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There is arguably much misunderstanding over feminist knowledge production among social scientists who do not take an explicitly feminist approach. Far too often, the conventional wisdom about feminist analysis is that it is imbued by postmodern agendas and is antiscientific, seeking to deconstruct established knowledge cumulation and theory development through politicized research that focuses on women's experiences, outside of standard social science practice. Often, these views of feminist research are based on caricatures of what the full range of feminist scholarly activity is actually undertaking. Such stereotypes, which are rarely articulated officially, may very well be a major key to understanding why much nonfeminist analysis throughout the social sciences has ignored feminist scholarship on gender or only marginally addresses its empirical, methodological, and theoretical contributions, a trend which appears to be fully operative in 2010 (e.g., Beckwith 2010 and Grasswick 2011).

As a consequence, the potential of newer feminist scholarship to improve knowledge and theory building in the mainstream is at best mitigated, if not altogether thwarted, by an opaque glass wall. The wall blurs the true nature of feminist approaches and prevents constructive cross-fertilization between feminist and nonfeminist scholars, even when feminist scholars seek to directly contribute to research and theory-building that is not explicitly feminist.
The goal of this chapter is to contribute to breaking down this glass wall by examining in detail how one feminist area of study located in political science, feminist comparative policy (FCP), takes an empirical and integrative approach to feminist analysis, rather than one that is uniquely grounded in standpoint and/or postmodern feminist epistemologies. Reflecting trends in gender and politics scholarship more broadly speaking in political science, FCP has become a highly institutionalized and active area of comparative scholarship that brings together over one hundred researchers in Europe and the United States to assess the dynamics and determinants of gender, policy, and the state. As this chapter shows, this international feminist “epistemic community” (Haas 1992) places feminist empiricism to the fore with a focus on scientific method and empirical observation. This scientific community also brings in other feminist approaches, to a certain degree, in the spirit of methodological pluralism and problem-driven research. FCP scholars actively seek to contribute to—rather than ignore or reject—nonfeminist theory development, methodological debates, and the cumulation of knowledge; thus they are often the loudest critics of the glass wall between nonfeminist and empirical feminist knowledge creation. At the same time that this area has developed and consolidated achieving quite high rates of scientific success, its contributions have been largely ignored by nonfeminist scholarship in adjacent areas. Thus, examining the case of FCP allows for a deeper understanding of the empirical integrative approach as well as the mechanisms that maintain the glass wall between feminist and nonfeminist scholarly communities even when they share similar epistemological and methodological principles and values.

To understand the context for FCP’s empirical integrative approach, the analysis first provides an overview of the different feminist epistemological approaches and traditions in social science. Next, the trend toward integration and empiricism is mapped out in the discipline of political science as a whole in both the United States and Europe and across the different established subfields of political science. In the last part of the chapter, the case of FCP is first presented in terms of its emergence from the 1980s to 2000 and then of more recent developments in the past ten years across nine large-scale international research projects. Next, the chapter reflects upon what this body of work brings to the table for nonfeminist research and theory-building and how and why adjacent nonfeminist scholarship tends to overlook findings in one of the nine research projects, the Research Network on Gender, Politics and State (RNGS).

22.1. APPROACHES TO FEMINIST EPISTEMOLOGY IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

22.1.1. What’s Feminist about Feminist Epistemology?

First and foremost, to understand the range of feminist approaches to knowing and knowledge cumulation, an operational definition of this oft-contested
concept needs to be presented. While for many feminist analysts it is not crucial, or even desirable, to develop a core definition of feminism, for empirically inclined feminist scholars it is of fundamental importance to identify the operational definition of feminism in order to advance research agendas. Pinpointing a core definition of feminism does not negate the fact that there are different families of feminism that share certain central characteristics, depending on the context in which the concept is used (McBride and Mazur 2008). In this perspective, feminism is seen as a “family resemblance” (Goertz 2006) concept, rather than a classical one based on hierarchically defined categories. Feminism is defined here using the approach of recent work that recognizes the core ideas of Western feminism from which academics, activists, and policy practitioners choose. These core ideas include

1. a certain understanding of women as a group within the context of the social, economic, and cultural diversity of women;
2. the goal of advancing women’s rights, status, or condition as a group in both the public and private spheres; and
3. the desire to reduce or eliminate gender-based hierarchy or patriarchy that underpins basic inequalities between men and women in the public and private spheres.

Any feminist epistemological approach in the social sciences takes into consideration, on some level, this threefold definition with regards to ontology, methodology, and methods, theory-building, and the production of knowledge and its relation to nonfeminist knowledge building. More concretely, there is a common understanding across all feminist approaches that established knowledge creation is biased, due in some way to gender-based hierarchies within the established scientific community that produces male domination. This bias excludes the serious consideration of issues related to the complex processes of gender as they are intertwined with sex, and in more recent years with race/ethnicity, age, sexuality, disability, and so on—referred to as “intersectionality”—in analysis and/or theory. This patriarchal/gender-biased/androcentric nature of social science, so the analysis goes, means that scholars tend to be predominantly men, and women are excluded from the process of knowing and studying. To do gender analysis from a feminist perspective, therefore, is to first develop a critique of established epistemological and methodological norms and then bring women, and for some feminists, men with feminist goals, into the research process as well as gender as an object of analysis and theorizing. Ultimately, the inclusion of feminist actors and ideas stands to improve established knowledge aggregation and the scientific process. As the next section shows, the degree to which women need to be in control of the entire research process as well as the extent to which feminist analysis needs to challenge existing modes of study and develop separately, outside of conventional scientific realms, to create a new feminist approach varies across different feminist epistemological approaches.
22.1.2. Stances on Nonfeminist Scholarship: Transformative and Integrative

Two general stances with regard to established social science practice have been identified in the feminist literature: transformative/revolutionary and integrative (Squires 2004, Tripp 2010, Staudt and Weaver 1997). Rather than a dichotomous concept where individuals take either a transformative or integrative approach, these two stances should be seen as ideal types each at the end of a continuum where individuals and approaches can be placed.

Transformative   Integrative

A transformative stance seeks to pursue feminist change separately outside of the existing system to radically reshape knowledge cumulation to incorporate feminist goals. The claim is that this can only happen through a woman-only process that occurs outside of established scientific channels in a new space. In this perspective, the scientific dialogue about gender needs to happen in gender-specific journals and publication venues with a new epistemic community of analysts who share feminist values. The development of women's/gender/feminist studies outside of the established academic disciplines is a key part of achieving this agenda for change and improving knowledge creation generally speaking.

An integrative approach asserts that meaningful feminist change can only occur through dialogue with existing knowledge cumulation and that bringing a feminist perspective into nonfeminist work will produce a more accurate pursuit of knowledge. Put simply, feminist integration will make science more scientific. The integrative agenda is pursued in both gender-specific and mainstream outlets and individual scholars seek to participate in larger nonfeminist projects to bring gender considerations in. While a feminist epistemic community emerges, its members are quite often active in other nonfeminist communities with the aim of bringing their work and research questions about gender to bear on the research of the nonfeminist epistemic community. Integration can also take place across different feminist approaches through collaboration between empirical, standpoint, and postmodern feminists, or combining different methodological feminist approaches that come out of each epistemology within a single project. Reflecting current developments, the feminist communities that follow these approaches have become less adversarial, incorporating different takes on doing feminist research and knowledge production.

22.1.3. Three Feminist Epistemologies: Postmodern, Standpoint, and Empirical

Beyond these stances, three feminist epistemologies are generally identified within feminist studies. Many attribute the threefold taxonomy to philosopher of science Sandra Harding, who first wrote about feminist ways of knowing across all of the sciences in her groundbreaking book The Science Question in Feminism in 1986. Her
goal was to show the biased nature of existing scientific knowledge cumulation across the social and physical sciences and the potential for feminism to address those gender-based biases to make for a more just and equitable scientific process. She also sought to critique existing feminist approaches. Thus, in some ways these three approaches are rhetorical constructs, but they have remained important touchstones in any treatment of feminist epistemology (Hawkesworth 2006; Squires 2004, 2007; Hesse-Biber, Nagy, and Yaiser 2004; Fonow and Cook 1994; Grasswick 2011). Taken together, the taxonomy shows how ideas from the second wave feminist movements of the 1960s and 1970s were transported into the scholarly realm of research and analysis by academics first through the newly created women’s studies departments in universities. More prevalent in the United States than in Europe, these departments were a major by-product of women’s movement mobilization and some would say a part of the women’s movement itself. Later, feminist researchers trained and grounded in established disciplines as well as feminist studies entered into discipline-based departments alongside the women/gender/feminist studies programs.

These three approaches must be seen as separate strands rather than a single unified feminist approach. To be sure, all three approaches share a feminist core, but there are essential differences that distinguish each epistemology and at times put them at odds with each other in terms of the best feminist route to science and the cumulation of knowledge. Furthermore, for many feminist scholars, the three-part taxonomy has an evolutionary element. Harding and others originally asserted that the first stage of this process was empirical feminism, what she referred to as “spontaneous feminist empiricism” (2004, 41). Other feminists then “advanced” (sic) the agenda through postmodern and standpoint approaches, which more directly challenged the highly androcentric scientific establishment.6 These early empiricists or prefeminists, so the story goes, did not look for the causes of the androcentric nature of the scientific establishment or seriously treat gender as a complex analytical category. Rather, they simply added women and stirred: they brought sex or gender in as a variable or a simplistic element. It is interesting to note that many feminist analysts’ bias against feminist empiricism is based on this interpretation of the early feminist empiricists.

Thus, underpinning this taxonomy for many feminists is the notion that feminist empiricism is not as feminist as postmodern or standpoint feminism. More recently, feminist philosophers have shown that feminist empiricism can be an equally acceptable and effective avenue for social science change, in large part due to the extent to which feminist empiricism has taken some of the lessons of other feminist approaches, referred to by Longino (1990) and Hankinson-Nelson (1990) as “contextual feminist empiricism.” Feminist empiricists still find themselves having to justify their approach to standpoint and postmodern feminists. For example, Saltzman Chafez’s chapter in an edited volume on feminist epistemology from 2004 was titled “Some Thoughts by an Unrepentant ‘Positivist’ Who Considers Herself a Feminist Nonetheless.”

Unlike using a continuum to map out the two feminist stances, it is better to think of the three feminist approaches as three circles with some areas of overlap in
Figure 22.1 Mapping Feminist Epistemologies in 2010

Figure 22.1 particularly given the extent to which in recent years there has been a certain sharing and blending of the different epistemological underpinnings of the three approaches in the interest of advancing a common feminist scholarly/scientific agenda and not only developing a critique of existing social science practices.  

Postmodern feminist epistemology is based on the principles that truth is unknowable and that how one sees power depends on where the "knower" is situated; patriarchy determines that universal concepts about men and women maintain established gender roles and the ensuing systems of gender discrimination. As a result, these universal categories should be deconstructed and put into question, including feminism itself. Established scientific practice and any pursuit of theory is rejected as well as the notion that women can actually make a difference in the existing system. As Julia Kristeva (1980, 166) famously asserted, "If women have a role to play...it is only in assuming a negative function: reject everything finite, definitive, structural, loaded with meaning, in the existing state of society" (cited in Squires 2004, 61).

Standpoint feminism, in contrast, emphasizes the key role of women and their experiences as analysts and as objects of analysis and asserts that women need to identify the patriarchal nature of scientific production as well as the methods and concepts that are used and then create a new way of conducting research to produce new "gynocentric theory" (Ferguson 1993), concepts, theory, and knowledge. For Squires (2004, 60), "the aim is not to break the link between experience and knowledge, but to enable a different set of experiences to provide a basis for new knowledge claims." Some standpoint feminists, but not all, assert that women as well as men can do feminist research since research is grounded in "the epistemic advantage of the margins," and knowledge creation is "situated" within the researcher's position of marginality with regards to the mainstream/dominant (sic) scientific process (Wylie 2011, 157).
In the beginning of the development of women's studies, postmodern and standpoint approaches were quite separate, with the emphasis on eschewing the development of new theories by postmodern feminists and embracing that development by standpoint theorists. Later analysis has shown that the dividing lines between the two have blurred (Squires 2004 and Hawkesworth 2006). Both share a transformative approach for the most part with an emphasis on the importance of understanding the power-biased nature of existing categories and theories, the need to develop new categories and theories based on women's experiences in the context of class, race, ethnic, and other important sociocultural differences among women, and by women themselves. The underlying assumption is that this process should take place outside of established patriarchal scientific arenas—for example, in separate women's studies departments—so as to bring out the contributions of the marginalized that comes from their structural position in society as well as the established scholarly order.

Figure 22.1 shows the recent overlap between postmodern and standpoint approaches, which is not as pronounced, with regards to these two approaches and empirical feminism with its distinctly different ontological foundation, inspired by "positivism" or "naturalism" (Moses and Knudsen 2007). Here, unlike constructivism, which sees all knowledge as being socially constructed and embedded in established power relations and hence not objectively knowable, knowledge can be established through the observation of reality that exists outside any power relations. But the feminist assumptions about gender bias are still part and parcel of the approach, albeit with a softer, less structural connotation than the other feminist approaches, which emphasize the patriarchal nature of established science—where male domination marginalizes and minimizes women's contribution. In this view, the "androcentric" and "masculinist" (Harding 1984, 134–35) nature of the scientific process prevent research questions and design from going beyond cultural biases against women and gender-specific objects of study which downplay their analytical salience; the outcome is bad science. To change this, women and men, infused with feminist ideas from the women's movement, need to follow the established norms of science—replication, falsifiability, and the scientific method of hypotheses testing and empirical theory building—to address the biases in the definitions of research, concepts, methods, theory generation, and outcomes.

Thus, conducting empirical feminist research is a two-part process that is sometimes contradictory: promoting a critique of existing scientific practices based on a set of normative ideas coming out of feminism in order to do better, more objective science. In the social sciences this has meant bringing gender processes into studies as the object of analysis, generating new empirically based theories that operationalize feminist propositions, but also putting established nonfeminist theories to the test of gender. In other words, empirical feminism inherently takes a more integrative approach to social science research, which is not necessarily the case for postmodern and standpoint feminist epistemologies. Newer forms of empirical feminism have been called "contextual empirical feminism" (Longino 1980 and Hankinson-Nelson 1990) to reflect the importance of understanding women's
experiences and position in the androcentric system as objects and subjects: direct lessons from standpoint and postmodern feminism. As figure 22.1 shows, there are soft and hard forms of empirical feminism—the newer contextual empirical feminism that this chapter calls empirical and integrative feminism overlaps with postmodern and standpoint feminism, integrating certain aspects of these approaches and dialoguing with scholarship from that area. It is this softer form of empirical feminist epistemology that drives much but not all gender research in political science.

22.2. FEMINIST APPROACHES IN POLITICAL SCIENCE: A TREND TOWARD EMPIRICISM AND INTEGRATION

22.2.1. The Larger Disciplinary Context in the United States and Western Europe

While the standpoint and postmodern approaches have been foundational for many women's/gender studies programs and departments, empirical feminism has been an important influence in the development of gender and politics as an area of study within political science in the United States and Europe, arguably more than in other social sciences. In the United States, this is in part due to the heavy influence of behavioralism with its strict naturalist approach to political science and the assumption that methodology and methods should be based on quantitative principles of statistics and large "n" analysis and that science should be value-free. This mono methodological approach was put into question by the Perestroika movement, which developed around the critique of the main disciplinary journal, the American Political Science Review, in the late 1980s.

The claim, articulated by over one hundred political scientists, was that the APSR represented the dominant behavioralist trend in political science and did not seek to publish research that was less methods-driven. Submissions were rejected that used a multiplicity of approaches to answer the particular question being studied, including quantitative, but also qualitative, interpretivist, or constructivist and/or explicitly took a problem-driven approach, where research was to examine real-world problems and provide solutions for them while still developing theory. The Perestroika group also asserted that this type of work was not valued by the dominant core of American political science either. The movement achieved its immediate goal of creating a new disciplinary journal—Perspectives in Politics—that could serve as an explicit platform for this problem-driven and methodologically pluralistic work. The discipline as a whole became more open and pluralistic, albeit for many members of the original movement only to a limited degree.
Feminist scholars were a part of the Perestroika movement. They showed the parallels between feminist epistemological approaches that identified the normative nature of what was seen as value-free political science and the need to analyze gender in a meaningful way and not just to “add women and stir.” Thus, this notion was not just associated with early empirical feminists, but also in political science, with nonfeminist analysts who treated sex or gender as a simplistic variable or an add-on rather than rethinking research design, methodologies, and theories in terms of feminism and gender (Carroll and Zerilli 1993). Methodological pluralism and problem-driven research are often associated with a focus on the analysis of discourse. Interpretivism and constructivism is more pronounced in European political science than in the United States, where the interpretivist/discursive turn in political analysis is quite pervasive. Thus, European feminist analysts have integrated social constructivism and a focus on discourse analysis more than in the United States (Lombardo, Meierm, and Verloo 2009; Kantoja 2006; Verloo 2007).

The Empirical and Integrative Feminist Approach

Despite the differences between the disciplinary context in Europe and the United States, the empirical and integrative feminist approach in political science followed by a highly international feminist epistemological community shares common features that both contributed to and came out of the larger movements toward problem-driven and multi-methods research that eschews classic distinctions between positivism and constructivism: that is, where research is still based on the assumption that reality exists and can be studied, but that a part of reality is the construction of meaning/gender relations in particular. The goal of scholars who take this approach is to operate within a cumulative, yet critical, dialogue between feminist and nonfeminist research—through hypothesis testing and development and the scientific method as well other epistemological systems that may not emphasize hypothesis testing, like constructivist/interpretivist approaches. While, to be sure, it is important to acknowledge the androcentric nature of established political science, it is of fundamental importance to bring gender research and gender researchers into nonfeminist political science for promoting better science. It is also important to remember the position of researchers and their experiences within the research process as well as the diverse contexts of gender and women’s experiences as objects of study.

As Siim (2004, 97) describes, “There is a conversation between an empirically grounded political research, cross-national analysis sensitive to context, and discourse analysis inspired poststructuralism.” This focus on integration and empiricism can be seen in the classic foundational writings of feminist political science. In particular, Randall (1991) clearly calls for a study of politics that is oriented toward cumulation and hypothesis testing. Thus, feminist political scientists clearly distinguish themselves from feminist scholars more aligned with postmodern and/or standpoint approaches at the intersection, as figure 22.1 above shows, of the three feminist epistemologies.

Gender and politics as a subarea in political science is necessarily cross-cutting. Gender scholars in political science focus on different ways in which gender is
processed by the political system in both public and private spheres and with regard to objects of analysis, like social movements, that have not been typically examined by mainstream political science. As early feminist political scientists pointed out, "gendering" political science is a highly complex process that aims to locate gender and gender processes in all aspects of politics broadly defined, from a feminist perspective to incorporate both the public and private spheres (Lovenduski 1998 and Sapiro 1991). Feminist political scientists, first in Australia, sought to disaggregate the state to look at its different parts as potential arenas for social change, rather than just dismiss the entire state as a monolithic patriarchal entity, as many postmodern feminists did (Pringle and Watson 1992 and Franzway, Court, and Connell 1989). The subsections of a recent reader on gender and politics scholarship show the major loci for analyzing gender in political science: social movements; women and political parties; women, gender, and elections; women, gender, and political representation; women, gender, and social policies; and women, gender, and the state (Krook and Childs 2010). There is also a strong emphasis on analyzing gender at different levels—local, subnational, national, and supranational.

The European Political Consortium for Research (ECPR) and the American Political Science Association (APSA) have active and large subgroups on the study of gender. While the ECPR Women and Politics standing group holds an annual meeting that attracts over three hundred scholars, the APSA Women and Politics division organizes more than twenty-five panels at the annual APSA meetings. It also publishes the journal *Politics and Gender*. There are also three other journals that publish gender and politics research—*International Feminist Journal of Politics, Journal of Women, Politics & Policy*, and *Social Politics*. *Politics and Gender* and *Journal of Women, Politics & Policy* both US-based journals, tend to emphasize the more empirical side of feminist research, with some representation of standpoint and postmodern work. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, a European-based journal, publishes more standpoint and postmodern feminist work. *Social Politics* blends all three feminist approaches, in part due to its highly international editorial board. The four journals play an important institutionalizing role in solidifying the new international feminist empirical epistemic community within political science that has increasingly become "contextual and comparative."12

### 22.2.2. Variations Across the Subfields

At the same time feminist political scientists operate within a separate subarea of gender and politics they also dialogue and choose to work within the established sub-areas of political science as a part of the feminist empirical and integrative agenda. There, they try to interface with nonfeminist scholars to show the importance of gender analysis to nonfeminist theories, methodological approaches, and knowledge creation. It is also in these subdisciplinary sites where the glass wall between feminist and nonfeminist scholars and scholarship is most evident with clear resistance to integrating the major findings of these studies on the part of nonfeminist analysts, although some subfields are more resistant than others. There is also variation across the subfields as to the extent the integrative empirical approach is taken by feminist scholars.
Feminist theory is arguably the most oriented toward more transformative perspectives (Mackinnon 1989 and Butler 1990), although there are many feminist theorists that dialogue with nonfeminist democratic theory as well (Phillips 1995 and Mansbridge 2003). Moreover, unlike other areas of study, there is an overlap between theoretical and empirical work in gender and politics; empirically oriented analysts often seek to operationalize and test propositions from feminist theory. Feminist international relations (IR) scholars for the most part take a more empirical and integrative approach as well as tend to “rejoice in the contradictions and tensions of adopting and exploring all [feminist approaches]” (Squires 2004, 62). Some of these feminist IR scholars have separated to pursue a nonfeminist focus on gender and international relations which examines gender outside of a feminist perspective (Tripp 2010, 191).

In comparative politics, feminist scholars have developed a quite unified empirical and integrative research agenda, called the comparative politics of gender (CPG). A recent symposium in Perspectives contains ten articles on this analytical take on gender and politics (Beckwith 2010). As Tripp (2010) points out, this subarea has been less critical than other feminist approaches and has sought to make contributions with other work in comparative politics. Caraway (2010) presents a figure that shows how CPG has the potential to intersect substantively with five other areas of comparative politics research (172). At the same time, much nonfeminist work in comparative politics ignores this new feminist work. One of the main comparative journals, however, Comparative Political Studies, has made an effort to publish work in this area, thanks to editor-in-chief, James Caporaso’s, interest in feminist work. A central concern of CPG is to conduct good research based on valid and reliable conceptualizations and measurements as well as to retain a problem-driven focus. The recent movement from studies based in a single region or on a single country to more cross-regional studies indicates efforts to make more macro-level grand theory from empirically based studies (Htun and Weldon 2010).

Gender work in American politics is perhaps the most empirical and the least integrative with other areas of feminist analysis. It tends to focus on sex rather than complex notions of gender as socially constructed category, comparing women’s and men’s political behavior with little reference to other adjacent feminist literature that does not take a purely empirical approach (e. g., Burns 2002).

22.3. Putting the Empirical Integrative Approach into Action: Feminist Comparative Policy

Feminist comparative policy resonates the most with scholarship on the comparative politics of gender. Scholars of FCP follow a “scientifically realist approach” (Htun and Knudsen 2007)—problem-driven research, methodological pluralism
replete with "creative tensions" (Süim 2004) found in much feminist political science work. They combine both constructivist, through the discursive turn in analysis, and naturalist approaches. In this final section of the chapter, the features of the FCP approach and its four areas of research up to the year 2000 are first discussed based on a large-scale assessment of the field (Mazur 2002). The findings of an analysis of nine FCP research projects carried out since 2000 in Mazur (2009) are presented in the next part to show how the contours of the integrative feminist approach have recently evolved in FCP. The last part of this section takes a closer look at one of these nine projects, the Research Network on Gender, Politics, and the State (RNGS), to better map out the specific contributions this feminist research makes to nonfeminist scholarship and to better understand the mechanisms of the glass wall that continue to block feminist empirical scholars from making lasting contributions outside of their own feminist epistemic community.

22.3.1. FCP up to 2000

Feminist policy scholars in Western Europe first acknowledged the empirical gaps and gender biases in theory and methodology used in the study of the state and public policy in the early 1980s. By the early 1990s, researchers in North America and Australia joined their Western European counterparts in the new feminist academic enterprise that sought to systematically study the interface between gender and the state. In the mid-1990s, a loose consensus in this transnational community around conventions for conducting research, developing theory, and reporting findings moved the field into a new stage of vitality and institutionalization. In 2000, with over four hundred published pieces, of which one quarter has been published in the previous five years, an estimated 20 million euros in research funding since the mid 1980s, and four journals that served as major outlets for FCP work—Social Politics, International Journal of Feminist Politics, Politics and Gender, and Women and Politics—FCP scholars and their work constituted a formidable presence in political science. The following features drove (and continues to drive) the work of the scholars in this growing feminist area of study.

Feature 1: An Applied Feminist Empirical Approach. FCP scholars fully embrace empirical feminism. Often, they design their studies so that findings may be used to help policy practitioners and activists in women's policy agencies, political parties, movements, and organizations learn more about the causes of gender-based inequities and the complex range of solutions, including different ways of designing good practices. Since the early 1980s, FCP scholars have been consulted regularly in their expert capacity by the European Union—in particular, in the context of the action plans on gender equality—the Council of Europe, the Nordic Council, and the United Nations, as well as numerous country-based commissions at national and subnational levels.

The applied feminist empirical approach underpins FCP scholar attitudes about identifying with specific feminist currents of thought and about adhering to a single
fixed definition of what constitutes feminist policy, feminist states, and feminist political action more generally. FCP scholars tend to avoid articulating a specific political stance on feminism in their research and teaching. The definitions of feminism FCP researchers use in their analyses, therefore, are related to broader principles of women’s inclusion, representation, democracy, and gender equality. FCP scholars tend to be leery of pinning down a single narrow definition of feminism connected to a specific current of Western political thought. In recent years, many agree that there is a growing consensus around broad definitions of feminism, like the one proposed above, that take into consideration the diversity of feminist ideas in Europe and travel across national boundaries.

Feature 2: Operationalizing Normative Feminist Theory on Democracy. Normative political theory has been an integral part of the development of feminist studies in general. A major question asked by the large literature on feminist theory is whether Western democracies are as democratic as observers think, particularly given the degree to which women and women’s issues have been excluded from politics, in the context of the formal articulation of universal and gender-blind values of equality, freedom, and representation (Squires 1999). Feminist theorists who write on democracy argue for a better inclusion of women and ideas that favor women’s rights in the political process through “descriptive” representation, women representatives speaking for women as a group and “substantive” representation, and women’s interests being included in a meaningful manner in public discussions and policy (Pitkin 1967). These themes of representation and democracy are at the center of FCP studies insofar as they ask the empirical question of whether, how, and why democratic states can be feminist. The question is less about the specific form and design of democracy than its capacity to incorporate women’s interests and women themselves into the political process and, in doing so, to promote gender equality and a more complete democratic system.

Feature 3: Bringing the Patriarchal State Back in as a Research Question. As most political scientists agree, particularly since the state was “brought back in” in the 1980s (Skocpol 1985), the concept of the state—government structures as opposed to country—is not a simple idea. For many feminist theorists, the state is highly problematic given that it is a product of systems of power based on male domination or patriarchy. From the assumption of the patriarchal nature of the state, where state actions, structures, and actors seek to perpetuate systems of gender domination that keep women in their inferior positions in the public and private spheres, many feminist analysts dismiss or are highly critical of the state as an arena for positive social change. Other feminist theorists provide a more malleable view of state patriarchy and argue that certain state arenas may be appropriate sites for feminist action. FCP analysts do not entirely dismiss the possibility of a patriarchal state; they see the issue of state patriarchy as a question for empirical research. Some parts of the state may be patriarchal while other parts may have the potential to be quite woman friendly. FCP places the state and its institutions at its analytical core; the four major areas of FCP research, outlined in the next section, all focus on some aspect of the state or state action.
Feature 4: Using Gender as a Category of Analysis. Since the mid-1980s, feminist research across different disciplines has shifted its focus from sex, a more-or-less dichotomous variable based on biological differences between men and women, to gender, the social construction of sexual difference between men and women. As Joan Scott first asserted in 1986, the relational concept of gender should be the prime category of analysis in theoretical frameworks and research designs. This holistic approach to the use of gender is intended to push analyses beyond the add women and stir phase, where sex or women is added as an analytical afterthought. Since the mid-1990s, FCP scholars have incorporated gender into their research designs in a variety of ways.

Feature 5: Comparative Theory-Building in Western Postindustrial Democracies. FCP scholars seek to develop theory through culturally sensitive, comparative, and cross-national analysis. They often employ principles of research design and methods developed outside of a feminist perspective. Up until 2000, with a few exceptions, FCP work utilized small “n” analysis—case studies and the comparative method. In recent years many studies include a large number of observations and, hence, use the statistical tools of large “n” analysis; other studies take a bridging approach, incorporating both qualitative and quantitative analysis. FCP studies take a most similar systems approach, where economic and political development in Western postindustrial democracies are the control variables and variations in nation-based culture, state-society relations, women’s movement mobilization, government design, and so on are examined as they influence gender, state, and policy issues. Most FCP work assumes that postindustrial countries from the West, unlike other countries of the world, share certain environments and institutions, with notable cross-national variations. A part of the common heritage is that women’s movements have developed strategies aimed, at least in part, to influence the democratic policy process and the development of large welfare states. Designing and using concepts like feminism that are able, as Giovanni Sartori first elaborated, to travel across national boundaries without stretching the core meaning is also a key part of the comparative agenda of FCP (1979).

Feature 6: One-Way Intersections with Nonfeminist Political Science. Many FCP scholars since the mid-1990s have actively sought to intersect their work with nonfeminist literature. Instead of completely rejecting traditional political studies or uncritically using feminist studies, FCP work purposefully develops the strengths and shores up the weaknesses of each to advance knowledge in both areas. In general, efforts to intersect work with nonfeminist political science tend to be one-way, confronting the glass wall that is at the center of this chapter’s analysis. FCP scholars seek to contribute to nonfeminist work and nonfeminist policy analysts ignore FCP theory-building that speaks directly to central analytical issues. Even within the context of the increasing methodological pluralism of political science, few studies outside the purview of feminist analysis use the findings or concepts of FCP research or even focus specifically on gender policy dynamics. This trend may be in the process of being reversed with the growing academic influence and reputation of FCP scholars and their work; however, as will be shown below, the obstacles to complete intersection persist.
22.3.2. Epistemic Community and Infrastructure

Following this unified approach, FCP scholars examine four different substantive areas related to the state and its institutions in a large and growing literature. Feminist policy formation work scrutinizes the ways in which public policy promotes women's status and strikes down gender hierarchies through studying the obstacles, actors, content, and processes of policy that is purposefully feminist. Feminist movements and policy research is concerned with the interplay between women's movements, the state, and policy. A major issue of interest here is to evaluate the success of women's movements in influencing public policy and the structures of the state. State feminism scholarship considers whether state structures and actors can promote feminism through focusing on the relations between women's movement actors and the activities of women's and gender equality policy machineries and the bureaucrats, or femocrats, that staff them, in a wide variety of government agencies and branches. Gender and welfare state literature examines the welfare state as a prime obstacle and/or promoter of gender discrimination and equality. Much of this scholarship looks at the impacts of social policy in terms of women's social conditions in comparison to men's in the public and private spheres.

In 2001, there were roughly one hundred scholars who worked regularly on FCP research. To be counted as a part of the FCP community, individuals needed to have two or more publications on an FCP topic. The list of active FCP scholars used for this analysis is available on request. Members of the FCP scientific community are mostly women. More than a result of any collective decision to exclude men, their absence is a result of the realities of graduate education; women tend to be more interested in the study of feminist politics and male students tend to be channeled away from what is often perceived as a less prestigious area of study. Less than one quarter of FCP scholars are from the United States, and nearly three quarters from Europe. One half of FCP scholars is based in English-speaking countries—Ireland, the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, and the United States. The other half is based in continental Europe—the Netherlands, Germany, Austria, Italy, Spain, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Finland, France, Belgium, and Greece. Controlling for national population and size of university infrastructure, this community is quite evenly spread among the different countries. Many FCP researchers are trained in one country and then work and live in others.

FCP practitioners began to develop research networks in the early 1980s. The networks often meet at the conferences of the European Consortium of Political Research (ECPR), the American Political Science Association, the International Political Science Association, or the International Studies Association. At least fifteen FCP books have come out of ECPR workshops. In the 1990s, FCP scholars increasingly developed multinational research projects. Once in place, the network convenors secure funds from a combination of supranational, national, university, private funding agencies, and other institutionalized venues that are not overtly feminist. These projects implement a complex, long-term, gendered research program, produce a series of publications, and often create more permanent infrastructure like newsletters, journals, home pages, graduate funding, and permanent teaching programs.
22.3.3. Developments Since 2000: An Analysis of Nine FCP Projects

The nine FCP projects that were analyzed are presented in Table 22.1.

While by no means a systematic assessment of all recent work in feminist comparative policy, this analysis provides an opportunity to reflect upon the state of current comparative gender and policy scholarship, particularly given that over 160 scholars in twenty-seven countries have actively participated in these studies. In some ways gender and comparative policy scholarship has not changed since 2000. Gender remains a fundamental category for analysis; issues of patriarchy, gender-biased norms, and the state are at the center of study designs; feminist and nonfeminist theory continues to be operationalized in studies, and comparative theory building based on qualitative analysis is an important part of analysis. At the same time, there have also been significant new developments reflected in these projects, also identified by other feminist policy scholars (Beackwith 2005 and Squires 2007), to which the analysis in this section now turns.

While not a prerequisite, the creation of a large international research group is becoming more of the norm, as a reflection of shifting priorities of major government funding agencies and efforts to include a broader range of countries into comparative studies. Given that research funding is often provided for by women’s policy agencies also with feminist agendas, the goals of the researchers tend to be quite compatible with the funders. The inclusion of Eastern European countries into the analytical purview of many of the newer FCP projects opens the door for the consideration of countries from outside of the West with different levels of economic and political development and cultural

Table 22.1 List of FCP Research Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Year(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EGG (2002–2005). Enlargement, Gender and Governance: The Civic and Political Participation and Representation of Women in Central and Eastern Europe <a href="http://www.qub.ac.uk/egg/">http://www.qub.ac.uk/egg/</a> (e.g., Galligan et al. 2007)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
contexts. As a result, FCP is faced with a new level of cultural diversity and the need to rethink core analytical concepts to make them better travel across cultural boundaries. This new development may allow FCP analyses of Western countries to bridge the gap with a growing and rich body of comparative work on non-Western countries and research that analyzes trends across a broad range of regions of the world (Rai 2003, Howell and Mulligan 2005, Htun and Weldon 2010). This push to go beyond the West clearly resonates with the calls for systematic cross-national research made by the advocates of a comparative politics of gender as well.

The analytical perspective of FCP has clearly gone beyond the nation-state to include a multilevel approach where the subnational and extranational levels are just as, if not more, important than the national level. Also, cultural differences must be placed in an intersectional perspective where race, ethnicity, class, religion, and sexual orientation become important and fundamental considerations alongside gender. Time period and policy issue areas have also become salient analytical dimensions when understanding the dynamics and determinants of gender and policy processes, perhaps even more important than national-level trends and dynamics.

Normative and empirical questions of democracy have increasingly become a focal point of FCP studies in terms of placing women's movements at the center of making the democratic process more democratic, and for the newer democracies in terms of effective transitions to democracies. An increasing emphasis on representation as a means to link issues of women's presence to policy outcomes in the FCP scholarship dovetails with comparative scholarship on women in politics, which is also taking a more systematic look at substantive representation and policy outcomes (Celis and Childs 2008). Thus, whereas in 2002 the work on women's political representation was identified as an adjacent area of research, today policy and representation research are becoming one and the same. Here too intersectional approaches are becoming essential; women's interests, movements, and representation must be disaggregated and understood in terms of differences among women by religion, race, ethnicity, class, and so on.

Methodological pluralism is also a more pronounced attribute of recent feminist comparative policy work. Much work is qualitative, emphasizing the importance of expert analyses of country cases and process tracing. Studies are also increasingly bringing in quantitative large "n" analysis out of necessity, due to the tendency to include more countries in study designs. In addition, the tools of moderate "n" analysis outside of any feminist purview, qualitative comparative analysis (QCA, e.g., Rihoux and Ragin 2008) are also being increasingly used in FCP studies (McBride and Mazur 2010a, Krouk 2009). An emerging part of the feminist approach is to more formally conceptualize and to develop specific data collection and analysis techniques, drawing from both feminist and nonfeminist work. While earlier FCP studies tended to take a more purely empirical feminist approach where studies were designed to test hypotheses through empirical analysis without putting into question the scientific method, some of the more recent feminist research has embraced the European "discursive turn" (Kantola 2006). The studies have brought
in approaches based on feminist standpoint theory and social constructivism with a focus on framing, discourse, and policy content and often a rejection of the scientific method.

This shift is not necessarily positive. On one hand, the key issues of whether formal polices are effectively implemented to actually change gender relations in society is left relatively unexamined due to the focus on discourse and policy content; on the other, an absence of clearly articulated hypotheses, formal concepts, and findings may limit the broader empirical and applied messages of the studies. Without this systematic consideration of policy implementation and impact, the feminist scholarship that focuses on discourse, frames, and the positionality of researchers in the process and the power system risks to miss the central questions of FCP—whether all of this new state activity actually matters. Also, the tendency of the more critical discourse analysis to not directly dialogue with the full range of feminist and nonfeminist scholarship on policy and the state limits the overall contribution of this work to wider discussions of democracy, policy, and the state. At the same time, the increased emphasis on bringing research to public officials and citizens through public meetings, conferences, and training, an emphasis brought in by a standpoint approach, potentially outweighs these empirical gaps.

Identifying common trends in findings is still an open-ended question, awaiting a systematic meta-analysis of all current FCP work to try to develop propositions about gender, policy, and the state that can be fine-tuned in future studies. Indeed, the FCP projects reviewed here do not directly build from each other and have little direct intragroup communication except through a few individuals who are in several projects. Analyzing the results and common conclusions of all current FCP research has the potential to build a bridge among all of the studies and in so doing to allow FCP scholarship to more systematically contribute to theory-building and the cumulation of knowledge.

One characteristic of FCP that has remained quite similar is the degree to which nonfeminist policy studies and political science continue to ignore gender and policy research. Mainstream comparative politics and policy studies still do not integrate the findings of feminist scholarship in a meaningful way or bring gender, women’s movements, or women’s representation in as an important aspect to be analyzed in comparative studies of democratic politics. To be sure, there has been an increase in publications of gender research in nonfeminist journals, but few nonfeminist scholars have seriously gendered their own analysis beyond isolated cases or the more expedient approach of add women and stir.

Research Network on Gender, Politics and State (RNGS) Contributions and the Glass Wall. Similar to FCP work more broadly speaking, it is puzzling why nonfeminist analysts have tended to ignore this large-scale study of women’s policy agencies conducted by forty-three researchers in seventeen countries across five policy areas from the late 1970s to 2000, particularly given that it is firmly located in the integrative and empirical feminist camp. The study design is based on standard principles of replication, sample selection, conceptualization, and measurement; is informed by feminist and nonfeminist literature on social movements, institutions,
policy, and democracy; and uses a mixed methods design that integrates established qualitative and quantitative analysis. It has produced seven books with major publishers, a publicly accessible dataset, and numerous articles in feminist and nonfeminist refereed publications. The project was funded by some of the top scientific agencies at the national and supranational levels.

To date, a handful of nonfeminist scholars have formally recognized the RNGS project—mostly in terms of its methodological approach; some have shown interest in using the dataset, with no publications yet. The RNGS dataset was nominated twice for the comparative politics division of the American Political Science Association award for the best dataset; both times it was not selected. The newest nonfeminist work on institutions, social movements, public policy, and democracy makes little mention of the core finding of the project that women's policy agencies have significantly changed the contemporary state to bring in women's movement demands and women's movement actors. Under certain conditions and in certain policy areas these agencies play crucial roles in helping women's movement ideas and actors enter the state and hence make democracies more democratic. Social movement scholars still make little mention of the importance of the women's movements or how RNGS has measured them; institutionalists never mention women's policy agencies and their discursive presence in the state; comparative scholars of democracy ignore the impact of state feminism on democracy; and public policy scholars have not recognized the importance of women's policy agencies or women's movements in the policy process. More broadly speaking, the comparative lessons about the importance of policy sector over national styles of policymaking, a theme that runs through all of the RNGS books, has only been taken up by FCP scholars.

It is interesting that where RNGS work has been acknowledged is in qualitative methods circles more than comparative politics circles, where there is more support of methodological pluralism and keen interest in examples of good practice in multi methods research. The focus on good conceptualization is another shared area of concern between the researchers in the RNGS project and qualitative methodologists. Also, many of the leaders of the qualitative methods movement, who are men, are very knowledgeable and interested in gender research for methodological reasons; thus the feminist argument of androcentricism seems not to work where there is a shared scholarly interest between feminist and nonfeminist epistemic communities.

Still, this begs the question of why the other scholars who work on social movements, institutions, and policy have not made connections between the RNGS study and findings and their own works. Here too these fields tend to be dominated by male scholars. Recently, Myra Marx Ferree, one of the leading scholars of comparative gender and politics, asserted at a public lecture at the University of Leiden that the apathy toward comparative feminist research was simply due to sexism—male political scientists are not interested in work conducted by women and about women. Moreover, in many continental European countries, certain male political scientists have been seen to make public statements about how gender research is not legitimate.
It is important to recognize timing as a factor as well. Up until this year, the major publications coming out of the RNGS project have been the issue-specific edited books. This year the group produced a mixed methods analysis of all of the RNGS findings in a final book (McBride and Mazur 2010a) and a presentation of its methodology in a qualitative methods publication (McBride and Mazur 2010b). One could argue that these books have not received the same attention that an overview of the findings across all five policy sectors would. At the same time, there seems very little uptake of the RNGS issues books published from 2001 to 2006 in the nonfeminist circles in comparative politics. Thus, what the RNGS case shows is that the persistence of the glass wall is a result of a complex combination of factors: shared scholarly agendas, androcentrism, publication strategies, and timing even when a great deal of resources, time, and effort are marshaled behind the scientific endeavor and it meets the conventional disciplinary standards of excellence.

22.4. CONCLUSIONS

The feminist empirical and integrative approach is appearing to become increasingly the norm in the study of gender within political science and reflects a broader trend in social science toward “scientific realism” (Moses and Knutsen 2007), and in political science in methodological pluralism and problem-driven research. The emergence, consolidation, and institutionalization of FCP more specifically represents the development of an internationally based, epistemic feminist community that seeks to dialogue and contribute to the general cumulation of knowledge on gender, politics, and the state, whether it takes an explicitly feminist approach or not. While, to be sure, the shared values of the community are integrative and feminist, there is no consensus about the use of a uniquely empirical approach; in fact, combining constructivist and empirically oriented approaches can be seen to bring more analytical leverage to a question. Thus integration involves interfacing with other nonfeminist areas of study, but also between different feminist approaches, something that is relatively new.

Hopefully, the conventional wisdom about feminist approaches can now be laid to rest both on the part of feminist and nonfeminist analysts and more constructive and productive dialogues can occur to systematically incorporate gender and gender findings into theories, research designs, and research questions. Indeed, this chapter is an illustration of this feminist empirical and integrative effort in itself, to better engage the mainstream, to contribute to the cumulation of knowledge, and ultimately to do better science.

As the case of FCP and more specifically the RNGS project show, breaking down the persistent barriers between feminist and nonfeminist research is a slow process, one that takes considerable resources on the part of feminist scholars, the presence of male allies on the nonfeminist side who see the importance of gender
research, and also the persistence and power of female feminist scholars to pursue the integrative agenda in nonfeminist publication and scholarly outlets. In the final analysis, similar to many feminist struggles throughout history, the glass wall between feminist and nonfeminist research is slowly being broken; time will tell if ultimate scientific integration can be achieved.
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NOTES

1. The term "mainstream" is often used by feminist scholars to describe work that neither includes gender as an object of analysis nor takes account of feminist critiques of established and dominant epistemologies and research traditions. It usually carries negative connotations that feminist work is marginal to mainstream work and implies that feminists need to work outside of the more established areas of scholarship. Other feminist analysis uses the label "nonfeminist" to denote a more neutral relationship between feminist and nonfeminist scholarship and a possibility for dialogue. In this chapter, the feminist/nonfeminist distinction is used.

2. In the tradition of feminist research, it is important to note my position in the scientific process to be clear about my own knowledge gaps and biases. I am not a philosopher of science, but a political scientist who has spent over twenty years conducting and coordinating research. I am a part of the FCP community, coconvener of the Research Network in Gender, Politics, and the State; and coeditor of Political Research Quarterly, a nonfeminist political science journal. I take an empirical and integrative feminist approach in all of my work.

3. Whether this notion of Western-based feminism can travel outside of the West is a question for research. Some argue that feminist ideas can be found outside of the Western context with modifications that take into consideration the particular context—i.e., Islamic feminism, developmental feminism. Others argue that it is not a useful concept in settings outside of the Western postindustrial world. For more on defining feminism, see McBride and Mazur (2008), and on concept traveling, see Goertz (2006) and Sartori (1970).

4. For more on intersectionality as an empirical concept and research agenda in political science, see the Weldon (2008) and the recent mini symposium in Political Research Quarterly edited by Hancock and Simien (2011).
5. These three concepts represent variations on the same theme of male domination with patriarchy being used to address the underlying gendered power relations and institutional outcomes within cultural, social, and political systems. The terms "androcentric" and "gender-biased" indicate that a given system is male dominated and based on notions of masculinity. For some, using the term "gender-biased" or "gender hierarchy" is a softer concept than patriarchy—a strategic choice made even to avoid alienating nonfeminist audiences. The concept androcentrism, rather than patriarchy, is used in feminist epistemological discussions of how established scientific communities have been male dominated and defined in terms of masculine/sexist notions of research questions, knowledge cumulation, methodologies, etc. (Harding 1986, 1987, 2004; Hawkesworth 2006; Hesse-Biber and Yaiser 2004; Fonow and Cook 1991).

6. This story of feminist epistemology is recounted in work on feminist epistemology generally speaking, for example, Hesse-Biber, Leavy, and Yaiser (2004) or Fonow and Cook (1991) and more discipline-based analysis. In political science, see, for example, Squires (2004), Hawkesworth (2006), or Tripp (2010).

7. The summaries of the three feminist approaches are thumbnail sketches presented to better contextualize FCP as an empirical integrative approach and develop the chapter's argument. They draw upon a rich wealth of literature on feminist epistemology, some of which is cited here.

8. Moses and Knutsen (2007) opt for the label "naturalist" over "positivist" given the extensive critiques of positivism and its often politicized implications.

9. In the feminist empirical approach it is important that men as well as women pursue the feminist agenda. At the same time, it is important to note that women scientists tend to be the motor for the epistemological shift and hence their presence in positions of power are key to doing more objective science.

10. For more on Perestroika and its implications for political science, see, for example, Monroe (2005) and Schram and Caterino (2006) For more on problem-driven or "use-inspired" research, see Schramm and Caterino (2006) and Stokes (1997). For an excellent treatment of the interpretivist approach in political science, see Yanow and Schwartz Shea (2006).


12. The Oxford Political Handbook on Gender and Politics, edited by Karen Celis from Belgium, Johanna Kantola from Finland, Georgina Waylen from the United Kingdom, and Laurel Weldon from the United States is an important source of current scholarship in this area and touchstone for the international gender and politics community. The four editors represent the national as well as epistemological diversity of this scientific community.

13. For an excellent review of feminist political theory, see Squires (1999).

14. Feminist theories on representation and democracy have been at the center of much empirical scholarship on representation. See, for example, Celis and Childs (2008).

15. For more on feminist approaches in IR, see Ackerly, Stern, and True (2006).

16. For more on research on gender and the state, see Hunt (2005).

17. See the bibliography in Mazur (2002) for a complete presentation of the FCP literature in 2006.

18. See my review of Lombardo, Meier, and Verloo (2009) in the Journal of Women, Politics & Policy (2010), where I further develop this critique in the case of this book's study, which comes out of MAGEEQ and QUING, two of the FCP projects covered in this section.
19. Poteete and Ostrom’s (2005) development of a large “n” database from small “n” studies on water collective action to manage natural resources in the United States provides a potential roadmap for the construction of a database on FCP scholarship.

20. A theme that cuts across all of the articles in the Perspectives symposium on the comparative politics of gender (Beckwith 2010).

21. For the RNGS project design, detailed project information, and the SPSS dataset suite, see http://libarts.wsu.edu/polisci/rngs/index.html.

22. The dataset was publicly released at the APSA meetings and on the RNGS website in 2007.

23. The articles in Beckwith (2010) also draw attention to the serious gaps in the nonfeminist literatures in these areas with regard to feminist scholarship.

24. The following nonfeminist qualitative scholars have integrated aspects of the RNGS project into their published work: Charles Ragin, Benoit Rihoux, Gary Goertz, David Collier, Evan Lieberman, Andreas Schedler, and Cas Mudde. Many of these scholars do comparative work as well, but their treatment of RNGS findings is in the context of methodological issues.
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