex and discrediting them with it. After such matters, I do not know

how to encourage women to get political career anymore.

Here participants speak about women's and men's different positions at the labour market.

They point out how the segregated labour market is characterised by the gender asymmetry

in Georgia (stressing both horizontal and vertical segregations) and how it influences them.

Their arguments are in accordance with the theoretical claims about gendered labour market.

Decision-Making Process and Women's Recognition

The discussion about women's position in the labour market leads participants to argue about

reasons behind such segregation. Most participants think that this is because women have

no access to decision-making process. In Irina's words this is characteristic to all the spheres

of employment or education, everywhere women are unable to represent the decision-

making positions. Salome also accentuates the lack of women in the decision-making

processes:

Everywhere women work hard. However, this is not followed by the benefit of power.

Decision-making is still up to man. Even if we do everything at work, decision is still

made by a man.

Irina explains that decision making does not take place in any of the fields which are more or

less feminised, for example third sector or secondary education. She argues that in these

sectors there are no finances and real power and thus, "it is not accidental that we see women there".

The alienation of women in the public realm, as participants stated before, takes place not only because women do not have access to certain positions. Nona indicates that it is important to differentiate between two levels of participation: invisible and visible. If a woman is working, has income and is invisible, attitudes towards her may not be negative, however if a woman is visible or active in the social life she is perceived to be in Nona's words, "out of control, which is, I do not want to say this word, but - threatening - to men." Thus, the visibility is a major issue for Georgian women and being visible is related to the range of problems that women face. Activist women, the participants of this research, draw attention to the problems which are provoked by the "visibility" of women in the public realm: "When you are visible there are speculations about your private life and appearance, things that are not a matter of interest in relation to men" (Irina).

Other participants draw attention to the question of recognition of women in the public realm. Some of them even state that the question of women's recognition in public realm is not less important than their participation as such. Khatuna notes that women are "trapped in the same box and still considered to be dolls in the hand of men". She explains that it is not enough to be employed, have education and income:

When women entered the public space, it became more apparent that they could not achieve recognition. It can be seen in the workplaces, everywhere. No one gives us opportunities to express ourselves, nobody wants to see us, nobody wants for us to be recognized.

It is significant that the participants focus on the vertical segregation and draw attention to the decision-making process, which relates well to the Acker's emphasis on power relations in the context of vertical segregation (2006). They stress that although women are on some level included in the labour market, they have no power and decision-making possibilities, or their work is unrecognised. This links well to the soviet past, where women were presented in the public realm and they were working, but "rarely appeared in the leadership positions in the higher echelons of power" (Ishkanian, 2003).

Gender Negotiation

The participants state that in rare occasions it is possible to achieve women's visibility and recognition, however in order to do this they have to adopt masculine roles. To put it in Irina's words:

> We [women] are forced to adopt characteristics that are considered to be masculine. In order to achieve equal position to men, we need to adopt masculine intonations, clothing, everything. We are not even thinking about it but it is an attempt to be perceived seriously.

Irina's account links to the Soviet past when gender differences were neutralised in the public realm, and women were treated as men in the workplace (Johnson & Robinson, 2007). The participants do not state that they are treated as men in the workplace, but they are saying that they have to adopt men's gender role in order to be perceived as equal. This shows that 'gender multiplication', or the choices of adopting alternative gender constructions are present (Lyon, 2007) but limited (Johnson & Robinson, 2007). Today, as under socialism, women still "play up their similarities to men" in order to be successful (Johnson & Robinson,

2007, p. 7). In this way women can move between different variations of gender but still stay inside the binary system of gender roles.

However, accounts of Tekla contradicts the above reviewed double role of women in the public realm:

> Perception about how women should act, is traditional. Even in the Soviet Union such stereotypes prevailed in Georgia. It had its traditional nuances in relation to the gender issues. A man was a Caucasian traditional macho and a woman was feminine mother.

Tekla's account suggests that women's gender role in Georgia was different from the image of women in Soviet Union. It may indicate that despite being in the Soviet Union, local culture and traditions were still, on a certain level, present.

4.2. Women and the Private Realm

When speaking about the reasons of exclusion women from the public space, one of the central theme for the participants is women's gender role in the private sphere (*piradi sivrtse*) or in the family life. The participants argued that family is often an important barrier for women when they want to be involved in public realms.

Some of the participants stated that traditional roles of a woman and a man still exist in Georgia. They drew particular attention on this issue and argued that marriage and motherhood is seen to be the primary responsibilities for them. Tamar stated that they are considered to be born for the family life and everything else is seen to be insignificant for them:

When I was a child I remember feeling protest towards the narrative that woman must go from one patriarch that is the father to another that is your husband. It was very tragic for me from the early age, I can recall. When I was looking at women around me, I did not want to be like them. I was looking at my mother, my aunt and was thinking, how can I avoid being like this? I recognised that in order to be perceived as a person I have to use so much additional energy… I felt, you know, I need to study well, have a good job in order to be free, in order to deserve my own freedom… I constantly had a feeling that I had some kind of chains on me and in order to unchain myself I needed to pay the price. I sometimes still feel the same.

Irina rather than discussing family in general, narrows her discussion to the importance of motherhood, which "is a necessity in Georgia". She further continues that motherhood, or bearing a child is not the only function of women in Georgia, a woman should also educate their children about traditions, Georgian values and their country. It is probably best indicated from Salome's account:

It is not only the physical reproduction that is important. Woman should also educate her daughter to be a woman, a mother, while her son should be educated to be a man, you know what I mean, to be a real man, a soldier. I always felt this during my childhood. Everyone was telling me: learn sweeping, learn stitching, things like this. I had a feeling that my primary function was to be a mother and that nothing else mattered. I remember I wanted to be a pianist and my mother told me that it does not matter how you play a piano, it will not give you a value as a woman. Such heart-breaking phrases… as if they are insignificant but still are in my mind. They formed a kind of protest in me, which probably will stay with me forever.

In their accounts, the participants focus on how important it is for women to be married and to be mothers. On the one hand, women being primarily ascribed to the family may be founded in the essentialist approach to gender, which dominated in the Soviet Union (Lyon, 2007) and underlined how women and men had 'innate differences' (Johnson & Robinson, 2007, p. 7). On the other hand, perception of women as primarily mothers and carers is different from the Soviet past, where women (as men) were considered to be primarily workers. It also contradicts the contemporary market economy, where women are required to prioritise paid work (Acker, 2006) and in this sense, is closer to the Goldthorpe's characterisation of the patriarchal societies (1983). When family is prioritised over work, it can indicate that characteristics of the patriarchal, rather than market societies prevail in Georgia.

This significant shift in the gender ideology and emphasis on the family rather than on work can be linked to the notion of neotraditionalisation. Participants' accentuation on the motherhood and double duties of physical and ideological reproduction can also be connected to the growing trend of nationalist ideology which shapes the gender inequality in post-Soviet countries (Johnson & Robinson, 2007). According to Kay, nostalgic nationalism seeks to tie women to their home (Kay, 1997). One of the participant's account confirms such 'revival' of the nationalist ideology: "In Georgia there are still traditional views on what women and men should be like. Even the youth likes to be traditional, they were Chokha's [Georgian national male dress] at their weddings and things like this" (Tamar). Participants' emphasis on elements which can be connected to the nationalist ideology (motherhood and double reproduction) address the question of neotraditionalist gender ideology. It implies the model of male breadwinner and woman-mother and is founded upon both pre-communist and Soviet gender regimes (Johnson & Robinson, 2007).

Putting emphasis on the neotraditionalist gender ideology leads to the negotiation of gender roles in the private realm. Even in frames of 'gender multiplication', which is possible in post-socialist countries (Johnson & Robinson, 2007), women's choices in relation to gender roles may be even more limited than in the public space and it can be dictated by the nationalist ideology and traditional gender regimes.

4.3. Negotiating Public/Private

As it is seen from the account of some participants, being primarily a mother and being seen in frames of family prevents women from entering the public realm. By stating this, Lela says that this is the source from where negotiating public/private starts. She summarises the meaning of this dilemma for woman:

> Unlike men, at some point of her life, every woman faces the dilemma: career or family. It is not even a matter of choice. It is assumed that even when woman works, she should have the same obligations in the family and fulfil its 100%.

The argument of Irina is also in accordance with Lela's words. She also says that it is not a dilemma for women because if woman cannot negotiate work and family than she should prioritise motherhood. She adds that the only exception is when women have economic capital to hire a nanny or a maid and this, in case of Georgia, is possible to only a few. This is also underlined in another participant's, Tekla's account:

> It is not a question who should skip work when the child is ill. It is apparent that it should be a mother. It is considered, that everything that happens in frames of the household should be done by women. Even in cases, when family is hiring someone for help, woman is in charge of who should be hired.

Participants in the above described accounts underline once more that the primary space for women is a family and if there is a question of negotiation of private/public, than they feel they should prioritise a family. In Irina's words, women's public activity is "desirable, but not necessary".

Here participants focus on how women have no 'choice' between the work/family and how their 'choices' are determined by the high significance of family in Georgia. In their opinion there are two ways women can 'negotiate' public/private. First strategy that participants suggest (prioritising family) resonates with the hierarchical nature of the public/private divide when "the private sphere and its inhabitants can be treated as subordinate and inferior to the public, literally as 'dependants' who may serve but not accompany those who operate in the public world" (Slater, 1998, p. 145). In the context of Georgia hierarchy between public/private may be also connected to the Soviet past where work had crucial role and was superior to private life (Gal & Kligman, 2000). Furthermore, such strategy focuses on the essentialist views one more time, where the private realm is seen to be "natural" to women (Slater, 1998).

Despite the fact that women's obligation is seen to be the family chores, as some of the participants say they still are more active in public life of Georgia than they were in 1990s. Nona notes that many 40-50 year-old women around her, who were not working in the previous years, just started their careers. As Tekla notes, today it is impossible for a family to be financially supported by one person only, and women "in some sense, have to work and be active". In result, "women are more present in the public realm than they were before, are active, but they are required to be fully involved in the family life as well" (Lela). Thus, the

participants state that this resulted in women's involvement in both - family and the public realm.

Here participants suggest the second strategy for negotiating public/private: being involved in both - the workplace and the family completely which imposes the dual burden on women. In this sense, women are post-Soviet superwomen (Ashwin, 2006b, p. 40). Thus, this may also be connected to the Soviet past, in which woman was both - worker and mother (Ibid.). On the other hand, it can be linked to the contemporary market economy, when women have "the triple shift" (Fraser, 2009) and they are responsible for domestic labour, paid work and childcare.

The participants' emphasis on breadwinning is in accordance with the family models in Soviet Union, indicated by Crompton (Crompton, 2006). As Crompton argues, socialist family model was a "dual-earner" model, where both woman and man were required to work; however, as Lyon mentions, primary breadwinners in the family were still men (2007). The participant's accounts suggest that men still are breadwinners in the family.

However, it is interesting that such distribution of breadwinning in Georgia was significantly changed in the 1990s. This is also underlined in the participant's accounts. Salome accentuates the transformation from the socialist to the capitalist systems and points out that men could not adapt to the new system in Georgia and women had to take the responsibility in their own hands. Participants suggest that being involved in both realms does not grant power to women in the family. Lela thinks that men still are heads of their households. The same position is seen from Irina's account who claims that their "breadwinner status was not followed by the privilege of power and this is the same today - women in the families have no power, they are not making important decisions."

The participant's emphasis on the power and decision-making in the context of the family or in the private sphere suggest that today men's status in the family is higher (Ashwin, 2006b), despite the fact who is breadwinner in the family.

4.4. Constraining Women's Participation in the Public Realm

Government of Georgia was accused by the participants in paying little attention to the gender issues. They stressed that it was an additional barrier for women that government does not recognise the gender inequality at all. As Magda points out, gender is defined as biologically determined even in the legislative documents:

> If you look at the legislative documents, you will think that it is a step forward because we have neutral laws, but we need gender-sensitive laws. In reality, state does not recognise that women and men are not in the equal conditions.

As she continues, this creates barriers for women since there are no mechanisms that will enable them to enter politics or certain positions at the labour market. Lela points out that the absence of quotas is an additional obstacle for women and thinks that if such quotas existed, women would be encouraged to be more active.

Participants point out that government does not recognise the gender inequality. It may be connected to the absence of the gender agenda in Georgia, which Ashwin describes is the characteristic of post-Soviet countries in the transition process (2006b). She adds that in such context Soviet gender regime affects the contemporary gender relation since it is not replaced by anything else (Ibid.).

Almost every participant focused on the ways women's activities were "controlled" both in the public and in private realms while noting that there are multiple levels of constraining

women. Magda thinks that some institutions are trying to control both public and private spheres and women's participation in them. If the state was controlling both 'private' and 'public' in the Soviet Union (Johnson & Robinson, 2007), today this function is delegated to other institution, as participants point out, to church and family. The participants' focus on these institutions suggests that family and religion may be domestic sources of power (Ibid).

Family

As it was discussed in the previous part of this chapter, according to the participants, women are primarily seen as mothers and wives and their 'natural space' is considered to be a family. Magda notes that it is definitely family, which is the major barrier for a women to be more active in the social, economic or political life of the country. Ana states that the fact that women have many responsibilities in their families defines their low level of engagement in the public spheres. She carries on by arguing that women's labour at home is considered to be natural, taken for granted and that they are unable to have time for themselves. Lela gives an example of her friend:

> She [my friend] wanted to be involved in the local politics of one of the regions of Georgia. She had competence and everything. But at the last minute she took back her words and said, you know, I do not want to have more responsibilities, nobody is helping me at home and I could not stand additional emotional stress at my job, it is just not worth it.

Women's responsibilities in their families lead to the question of labour division at home between man and woman. In this sense, family is an additional barrier for women since it cannot help her negotiate work/home. As the participants note, women could not enter the public space because of their labour at home and as Lela puts it, because "men did not enter

the private space." Other participants also note that negotiation about domestic labour division is non-existent in many families. Nona, on the example of her friends says that they never talked about labour division at home with their partners, it was implied that home duties were up to women. Most of the participants agreed that labour division in family was of crucial importance for women and it could, in some sense, determine women's active involvement in the public spaces. Ana's account is drawn on her experience:

> When I started my career, there was a lot of work to do at home. My husband and I distributed this work more or less equally so I could work. Thus, I did self-realisation on some level because I had support, I was attending the trainings in Tbilisi and my husband was staying with children. Although some moms were attending the trainings with their children since they could not leave them anywhere. For the family when woman works it is… well, woman is doing everything, if she does not do it then somebody else should, but no one else is willing to.

As it is seen from the account of Ana, domestic labour division between man and woman is crucial for women's career. Khatuna summarises that if a woman is active in the public realm, it means that family not only supports her emotionally, but helps her and shares the domestic duties.

However, it is not a matter of 'support' and 'help' in some cases. As participants argue, there are circumstances, when families prevent women from being active in the public realm. As Lela puts it, there are some occupations that are harder to enter for women, for example, politics, military, when family is especially against it. She remembers the case of the woman who was unable to work in the police because the idea was opposed not by her parents as

such, but mostly by her male cousins. Ana draws on her own experience to show how family can be a source of restriction and control:

> Several years ago I was a supporter of one political party and went with them on one event. When my father found out, I had serious problems at home, because I went there without his consent. My father was a typical Georgian traditional man like everyone else around him and did not like active women. However, I was not living with my family since I studied in Tbilisi and he could not fully influence my life.

These accounts suggest that expectations about the family responsibilities a woman should take on can act as a barrier preventing them from entering the public sphere, whether it is employment or politics. However, interviews suggest that there may be other systems that also constrain women and prevent them from participating in the public realms.

Religion

Most of the participants underlined the importance of religious narratives in women's lives. They argued that religious institutions try to control women in contemporary Georgia. As Magda states, Georgian Orthodox Church has a declared position on the control of women in the public sphere and openly argues who should or should not be visible in the streets, how should and should not women act. By doing so, she says, church sets physical and moral borders. She emphasises, that church seeks to marginalise women, "to make them disappear from the public spaces":

> Our [women's] active participation in country's life is a threat to certain institutions. I remember when Patriarch [Patriarch of Georgia, Illia II] recommended emigrant

women to quit working and told them to come home and care for their own children.

He said, 'is your income worth it?' I felt so much anger at that moment…

However, Magda argues that church's position is not limited to the public realm, it also controls the private while determining what women and men should do in families declaring that woman's responsibility is motherhood and man's – breadwinning in the family. According to Magda's account, church's has a real political power and resources to control women. She says, it is hard not to believe its controlling power "when it tells me how to act as a wife and how to be obedient to my husband, and that husband is the head of the family".

Tekla looks at this question from women's perspective. She claims that such religious narratives have an impact on women, it demotivates them:

> It is impossible not to be demotivated when all day long church tells you that as a
> woman you should be obedient of your husband, and that your family's honour is up
> to you and you should stop having fun and raise your children for your country.

In order to illustrate the major impact of church on women's lives, Irina gives an example of Patriarch of Georgia's sermons, where he spoke of how Georgian women, influenced by the West, want to have more rights than they are allowed to. She suspects that if the most respected person in the country can say such things, than priests probably will have worse attitudes towards it:

> I do not go to church and cannot say definitely but I have heard from so many people
> and even from the TV that all their narrative is built upon the secondary role of
> woman. They say, woman should not demand more than our grandmothers
> demanded, should be traditional and strive to be mothers. When this is the reality,

what socio-political spaces are we even talking about? Imagine how such narratives influence those, who go to church.

Ana's account responds the above quoted position. She points out that church has serious influence over the youth. She says she has seen how younger generation talks about women and that women's employment and education is unacceptable for them. In Irina's opinion, such narratives are also prevalent in the media and in this way the power of church is spread over the country. Tekla suggests that the stronger women are trying to get, the more the church tries to control them.

The power of Georgian Orthodox Church is strongly emphasised in the participants' accounts. After the fall of the Soviet Union, revival of religion was observed in many countries; however it varied by country (Johnson & Robinson, 2007). The participant in this section spoke about the forms religion takes in Georgia and how it constraints women. It is typical to the neotraditionalism, when religion along with the nationalist ideology, tries to ascribe home to women (Kay, 1997). In the previous chapters there was discussed how the nationalist ideology may have an influence on women by requiring motherhood and ideological reproduction from them. When the participants' also focus on religion, it can indicate that both components of the neotraditionalist ideology – nationalism and religion - are present in Georgia. As Hochschild defines, traditional gender roles prevail when men are heads of the families and women have no power in family (1989). In this sense, the participants' accounts suggest that there may be growing trend of traditional ideology and re-feminisation/re-masculinisation (Johnson & Robinson, 2007) in Georgia. It can be also argued that the participants' accounts can be linked to both: Soviet and pre-Soviet gender orders, with

reference to the essentialist approach to gender, which are the assets of neotraditionalisation.

Summary

The research findings suggest that notion of neotraditionalisation may be relevant when speaking about contemporary gender order is Georgia. Women's experiences can be shaped by such gender ideology. Also they can be influenced by the Soviet gender regime. Women's participation patterns in the public realm seem to be shaped by neotraditional gender ideology, including the pre-socialist and socialist gender regimes and by the gender dispositions in the market economy as well. Essentialist gender roles seem to be still prevalent in Georgia ascribing women to the private and men – to the public realms.

Chapter 5. Conclusion

The study has explored women's participation patterns in the public sphere and gender ideologies, which may have influence on these patterns. The study addressed the public/private distinction in the feminist literature, and the concept of neotraditionalisation in post-Soviet gender studies.

Theoretical framework for this dissertation was provided in the literature review, which outlined the contemporary context of Georgia, emphasizing women's limited participation patterns in the public realm. It also discussed the debates around public/private distinction from the feminist perspective in order to situate the research in context; Reviewing Soviet and post-Soviet gender order based on the works of Ashwin (2006a, 2006b) made possible to explore the influence of the Soviet Union on women's participation patterns in the public realm; Women's position in contemporary labour market indicated the challenges women have in the public realm in frames of market economy; Work of Johnson and Robinson (2007) was used to explore how neotraditional gender ideology influences women's participation in public realm. The debates in the literature review indicated how different gender regimes and ideologies influence women's positions in the public realm.

In order to address the research questions, the qualitative research was conducted. It adopted the feminist standpoint epistemic stance. Ten online semi-structured interviews were conducted with activist women in Georgia, aiming to explore women's individual and collective experiences in the public realm. The sample size for this research was quite small, however the research did not strive to generalise data; its aim was to give rich description (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016) of women's experiences and to explore their interpretations and perspectives.

The research findings were connected to the theoretical framework emphasised in the literature review. Participants' accounts indicate that they perceive the distinction between private and public as 'domestic/public' (Weintraub, 1997) or 'production/reproduction' divide. They also emphasised its hierarchical and gendered nature.

Participants' accounts addressed the research questions for this study. They indicated that women were excluded from the public sphere, especially from the decision-making or power-related positions. Participants' emphasis on the vertical and horizontal segregation in the labour market suggests that contemporary market economy may have impact on women's participation in public realm. Participants underlined, that women are often facing the dilemma of work/family, which may be influenced by the dual burden on women prevalent both in Soviet Union as well as in the market economy.

The research suggests that essentialist approach to gender may be prevalent in Georgia, and that women are perceived primarily as mothers and carers. This influences women's participation in the public realm because women are confined to the home and are less encouraged to work. Participants identified the role of family and religion as one of the main barriers for women to participate in the public sphere. This may suggest that neotraditional gender ideology may be present in Georgia, consisting of nationalism, religion, and essentialist approach to gender.

The influence of Soviet past may be observed in many accounts that participants spoke about. First of all, it can be observed in women's negotiation strategies in the public and private realms, where their limited gender roles from where they can choose from, can be influenced by the Soviet past and the neutralisation of gender difference in public realm. Also, the notion

of neotraditionalisation is closely connected to the Soviet Union, since many post-Soviet countries are characterised by such processes (Johnson & Robinson, 2007).

Thus, the participants' accounts indicate that women's participation in the public realm in Georgia can be shaped by the neotraditional gender ideology, which means that it is influenced by both traditional as well as Soviet gender regimes. The partial impact of contemporary market economy was also highlighted, especially when discussing the work/family conflict.

This was an exploratory study, the findings of which are related to the existing literature. It is connected to the studies conducted in other post-Soviet countries as well. However, the research also contributed new findings, for example, the impact of Caucasian traditions and local culture on contemporary gender order. Participants' accounts suggest that, in a sense, the gender order in Georgia has its specificities compared to the general Soviet gender regime.

However, there are some limitations to the study. First of all, only ten women were interviewed and the sample size was quite small. More extensive research would be required with a larger sample size in order to overcome this limitation. Second of all, focusing not only on activists would be more exploratory, and would result in more diverse findings. In the future, the study can also include different 'variables' such as religion, age and ethnicity, relationship status, which may be important in the women's participation patters in public realm. More importantly, it may be interesting to focus on class, as it can be of the crucial importance when discussing the labour market. Thus, further this study may wish to have a larger and more diverse sample.

As it was indicated before, the research about women in public realm in the post-Soviet context is non-existent, and the influence of the Soviet Union on the contemporary gender regime has not been studied. It is hoped that this research will contribute to the gender studies in post-socialist transformations. Research in this area is necessary in order to study women's experiences in Georgia and to understand the reasons of their exclusion from the public life.

References

Acker, J., 2006. Inequality Regimes: Gender, Class, and Race in Organisations. *Gender and Society,* 20(4), pp. 441-464.

Arendt, H., 1958. *The Human Condtion.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ashwin, S., 2006a. Dealing with Devastation in Russia: Men and Women Compared. In: S. Ashwin, ed. *Adapting to Russia's New Labour Market.* Abingdon: Routledge, pp. 1-31.

Ashwin, S., 2006b. The Post-Soviet Gender Order: Imperatives and Implications. In: S. Ashwin, ed. *Adapting to Russia's New Labour Market.* Abingdon: Routledge, pp. 32-56.

Attwood, L., 1996. The Post-Soviet Woman in the move to the Market: A Return to Domesticity and dependence?. In: R. Marsh, ed. *Women in Russia and Ukraine.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 255-268.

Bell, L., 2014. Ethics and Feminist Research . In: S. Hesse-Biber, ed. *Feminist Research Practice: A Primer.* London: SAGE Publications, pp. 73-106.

Bradley, H., Erikson, M., Stephenson, C. & Williams, S., 2000. *Myths at Work.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Braun, V. & Clarke, V., 2006. Using Thematic Analysis in Psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology,* 3(2), pp. 77-101.

Bryman, A., 2008. *Social Research Methods.* 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Connell, R. W., 1987. *Gender and Power: Society, the Person, and Sexual Politics.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Correl, S. J., Kelly, E. L., O'Connor, L. T. & Williams, J. C., 2014. Redesigning, Redefining Work. *Work and Occupations,* 41(1), pp. 3-17.

Crompton, R., 1989. Class Theory and Gender. *The British Journal of Sociology,* 40(4), pp. 565-587.

Crompton, R., 2006. *Employment and the Family: The Reconfiguration of Work and Family Life in Contemporary Societies.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dwyer, S. C. & Buckle, J. L., 2009. The Space Between: On Being an Insider-Outsider in Qualitative Research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods,* 8(1), pp. 54-63.

Eatough, V. & Smith, J. A., 2006. I Feel Like a Scrambled Egg in My Head: An Idiographic Case Srudy of Meaning Making and Anger Using Interpretative phenomenological Analysis. *Psychology and Psychotheraphy: Theory, Research and Practice,* Volume 79, pp. 115-135.

Einhorn, B., 1993. *Cinderella Goes to Market: Citizenship, Gender, and Women's Movements in East Central Europe.* London: Verso.

Election Administration of Georgia (CEC), 2014. *2014 წლის 15 ივნისის ადგილობრივი თვითმმართველობის წარმომადგენლობითი და აღმასრულებელი ორგანოების არჩევნები/გენდერული სტატისტიკა.* Available at: http://cesko.ge/geo/list/show/17788-2014-wlis-15-ivnisis-adgilobrivi-tvitmmartvelobis-warmomadgenlobiti-da-agmasrulebeli-organoebis-archevnebigenderuli-statistika [Accessed 07 August 2016].

Fraser, N., 1990. Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy. *Social Text,* 25(26), pp. 56-80.

Fraser, N., 2009. *Fortunes of Feminism: from State Managed Capitalism to Neoliberal Crisis.* London: Verso.

Gal, S. & Kligman, G., 2000. *The Politics of Gender After Socialism.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Gilbert, N. & Stoneman, P., 2016. *Researching Social Life.* 4th ed. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications.

Goffman, E., 1972. *Relations in Public: Microstudies of the Public Order.* London: Penguin .

Goldthorpe, J. H., 1983. Women and Class Analyss: In Defence of the Conventional View. *Sociology,* 17(4), pp. 465-488.

Guba, E. G., 1990. The Alternative Paradigm Dialogue. In: E. G. Guba, ed. *The Paradigm Dialogue .* California : SAGE Publications, pp. 17-30.

Habermas, J., 1989. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society.* Oxford: Polity.

Hakim, C., 1995. Five Feminist Myths about Women's Employment. *The British Journal of Sociology,* 46(3), pp. 429-455.

Haraway, D., 1991. Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Priviledge of Partial Perspective. In: D. Harawas, ed. *Simians, Cyborgs and Women: The Reinvention of Nature.* London: Free Association Books, pp. 183-201.

Harding, S., 1986. *The Science Question in Feminism.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Hesse-Biber, S., 2014. Feminist Approaches to In-Depth Interviewing. In: S. Hesse-Biber, ed. *Feminist Research Practice: A Primer.* London: SAGE Publications, pp. 182-232.

Hochschild, A. R., 1989. *The Second Shift.* 1st ed. New york: Penguin Group Inc..

Hochschild, A. R., 1997. *The Time Bind: When Work Becomes Home and Home Becomes Work.* 1st ed. New York: Metropolitan Books.

Ishkanian, A., 2003. Gendered Transitions: The Impact of the Post-Soviet Transition on Women in Central Asia and the Caucasus. *Perspectives on Global Development and Technology,* 2(3), pp. 475-496.

Johnson, J. E. & Robinson, J. C., 2007. Living Gender. In: J. E. Johnson & J. C. Robinson, eds. *Living Gender after Communism.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, pp. 1-21.

Johnson, J. E. & Robinson, J. C., 2007. *Living Gender after Communism.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Kay, R., 1997. Images of an Ideal Woman: Perceptions of Russian Womanhood through the Media, Education and Women's Own Eyes. In: M. Buckley, ed. *Post-Soviet Women: From the Baltic to Central Asia.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 77-98.

Kvale, S., 2006. Dominance through Interviews and Dialogues. *Qualitative Enquiry,* 12(3), pp. 480-500.

Letherby, G., 2003. *Feminist Research in Theory and Practice.* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Lewis, J., 2006. Gender and Welfare in Modern Europe. *Past and Present,* pp. 39-54.

Lister, R., 2003. *Citizenship: Feminist Perspectives.* 2nd ed. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Lykke, N., 2010. *Feminist Studies: A Guide to Intersectional Theory, Methodology and Writing.* Abingdon: Routledge.

Lyon, T. R., 2007. Housewife Fantasies, Family Realities in the New Russia. In: J. E. Johnson & J. C. Robinson, eds. *Living Gender after Communism.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, pp. 25-40.

MacKinnon, C. A., 1989. *Toward a Feminist Theory of the State.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Merriam, S. B. et al., 2001. Power and positionality: Negotiating Insider/Outsider Status Within and Across Cultures. *International Journal of Lifelong Education,* 20(5), pp. 405-416.

Merriam, S. & Tisdell, E. J., 2016. *Qualitative Research: A Guide to Design and Implementation.* 4th ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Motiejunaite, A. & Hohne, A., 2008. Gender-role Attitudes and Female Employment in East/West Germany and the Baltic Countries. In: A. Motiejunaite, ed. *Female Employment, Gender Roles, and Attitudes: The Baltic Countries in a Broader Context.* Stockholm: Stockholm University, pp. 55-80.

Naples, N. A. & Gurr, B., 2014. Feminist Empiricism and Standpoint Theory: Approaches to Understand the Social World. In: S. Hesse-Biber, ed. *Feminist Research Practice: A Primer.* London: SAGE Publications, pp. 14-41.

Narayan, U., 2004. The Project of Feminist Epistemology: Perspectives from a Nonwestern Feminist. In: S. Harding, ed. *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual and Political Controversies.* New York: Routledge, pp. 213-225.

National Statistics Office of Georgia, 2014 [Online]
Available at: http://www.geostat.ge/index.php?action=page&p_id=146&lang=eng
[Accessed 7 August 2016]

National Statistics Office of Georgia. [Online]
Available at: http://www.geostat.ge/index.php?action=page&p_id=65&lang=eng
[Accessed 7 August 2016].

National Statistics Office of Georgia, 2015. *ქალი და კაცი საქართველოში, http://www.geostat.ge/cms/site_images/_files/georgian/health/Qali%20da%20kaci_2015.pdf* [Accessed 7 August 2016].

O'connor, H., Madge, C., Shaw, R. & Wellens, J., 2008. Internet-based Interviewing. In: N. Fielding, R. M. Lee & G. Blank, eds. *The Sage Handbook of Online Research.* London: SAGE Publications, pp. 271-289.

Olesen, V., 2005. Early Millennial Feminist Qualitative Research: Challenges and Contours. In: N. K. Denzim & Y. S. Lincoln, eds. *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research.* London: SAGE Publications, pp. 235-278.

Pateman, C., 1988. *The Sexual Contract.* Cambridge: Polity.

Reinharz, S., 1992. *Feminist Methods in Social Research.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Rosaldo, M. Z., 1974. Woman, Culture, and Society: A Theoretical Overview. In: M. Z. Rosaldo & L. Lamphere, eds. *Woman, Culture, and Society.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, pp. 17-42.

Roulston, K., DeMarrais, K. & Lewis, J. B., 2003. Learning to Interview in the Social Sciences. *Qualitative Enquiry,* Volume 9, pp. 643-668.

Sacks, K., 1975. Engels Revisited: Women, the Organization of Production, and Private Property. In: R. R. Reiter, ed. *Toward and Anthropology of Women.* New York: Monthly Review Press, p. 232.

Sandoval, C., 2000. *Methodology of the Oppressed.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Shevchenko, I., 2007. Does the Gender of MPs Matter in Postcommunist Politics? The Case of the Russian Duma, 1995-2001. In: J. E. Johnson & J. C. Robinson, eds. *Living Gender after Communism.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, pp. 128-147 .

Skeggs, B., 2001. Feminist Ethnography. In: P. Atkinson, A. Coffey, S. Delamont & J. Lofland, eds. *Handbook of Ethnography.* London: SAGE Publications, pp. 426-442.

Slater, D., 1998. Public/Private. In: C. Jenks, ed. *Core Sociological Dichotomies.* London: SAGE Publications, pp. 138-150.

Smith, D., 1992. Sociology from Women's Experience: A Reaffirmation. *Sociological Theory,* 10(1), pp. 88-98.

Stanley, L. & Wise, S., 1995. Method, Methodology and Epistemology in Feminist Research Processes. In: L. Stanley, ed. *Feminist Praxis: Research, Theory and Epistemology in Feminist Sociology.* London: Routledge, pp. 20-62.

Statistics, I. D. o., n.d. *International Labour Office database on labour statistics.* [Online]
Available at: http://laborsta.ilo.org/applv8/data/c1e.html
[Accessed 7 August 2016].

Swidler, A., 1995. Cultural Power and Social Movements. In: B. Klandermans & H. Johnston, eds. *Social Movements and Culture.* London: UCL Press, pp. 25-40.

Treas, J. & Widmer E. D., 2000. Married women's Employment over the life course: Attitudes in Cross-National Perspective. *Social Forces,* 78(4), pp. 1409-1436.

UNDP, 2014. *Human Development Reports, United Nations Development Programme.*
[Online]
Available at: http://hdr.undp.org/en/content/gender-inequality-index-gii

UN Women, 2014. *Men and Gender Relations in Georgia,* Tbilisi. Available at:
http://eeca.unfpa.org/publications/men-and-gender-relations-georgia [Accessed 12.08.2016]

Walby, S., 1990. *Theorising Patriarchy.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

World Economic Forum (WEF), 2015. *The Global Gender Gap Report.* Available at:
http://www3.weforum.org/docs/GGGR2015/cover.pdf [Accessed 13.08.2016]

Weintraub, J., 1997. The Theory and Politics of the Public/Private Distinction. In: J. Weintraub & K. Kumar, eds. *Public and Private in Thought and Practice: Perspectives on a Grand Dichotomy.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, pp. 1-43.

West, C. & Zimmerman, D. H., 1987. Doing Gender. *Gender and Society,* 1(2), pp. 125-151.

Appendix 1.

<div style="text-align:right">**University of Glasgow,**
School of Social and Political Sciences</div>

This is the English translation of the Participants Information Sheet, which will be provided to the participants in Georgian language

Participant Information Sheet

Women's Participation Patterns in the Public Sphere in Contemporary Georgia

Researcher: Sopio Davituri, MRes Sociology, **email: 2185476d@student.gla.ac.uk**
Supervisor: Matt Dawson, email: Matt.Dawson@glasgow.ac.uk

Greetings!

I am Sopio, the student of the University of Glasgow and I am writing the dissertation about women's participation patterns in the public space in Georgia. You are invited to take part in this research. Before you decide it is important to understand the goals and objectives of this research. Please take time to read the following information. If you have any questions or concerns, please ask me and I will provide you with the relevant information.

Thank you!

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY:	The purpose of the research is to explore women's participation patterns in the public space in Georgia. I am interested how women are represented in the public space and what barriers and challenges they have in the social and political lives of Georgia. This study will be finalised by the September 1st.
CHOOSING PARTICIPANTS:	For fulfilling the research purpose, women's rights activists and representatives of the Non-Government Organisations in Georgia will be interviewed. You are being asked to take part in this research because you responded to my Facebook post or have been recommended as someone who would be interested in this topic.

<div style="text-align:right">60</div>

TAKING PART IN THE RESEARCH:	Taking part in this research project is entirely voluntary. Also, you are free to withdraw the consent and your interview any time without giving a reason.
THE INTERVIEW PROCESS:	If you decide to take part in this research project, the interview will take 40-60 minutes. Our conversation will be audio-recorded. Your verbal consent will be obtained at the start of the interview and audio-recorded as well.

The interview will have the form of a conversation, there will be given general topics on which you can suggest your viewpoints. We will discuss how women's and men's positions are different in the socio-political life in Georgia; What are the main problems and challenges women face in the labour market, politics, education, employment; What are the stereotypes women are characterised by in the public sphere and how these stereotypes changed through time.

You are free to provide as much information as you want and if you do not want to respond to the particular question, it is also your right to do so. |
| **CONFIDENTIALITY:** | All information which is collected about you during the research will be kept strictly confidential. Any information about you will have your name and address removed so that you cannot be identified from it. Also, for ensuring the confidentiality of the data, it will be stored in my password protected computer in the separate folder also protected with the password.

The organisation you are working in will also be kept confidential, but there are certain problems to the confidentiality that you should know: there are limited number of women's activists in Georgia, the sample size is quite small and this may have implications for anonymity: some information still maybe identifiable due to the small sample size.

In addition to this, some of the direct quotes will be used in the dissertation (without revealing your names or other personal information about you). In the end, the study analysis will be designed and included in the dissertation. The results of the research will be reported in English. The dissertation will not be published, only dissertation markers will have access to the dissertation.

Please note that assurances on confidentiality will be strictly adhered to unless evidence of wrongdoing or potential harm is uncovered. In |

such cases the University may be obliged to contact relevant statutory bodies/agencies.

RESULTS OF THE RESEARCH:	After gathering the given information and transcribing it, the translation from Georgian to English will be done, which will be followed by the process of analysis and then the dissertation will be written based on this empirical data. The dissertation will be read and evaluated by the lecturers at the College of Social Sciences. Your will not be identified in this dissertation. Furthermore, the data will be destroyed in the end of September 2016 (erased from the computer).
STUDY REVIEW:	The project has been reviewed by the School of Social and Political Sciences Ethics Forum.
CONTACT INFORMATION:	For further information or any questions regarding to this research, please contact me: Sopio Davituri, email: 2185476d@student.gla.ac.uk

If you have any concerns regarding the conduct of this research project, you can contact the School of Social and Political Sciences Ethics Officer Professor Keith Kintrea, email: Keith.Kintrea@glasgow.ac.uk.

Appendix 2.

University of Glasgow
College of Social Sciences

Consent Form

This is the English translation of the Consent Form, which will be provided to participants in Georgian language

Women's Participation Patterns in the Public Sphere in Contemporary Georgia

Researcher: Sopio Davituri

Supervisor: Matt Dawson

- I confirm that I have read and understood the Participant Information Sheet for the study and have had the opportunity to ask questions.
- I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time, without giving any reason.
- I consent to the interviews being audio-recorded.
- I consent that I will be identified by pseudonym in any publications arising from the research.

Taking part in the research:

I agree to take part in this research study ☐

I do not agree to take part in this research study ☐

Participant ……………………………… Signature/typed name ……………………………… Date ………

Researcher …………………………………… Signature ……………………………… Date ……………………

Appendix 3.

Semi-Structured Interview Themes

Women's Participation Patterns in the Public Sphere in Contemporary Georgia

1. Do you think that "women's place is home and men's – work" is still a popular position in Georgia?

2. Do you think that overall women's lives changed in the last decade and if so, how?

3. What are the key things you could identify as problematic to Georgian women in the public sphere?

(Possible prompts)

What are the opportunities women have today in the public sphere?

4. How women's and men's positions are different in the labour market are different?

(Possible prompts)

What do you think are the main challenges for women in the labour market?

Do you think they are discriminated against or considered as being 'suitable' for specific positions?

5. How women's and men's positions are different in the education system?

(Possible prompts)

What do you think are the main challenges for women in the education system?

6. What are the stereotypes that are mostly used when describing the 'working' or active women?

(Possible prompts)

How the active women are characterised in Georgian society?

7. How do you think these stereotypes are influencing women in Georgia?

8. Do you think these stereotypes have been changed through the years and if so, how?

(Possible prompts)

Do you think they were different in Soviet Georgia and if yes, how?

9. Is there anything you would like to add?

Thank you for your time and participation!

University | College of
of Glasgow | Social Sciences

Ethics Committee for Non Clinical Research Involving Human Subjects

NOTIFICATION OF ETHICS APPLICATION OUTCOME – UG and PGT Applications

Application Type: **New** **Date Application Reviewed:** 28/6/16

Application Number: SPS/2016/671/SOCIAL SCIENCE
Applicant's Name: Sopio Davituri
Project Title: Women's Participation Patterns in the Public Sphere in Contemporary Georgia

APPLICATION OUTCOME

(A) **Fully Approved** ☒ *Start Date of Approval: 24/6/16* *End Date of Approval: 1/9/16*

(*B*) **Approved subject to amendments**
If the applicant has been given approval subject to amendments this means they can proceed with their data collection with effect from the date of approval, however they should note the following applies to their application:

Approved Subject to Amendments without the need to submit amendments to the Supervisor ☐

Approved Subject to Amendments made to the satisfaction of the applicant's Supervisor ☐

The College Ethics Committee expects the applicant to act responsibly in addressing the recommended amendments.

(C) **Application is Not Approved at this Time**

Subject to Amendments made to the satisfaction of the School Ethics Forum (SEF) ☐

Complete resubmission required. Discuss the application with supervisor before resubmitting. ☐

Please note the comments in the section below and provide further information where requested.

If you have been asked to resubmit your application in full, send it to your supervisor who will forward it to your local School Ethics Forum admin support staff.

Where resubmissions only need to be submitted to an applicant's supervisor.
This will apply to essential items that an applicant must address prior to ethics approval being granted. As the associated research ethics risks are considered to be low, the applicant's response need only be reviewed and cleared by the applicant's supervisor before the research can properly begin. For any application processed under this outcome, it is the Supervisor's responsibility to email socpol-pgt-ethics@glagow.ac.uk with confirmation of their approval of the re-submitted application.

APPLICATION COMMENTS

Major Recommendations:

There is some confusion in the application form but I think this is down to writing style: in the form it is claimed that all interviews will be conducted on-line but in sections 23 and 24 it is stated that most will be conducted on-line and this raises issues of health and safety.

Minor Recommendations:

The application form and participants information forms have many grammatical and stylistic errors that need addressed
The consent form to map on to the application form shou;d give applicants the right to decide if they wish anonomous or not - see section 8.1.
section 8.2 needs to add the address at which the computer is housed.

Please retain this notification for future reference. If you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact your School Ethics forum admin support staff.