



University of HUDDERSFIELD

University of Huddersfield Repository

Monro, Surya

Reconceptualising Gender: The Challenge for Managerialism

Original Citation

Monro, Surya (2006) Reconceptualising Gender: The Challenge for Managerialism. In: IFSAM VIIIth World Congress 2006, 28th - 30th September 2006, Berlin, Germany. (Unpublished)

This version is available at <http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/id/eprint/6317/>

The University Repository is a digital collection of the research output of the University, available on Open Access. Copyright and Moral Rights for the items on this site are retained by the individual author and/or other copyright owners. Users may access full items free of charge; copies of full text items generally can be reproduced, displayed or performed and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided:

- The authors, title and full bibliographic details is credited in any copy;
- A hyperlink and/or URL is included for the original metadata page; and
- The content is not changed in any way.

For more information, including our policy and submission procedure, please contact the Repository Team at: E.mailbox@hud.ac.uk.

<http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/>

Reconceptualising Gender: The Challenge for Managerialism

People whose gender identity is fluid, or other than male and female, challenge the ontological assumption that gender falls into binary categories. The gender binary system is continually problematised, by women and men who transgress gender stereotypes, by sissy boys and tomboys, by transgender people and intersex people, and by many others. Sexual orientation binaries are destabilised when people move between or beyond gay and straight identities. There are other ways of conceptualising gender, and sexuality, which account for the full range of lived genders rather than simply female and male ones. Gender and sexual dimorphism are, however, continually reinscribed, and people who move beyond - or exist outside of - the binary system, are systematically socially excluded, via the operation of social institutions and discourses that privilege non trans and non intersex people, and heterosexuals (Monro 2005). The inclusion of gender diverse people in discussions about gender and organisational theory leads to a problematisation of assumptions which rest on the notion that male and female are the only categories, and that these categories are discrete.

Performance management has become increasingly important in the UK local government arena (Sanderson 1998). There has been a considerable increase in the focus on 'performance' in local government as reforms over the past decade or so have introduced market reforms and private sector management practices (Sanderson 1998: 1). The changes, driven by factors such as an increase in managerialism and the tightening of fiscal policies, have entailed the development of detailed performance indicators by both the Audit Commission and the Best Value Commission (see for example Audit Commission 2001). They reflect wider movements towards new public management (see Cunningham 2000) as well as a 'regulatory

state' (Hood et al 1999). Performance indicators now include more indicators concerning service quality, efficiency, and consumer and citizenship responsiveness (Boyne 2002). Tichelar (1998) identifies increasing interest amongst local authorities in developing indicators which reflect the needs of their localities, and Boyne (2002) documents the way in which the use of performance indicators which evaluate democratic outcomes have increased. There has been some research concerning performance indicators in relation to sexual orientation (Monro 2006), but there is an absence of literature about performance management and gender diversity.

The inclusion of gender minorities is supported in the UK by New Labour's modernisation programme, which rests on the twin strategies of increased participatory democracy, and a requirement for services to demonstrate 'Best Value' (see Dibben and Bartlett (2001); Thomas and Lo Piccolo (2000)). New priorities for local government have emerged, including community involvement (Sommer 2000). These can be seen as part of the government's programme for democratic renewal, as discussed by Leach and Wingfield (1999). As Hambleton says, 'rising public expectations and strong pressures from local communities for a greater say in decision-making are putting new demands on local authorities' (2000: 931). These changes invoke a push towards the greater social inclusion of marginalised minorities, including transgender and intersex people. Discussions concerning gender diversity and organisational processes in the UK are particularly topical because of the Gender Recognition Act 2004.

This paper aims to describe and theorise gender diversity, and to open up debates concerning managerialism and the diversity and fluidity that is associated with marginalised genders. The paper begins by discussing definitions of transgender and then describes the methodology on which discussions are based. The paper then provides an overview of gender diversity in the UK and India, before developing theory concerning gender diversity. I conclude with a tentative comments concerning gender diversity and categorisation in the context of

managerialism. This discussion draws on material concerning the erasure of gender diversity via social policy processes. Although I provide an indication of the importance of cross-cultural issues via my discussion of gender variance in India, dealing in any systematic way with cross cultural variations in gender and sexual categorisation is outside of the scope of this paper. Interested readers can refer to Bullough and Bullough (1993), Herdt (1994), Feinberg (1996), Ramet (1997) and Prieur (1998). Similarly, analysis of disability and gender fluidity and multiplicity is an important area, which I do not deal with here. I also do not address some of the other relevant issues, such as challenges to gender norms amongst non trans people, which are widely discussed in the feminist and masculinities literature.

Definitions

This paper uses an inclusive definition of ‘transgender’ (trans). Trans in its broadest definition can be taken to mean anyone who transgresses usual gender roles (see Raymond 1994), but it is taken here to mean cross-dressers, transsexuals, androgynes, drag kings and queens, and other gender-complex people. The term ‘intersex’ is sometimes included under the trans umbrella but I separate it from trans in this paper to indicate the different identities and experiences that intersex people have. Diversity is of importance across the trans and intersex communities, and it is important to point out that many trans and intersex people identify as male or female and would not necessarily relate to the gender pluralist theories I outline below.

Methodology

My data has been drawn from four main studies. Firstly, I utilise an in depth exploration of trans politics, which I conducted during the 1990s, and which included transsexuals, intersex people,

cross dressers, drag kings and queens and others. Secondly, I have used material from a large ESRC funded study of lesbian and gay equalities work in local government, (this included bisexuals and trans people to an extent) which took place in 2000-2003ⁱ. Thirdly, I have included data from a small study of gender and sexual diversity in India, which I conducted in 2003. Lastly, I interviewed a number of bisexual, lesbian and gay, and trans people during 2003, as a way of updating the earlier study on transgender. In keeping with the usual norms (see Kirsch 2000), I shall identify myself at this stage as a female bodied UK-based bisexual, who does not identify as trans in any substantial way at present, but who has explored some trans identities in the past. I have identified the people who took part in the research projects as research contributors, and their contributions can be distinguished from the literature by the absence of dates in the text. They are quoted by name unless a preference for anonymity was expressed. The projects that contributors took part in are identified in some cases by the following: Transgender Politics [a]; Lesbian and Gay Equality in Local Government [b]; Gender and Sexual Diversity in India [c], and LGBT research [d].

Challenging Gender Binaries: The UK Situation

Trans and intersex provide a fundamental ontological challenge to the gender binaried system to which organisational and social policies refer. Whilst the majority of trans people and crossdressers exist within a gender binary system, identifying as either male or female, there are a range of other people who identify in gender diverse ways. Intersex is perhaps the most profoundly disruptive identity. It provokes a questioning of the gender binary system on two levels – physical, as the various conditions subsumed under the umbrella term of intersex involve physiological characteristics (for example chromosomal, hormonal and gonadal) which are other than (or a mixture of) those conventionally associated with males and females; and identity, as research contributions showed that in some cases intersex people wish to have an identity that is other, or in addition to, male or female (projects [a] and [d]). Non-gendered, ‘third space’ (see Nataf 1996),

multiply gendered (sometimes called 'gender pluralist'), androgynous or multi-gendered people also destabilise the discrete gender binaried system. Some of the research contributors (projects [a] and [d]) identified as other than male or female. For example, Simon Dessloch, a FTM trans person, said that he felt himself to be inbetween, or neither, or both, or third sex. Similarly, Christie Elan Cane, who started life as female, said in 1998:

I don't feel male or female, and I say that I'm basically third gender because I can't identify as male or female...I mean I'm still trying to unravel how I wanted to be, I wondered whether maybe I could be part of both, which is not how I feel any longer but I sort of went through several stages along, trying to express and figure out how I felt, but now I feel I'm neither. I can't relate to male and female.

Gender fluidity may also destabilise gender binaries. For example contributor Zach Nataf described the way that, during the early stages of his transition from female to male, he felt more like a man on some days and more transgendered on others, and that this depended to an extent on who he was with (see also Bornstein 1994). Butch dyke Hamish described gender fluidity as a state in itself, whilst gender transient Pheadra Kelly said:

It's about a discipline of duality with an open mind, without changing sex with hormones, with pills, with injections or surgery, living ones dualism as much as possible. If I am Phaedra, I allow elements of Bruce through, and there is no self hating or loathing going on. If I am Bruce I allow elements of Phaedra – it's horses for courses, but like the transvestite, and to some degree the trans person living full time, I live with a separate identity. I have accepted my separate identity as well.

Transsexuality can in some cases be seen as a space beyond gender binarisms. Cameron (1996) frames transsexuality as an inbetween place outside of gender duality, while Stone argues that 'a trans person currently occupies a position which is nowhere, which is outside of the binaried

oppositions of gendered discourse' (1991: 295). This was mirrored by some contributors, for example Christie Elan Cane discussed moving beyond the gender system and being non gendered. 'Gender fuck' also disrupts gender binaries. 'Gender fuck' refers to conflicting sex/gender signals - in some cases these are consciously taken on as part of identity (see Halberstam 2002). Kate N' Ha Ysabet explained that:

...if I have a penis and big tits that's gender fuck, if I wore makeup and butch clothing that's gender fuck. And what's quite interesting is that androgyny is acceptable because there's a reason for that, but gender fuck isn't, because people go 'oh, OK' but with gender fuck its this thing of 'shit, I'm getting two sets of signals' and it feels like you're having a drum and bass mix on one side and classical music on the other and you're going 'Oh my God which am I going to listen to?'

As shown above, the multiplicity, messiness, and fluidity demonstrated by some forms of intersex and trans provoke a destabilisation of gender binaries. The disruption of binaries that intersex and trans can entail also applies to sexual orientation categories. The sexual orientation categories that are used in the West – lesbian and gay, heterosexual, and bisexual, are based on the gender binary system. This binary system operates differently in other contexts and other regions of the world. A cross-cultural comparison is provided by research concerning gender in India.

Gender Diversity in India

Gender variance in India has ancient, even prehistoric, roots. According to one text, 'The Hijra communities in India have a recorded history of more than 4000 years' (PUCL-K 2003: 17). Hijras, who are born as intersex or as male (some undergo castration), currently form a third sex community in India, tracing their origins to the myths in the ancient Hindu scriptures of the Ramayana and Mahabarata. Hijras belonged to the 'Eunuch' culture that was common across the Middle East and India, where Eunuchs worked as guards, advisors, and entertainers

(PUCL-K 2003). Other forms of gender pluralism in ancient India were also socially accepted. Gender variant women took roles as mercenaries, advisors, and religious people, and same sex sexual expression is also documented, often taking place alongside opposite sex relationships (Penrose 2002); 'traditionally, sexuality has always been more fluid, less rigidly categorised [than in the West]. Western naming, for many Indians, does not correspond to the amorphous nature of sexual experience' (Seabrook 1997). With the advent of British colonialism, the established social position of gender variant people was undermined, for example the British removed the land rights of the Hijra communities. Indigenous sexualities were also suppressed by the British, and to some extent by Islam (Seabrook 1997).

Exploratory research in India (project [c]) shows that there are different systems of gender and sexuality classification operating simultaneously, set against the backdrop of ancient systems of gender variance, dominant patriarchal norms, and post colonialism. These systems are being integrated to some extent by the growing LGBT communities, which bridge indigenous and western systems of categorisation⁶, and are reportedly inclusive of Hijras and Kothis (effeminate gay trans people). Gender or sexually variant Indians who are born female have fewer options than those born as male. They can identify as lesbian or transsexual, but these possibilities are often only available to the middle and upper classes. In theory, people born as male, on the other hand, can identify as gay, transgender, cross dresser, Kothi or Hijra. In practice, these choices are heavily structured by caste/class and location. As Seabrook (1997) says, 'there are men who call themselves gay in India, but they are overwhelmingly middle class, English speaking, and privileged.' According to Seabrook (1997), the undefined same sex expression that was present prior to British rule still takes place to an extent in the slums and villages, whilst amongst the less affluent urban dwellers, a heavily gendered system of male classification has emerged. Men who have sex with men are divided into two categories – the 'karte hain' (those who do) and the 'karvate hain' (those who are done to). Same sex sexual expression is not linked with gay identification. For

instance, one Kothi contributor told me that ‘some heterosexual men like anal sex. If I do sex with a straight man, fucking him, he gets some pleasure from anal sex. Homosexuality is about attraction, it’s not physical.’ Heterosexual identification is usual amongst the giriyas, or active partners. Kothis seem to identify more with transgender than gay identities - although some of the Kothis I met identified as gay. Kothis are further subdivided into feminine and masculine Kothis.

The Kothi and Hijra systems seem to exist side by side, overlapping to some degree. I found that although many Hijras identify as a third sex, the majority do not, and that:

Hijras are akwas (not castrated) and nirvana (castrated) –some Hijras are akwas, so biologically they are men – they are mostly homosexual though they may be married with kids, but this is due to convenience, they are not bisexual. These are the Kothis, who cross over into the Hijra communities. Less than 1% are intersex and 5% have been castrated...they would not speak about this to most people because it is not in their interest (sexual health organisation worker)

This contributor pointed out that Hijras occupy a position in society that is simultaneously revered and stigmatised, and that they cultivate the mystique associated with this. They are seen as having the power to curse or bless people, due to their spiritual heritage, and they are also seen as having a huge potential for embarrassment because they threaten to expose themselves physically if they are not paid. The Hijras utilise these sources of power, retaining a somewhat secure position in society. This means that they can beg, and are less harassed by the police than other gender and sexual minorities. In addition, there are some designated political seats for Hijras, and Hijra involvement in party politics is well documented in the newspapers. Hijras are using their third sex status to advantage, marketing themselves as

‘incorruptible Eunuchs’ (Chakraborty 2002). As one contributor said, ‘they are seen as not being part of the mainstream, which then allows them to have a place in the mainstream’. However, most Hijras belong to the poorer castes and classes, and economic marginalisation structures their experiences very heavily. As Gupta says, ‘Hijras might have an accepted place in Indian society, but it is a place pretty much at the bottom of the heap – making them not only a sexual but also a highly deprived social minority’ (2002:21).

Overall, therefore, it appeared that three main types of gender and sexual classification are current in India – unclassified sexual activity, the Hijra and Kothi systems (where transgender and same sex expression are merged but are heavily structured by the gender binary system), and Western systems. The Hijras, by occupying a social position in opposition to the binary system, have carved out a social space in which mainstream norms are rejected or revised, perhaps challenging, but not escaping, other structuring factors.

Theorising Gender Diversity

The problematisation of gender and sexual orientation binaries provokes an evaluation of gender theories, including feminisms, masculinity studies, and poststructuralist and queer approaches (see Monro 2005). The existing theoretical approaches are problematic in various ways. In particular, poststructuralism can be seen to undermine the unitary nature of identity, because everything is seen as constructed, leading to difficulties concerning gender categorisation:

What is left to organise around if we don't use identities? While postmodernism has been largely unable and unwilling to apply itself to the nitty-gritty of social change, you and I don't have that luxury. We have a movement against gender oppression to mount (Wilchins 1997: 85)

Theorists such as Butler (1990) argue that seeing the subject as constructed does not mean that it is predetermined and that it is the individual's ability to reformulate discourses, and to exploit the contradictions between the different discourses that are imposed on them, that enables agency. Identities can certainly be used and reformulated for organisational and political purposes, for example contributor Kerry said that 'I'd look at bisexuality as a tool to be used on the way to gender and sexual cultural subgroups being more fluid and diversifying – bisexuality might not last for ever'. However, arguably, there are still difficulties with the destabilisation of identity that poststructuralism provokes. These limitations lead into an exploration of conceptual alternatives to the gender binary system that draw on, but move beyond, poststructuralist theory. These can be divided into three ideal types:

[i] The Expansion of Male and Female Categories

As Halberstam (2002) suggests, the elasticity of gender binary categories allows gender diversity to be subsumed into 'male' and 'female' – at least to an extent. Expanding gender binary categories involves theorising femininities and masculinities as diverse, including people who have bodies or social roles that are different to those traditionally associated with women and men, for example, intersex people living as male or female (see Dreger 2000). The expansion of binary categories is conceptually related to notions drawn from masculinity studies. The notion of masculinities as plural involves moving away from an understanding of masculinity as white, middle class, heterosexual and able-bodied, towards thinking about masculinities as multiple, and the notion of some masculinities as hegemonic, whilst others are subordinated (see Hearn and Morgan 1990: 11). Hearn and Collinson discuss 'distinctions between gay, nonheirarchic heterosexual, and hierarchic heterosexual; between white and black, between nonfathers and fathers; unpaid careers, paid careers, and non-careers; and non-violent, violent, and militant masculinities (1994: 107). This understanding of femininities and masculinities as plural is helpful

in theorising gender and sexual diversity, because it includes people such as camp gay men, butch women, and trans people who have undergone full sex reassignment.

There are limitations to the 'expanded gender binaries' model, which can be illustrated by looking at the notion of female masculinities. Halberstam (2002) describes a range of female masculinities, for example tomboys, butch dykes, and masculine heterosexual women. This interpretation of gender risks cooption of what can be seen as transgressive and positive identities that are arguably female, not male (for example butch). In addition, if masculinity is de-essentialised and delinked from male bodies, it becomes slippery and hard to characterise, relying on ideas that reinvolve social inequalities, such as rationality and aggression. For example, Halberstam suggests that 'Masculinity in this [USA] society inevitably conjures up notions of power and legitimacy' (2002: 356). Another problem with the expanded binaries model is that it fails to include those people who fall more fully outside of the gender binary system, and perhaps defuses the potential for gender pluralism because some alternative identities are subsumed into 'male' and 'female'. However, it is a pragmatic strategy, enabling many people with diverse sexualities and genders to gain social rights and acceptance, as well as perhaps broadening out options for others.

[ii] Moving Beyond Gender

Feminist authors such as Lorber (1993) argue for the 'degendering' of society. The notion of gender liminality can be linked with degendering. As shown above, authors such as Stone (1991), Bornstein (1994) and Cameron (1996) describe transsexuality as a place outside of duality. Notions of moving beyond gender, and gender liminality, are useful for conceptualising gender diversity. A number of contributors discussed the need for a less heavily gendered society – for example, the use of 'male' and 'female' on forms when sex/gender is irrelevant to the matter at hand. In a society where there is less concern with gender, androgynous and gender ambiguous people would face less barriers to social inclusion, and gender norms overall would be less heavily enforced. A certain amount of degendering is clearly helpful in achieving a more equal, inclusive society.

However, there are some difficulties with the 'degendering' approaches. Firstly, once fluidity is named, it becomes a space which people can inhabit (see Prosser 1998), and is therefore arguably no longer a non category. Secondly, identity categories seem to be necessary as a basis for cultural and political organisation. If a strategy focused on erasing gender is pursued, the minority gender groups - and those who have less power, including non trans women - are likely to be disadvantaged because the default dominance of men and non transgender people will remain unchallenged. The second approach, degendering, is useful in some ways. In itself degendering is an inadequate approach, because of the power of existing systems of categorisation and the related structural inequalities. Faced with a universalist gender vacuum, existing hegemonic norms are likely to be reasserted, and marginalisation of people with different genders and sexualities will be perpetuated.

[iii] Gender Pluralism

A further theoretical strategy concerns conceptualising gender as plural, and as a spectrum, a field, or intersecting spectra or continua. Gender is seen as being more finely grained than is the case with the binary system, and as being formed via the interplay of different characteristics associated with gender and sexuality. Gender pluralism involves 'calls for new and self-conscious affirmations of different gender taxonomies' (Halberstam 2002: 360). It involves conceptualising gender as 'fields' or 'groupings' of - in some cases overlapping - masculinities, femininities, and gender diverse identities. It could entail the more widespread use of pronouns such as 'ze' and 'hir' (see Feinberg 1996) for people who chose them as alternatives to male/female pronouns. More gender possibilities also means acknowledging that the categories of 'lesbian', 'gay', bisexual' and 'heterosexual' cannot encompass all sexual orientation options, and complementary terms are likely to become more widespread.

There was support for gender pluralism amongst some of the research contributors to projects [a] and [d], some of whom discussed the way that they would prefer to identify as something other

than female or male if this was socially possible. For instance, sex and gender as a continuum or as a spectrum was discussed by contributor Ann Goodley, who said:

Ann: I see the main problems being that society and indeed children, in other words all of us, are programmed to only see in black and white, in monochrome. A concept I actually see as a rainbow, or many shades of grey, I prefer to see it as a rainbow, that's more positive, the grey areas are actually the technicolor colours between black and white. I believe that there are elements of all the colours in everybody, but that people knee-jerk into one column or the other quite often in Western patriarchal society. And I think that's damaging.

Interviewer: I'd like to ask a bit further into that if that's OK

Ann: Surely

Interviewer: Um, it sounds as if you're saying that it's not a rigidly gendered binary system?

Ann: No I'm certain this division isn't on behavioural, biological or spiritual levels, if there is such a thing, but on all levels. In terms of personal identity it's one of the ways in which each of us defines ourselves and is defined by other people that forms a portion of a very complex mosaic that makes a person

Some of the literature supports the spectrum model of sex and gender. Rothblatt (1995) discusses what she terms 'gender continuum theory', a shift away from bipolar sex/gender categories towards a multiplicity of genders. The notion of a gender and sex continuum may be expanded. For example one (non trans) bisexual contributor described genders as places in space rather than a continuum. Debates about the viability and advisability of a plural gender system will continue.

One trans contributor [project d] said that the time was not right for a movement for third and other sexed/gendered people's rights, given existing social conservatism and bigotry and the need to fight other battles first, whilst another said: 'third gender – I resist that phrase, because all it does is rigidify, codify stuff' (James Green), and a further contributor argued that 'it's [third gender] got a sort of dustbin sense to it, even though I know people would use it for themselves' (Hamish). Gender pluralism could therefore be seen to perpetuate categorisation. Politically, the development/recognition of identities that are intersex, androgynous, third and other sex, or gender diverse in other ways is powerful because it enables calls for justice and social change. It moves beyond the poststructuralist deconstruction of gender and sexuality binaries towards reconstruction - potentially towards a more diverse and tolerant society. Theoretically, gender pluralism allows for the inclusion of both essentialist and constructionist approaches to gender and sexuality - and it moves gender theory beyond the binary system.

The Organisational and Social Policy Erasure of Gender Diversity in the UK

This paper so far has outlined gender diversity and developed three strands of theory with which to conceptualise gender variance. How has gender diversity been dealt with within the context of organisational studies and policy? Traditionally, organisational studies has tended to overlook sexual orientation and gender, and to assume a heterosexual male subject. A body of literature has developed that is critical of 'gender blind' approaches, including critiques of social policy from feminist perspectives (Lewis 1998, Woodward 1997, Lister 2000). These contributions have been important in moving debates forward and in providing analytical tools for deconstructing social policy, highlighting the ways in which women and sexual minorities are marginalized by policy processes. However, feminist analysis constructs 'male' and 'female' as separate, discrete categories, and overlooks trans, intersex, and other forms of gender diversity and fluidity. Gender diversity adds an extra dimension to organisational analysis, partly because trans, and intersex raise particular policy issues, but also because they destabilise the rigid structuring of social policy along gender binaries. How

do trans and intersex trouble systems of organisational categorisation? What omissions and tensions are revealed by examining social policy in relation to gender diversity?

The gender binaried nature of social policy and organisational processes systematically acts to erase and marginalize trans and intersex people. When they are included, this is usually limited to post operative transsexuals and in some cases crossdressers, whilst intersex people and other gender diverse people are overlooked. The discursive marginalisation of trans and intersex people can be addressed by poststructuralist analysis, which provides useful tools for understanding the policy silences concerning sexual and gender diversity (Bacchi 1999). Bacchi, unlike mainstream theorists, treats policy studies as inherently political. She maintains that 'problems' themselves are discursively constructed based on actor's interpretations of the situation. This process structures social and organisational policy because certain groups are constructed in certain ways, and the limitations of this produce specific social effects. For example, framing something as a 'social problem' may mean the portrayal of certain subjects as 'sick' or 'troublesome'. Instead of aiming for organisational solutions, Bacchi addresses the way in which certain things are considered to be 'inappropriate' for consideration. She suggests that policy is discursively constructed in different ways in different contexts, and that discursive representations are 'nested'. In other words, certain assumptions and norms underpin large areas of policy, and within this, other types of discourse operate in different ways. She interrogates social and organisational policy using questions concerning the way in which problems are constructed or omitted from consideration.

Bacchi's approach can be used to explore the ways in which policy processes act to shape or erase gender diversity. Many social policy initiatives are constructed without much reference to gender, and when gender is addressed, it is often framed as a women's issue. For instance, Escott and Whitfield, writing for the Equal Opportunities Commission produced a report titled *Promoting Gender Equality in the Public Sector* which appears to be targeted at the

equality of women, excluding gender diverse people, for instance that 'it is necessary to challenge those public bodies which do not share the commitment to reducing inequality between women and men' (2002:vi). Trans people and other gender diverse people are generally omitted from consideration. For example, the benefit system assumes that people are either male or female, and gives maternity benefits only to those people who identify as female, rendering FTM trans people who have babies invisible and excluded from provision. People whose gender identity is discretely male or female benefit from this, whilst others are heavily disadvantaged. Assumptions concerning the normalisation of the gender binary system underpin this dynamic.

The organisational erasure of gender diverse people is evident in the area of local government equalities initiatives. Until the mid 1990s, sexualities work was represented as lesbian and gay work, with little questioning of the sexual orientation binary system, and equalities work concerning gender concerned women, with trans and intersex people being omitted from consideration. After this, mostly in response to changes within the sexual and gender minority communities, some local authorities began to include bisexuals and, to a lesser extent, trans people, usually in equalities work concerning sexual orientation rather than gender. However, certain gender groups, especially non binaried gender diverse people, are overlooked due to assumptions that transgender means either transsexuality or cross dressing. Overall, where trans people are included, in many cases inclusion is symbolic, with little policy development or implementation. Findings from project [b] also showed that there is opposition to bisexual and transgender inclusion, coming from within the communities in some cases, but also from some key lesbian and gay players (officers, councillors) in the local authorities. The assumptions underlying the erasure of trans and intersex subjectivities include the notion that people with these identities are so unusual as to be unworthy of consideration. The ideas underlying the marginalisation of trans and intersex people are constructed in the context of the history of local government work; work concerning gender

equality stemmed from activism by feminists, and traditionally, feminists have marginalised or denigrated trans people (see Raymond 1980). What is left unproblematised in the current situation are assumptions about the stability of gender, as well as lesbian, gay, and heterosexual identities, assumptions that have an ontological foundation in a gender binaried system.

The Implications of Gender Diversity for Organisational Policy and Practice

What are the organisational and social policy implications of gender diversity? Explorations will be structured in relation to the three types of theory concerning gender diversity that are identified above; [a] the broadening of male and female categories; [b] degendering, and [c] gender pluralism. It is important to reiterate the temporary, limited nature of my discussions of policy implications in this field. I am not intersex, or trans to any significant extent, and the development of effective organisational processes concerning gender minorities rests upon consultation with representatives from the trans and intersex communities and support for the infrastructure to enable such consultation. Moreover, some of the implications discussed are outside the remit of organisational studies, but are mentioned here in order to provide relevant context.

[i] The Expansion of Male and Female Categories

This approach consists of widening definitions of ‘male’ and ‘female’, so that people who might be considered ‘other’ are able to assimilate by organisational processes as either female or male. As I pointed out above, this is the most currently prevalent approach, cutting across both mainstream policy making and the political goals of much of the trans community. This is a pragmatic solution for many gender diverse people, but it does erase those few people

who cannot or chose not to fit into the gender binary system. It is also a workable option for most members of the sexual minority communities, as well as the heterosexual majority. It operates inclusively except for where people identify as neither male or female – those people who identify otherwise may be excluded.

The implications of broadening out gender binaries include:

1. Depathologisation of gender diversity, including the removal of transsexuality and transvestism from psychiatric diagnostic manuals, and discussion of gender issues in terms of gender identity rather than ‘problems’ (see Zandvliet 2000).
2. The continued/increased provision of resources, including access to surgery and hormone treatment, for transsexuals.
3. The cessation of intersex genital mutilation - surgery that is unnecessary for physical functioning on intersex infants and children until each individual is able to choose which gender they would like to live as.
4. Assignment of intersex infants to one gender at birth on a temporary basis, until they are old enough to choose whether to live as male or female (see ISNA guidelines).
5. The reworking of legislation and social regulations/norms concerning men who wish to wear dresses, skirts, makeup and high heels, so that they are not discriminated against (see Holmes 2003).
6. Broader gender equalities initiatives, for example stronger paternity leave legislation to enable men to care for their children.
7. Social and cultural initiatives that increase the acceptance of diverse ways of being male and female, for example anti-bullying initiatives that tackle the victimization of effeminate boys in school, and initiatives to increase the number of women in traditionally ‘male’ jobs and higher ranking male dominated positions.
8. Positive portrayal of diverse ways of being male and female, and different forms of relationship in the statutory and other sectors.

[ii] Moving Beyond Gender

As I have described, moving beyond gender, or degendering, involves the removal of gender signifiers and codes from social life as far as is possible, and the concurrent minimization of sexual orientation categorization systems. This means that the differences between women and men would be limited as much as possible. One major implication of degendering is the removal of all questions concerning gender from official and commercial forms, unless these are specifically necessary, as for example in the case of treatment for reproductive health issues. Others include the changing of terms that are unnecessarily gendered, for example the use of 'chair' or 'chairperson' rather than 'chairman', and unnecessarily sexualized, for example the terms 'husband and wife' being replaced with the term 'partner'. Wider social implications would include reform of the welfare system to minimize gender differences, for example flattening out policy and practice that assumes that people are heterosexual, and changing therapeutic practice guidelines to support people who are fluid in their gender or uncertain as to their gender identity (see Zandvliedt 2000). It would also entail government support for the minimization of gender differences in the business world (for example advertising), and increased media portrayal of androgynous or non stereotypical women and men.

Gender Pluralism

Gender pluralism is generally compatible with the first two approaches, but moves beyond them in that it develops support for people with a range of gender and sexual identities. Instead of focusing on broadening out existing categories, or attempting to eliminate gender as far as possible, it celebrates gender diversity and the sexual diversity that is linked with this. The focus for gender pluralism is, therefore, on creating space for the addition of new categories and identities to those that are already established, so that a spectrum or universe of

genders becomes possible; intersex, androgynous, gender plural, male, female, trans, a related universe of sexual orientations is developed; heterosexual, gay, lesbian, bisexual, polysexual, and fluid (certain identities, especially genderqueer, involve a combination of non binaried genders and sexualities). Policy in this area is particularly reliant on mechanisms for community inclusion and responsiveness to pressure from new welfare constituencies, because the territory is new and change must be led by the people who will be most affected by it. However, some possible areas for policy work include:

1. The creation of 'other' categories on forms and documents
2. The recognition of socially viable categories for people who wish to identify as other than male or female – particularly intersex people, who are born 'other' and might chose to identify as intersex if it was socially possible. This would involve significant changes to a whole raft of legislative and statutory procedures.
3. Depathologisation of all forms of gender variance (including intersex, transsexuality, multiple genders, and transvestism) as conditions in themselves, and the development of strategies to enable access to treatment with minimal pathologisation, where treatment is necessary.
4. The naming of intersex, androgynes, gender fluid, and gender plural on equalities documents and strategies.
5. Statutory resources to support the equality of non male/non female people, for example funding for work in central government concerning these groups.
6. Legislation to support relationships between people of non binaried genders, and those between a man or a woman and a person who identifies as androgynous, intersex, or gender diverse in other ways.
7. The cessation of operations on intersex people that are unnecessary for physical functioning, unless individuals wish for this (as above).
8. Continued provision of surgery and hormone therapy for transsexuals, but also the provision of alternative options such as non operative reassignment - and the provision of

full equal rights for trans people who do not wish to have surgery, or who identify as other than male or female after surgery.

Gender pluralism is the only type of approach that will fully include all people. The other approaches create space for diversity, and mostly combine productively together and with gender pluralism. However, ultimately they may act to continue excluding people who cannot or do not wish to live within the gender binary system. Perhaps gender pluralism is impossible within current mainstream western society, although the extent of change associated with women's and gay and lesbian rights, as well as, for example, disabled people's rights, over the last century would indicate that this is not necessarily the case. People who do not fit male or female norms suffer considerable amounts of discrimination and social exclusion (Monro 2005) and deserve to have equal rights, including the right to determine their gender and sexual identities. The broadly liberal diversities initiatives appear to be amenable to supporting a range of different identities, including gender pluralism.

Analysis and conclusion

As noted above, there is a movement within the statutory sector in the UK to support the inclusion of minorities, and a related renewal of democratic processes. This has occurred in conjunction with an increase in managerialism, including performance management. These two dynamics are not necessarily oppositional, as shown by Monro (2006), who develops tools for measuring the performance of equalities initiatives for sexual minorities. However, managerialism does rely on categorisation as a basis for performance measurement and evaluation. It is, after all, impossible to design effective tools for evaluation if the subject of evaluation defies categorisation, or is excluded from existing categorisation systems. This situation is recognised within the sexual/gender fringe communities, for example contributor Giles said that 'having categories enables them to think in small, easy, steps...' genderqueer' lets people get a handle on it – if you say 'I'm somewhere in between' they can't get a handle

on it'. As described earlier, gender diversity (specifically the existence of trans and intersex people) is generally erased from organisational processes in the UK, or, if such subjects are included, they form part of the 'lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT)' category, a system which marginalises trans and intersex people within an already marginalised grouping, because LGBT equalities work inevitably focuses on sexual orientation issues. It may be useful to note that gender diversity is not erased in the same way in India, where Hijra people occupy – in some cases – socially prominent positions, although Hijras as a group are socially denigrated and marginalised.

The three types of theory developed above in relation to gender diversity have varied implications for organisational – specifically managerialist – theory. The 'degendering' approach is especially problematic for managerialism, because the removal of gender categories from, for example, monitoring forms makes evaluation impossible. The 'expansion of gender binaries' type of theory implies a widening of the categories used for management, so that, for example, a male could be permitted to wear a skirt to work if so desired. Whilst workable for the majority of employees/service users/customers, this approach will erase the small minority who do not fit expanded gender binaried categories, or who move fluidly between them. 'Gender pluralism' takes a different trajectory, opening up systems of gender categorisation and recognising non male/female and gender-fluid categories as real categories inhabited by a minority of people. This approach is the most inclusive, but it does have implications for managerialism – and wider organisational processes and theory – including a need to revise the categories by which organisational processes are measured. 'Gender pluralism' raises questions regarding the ways in which gender is defined and the forms of grouping around genders that are possible, for example the size of minority groupings required for a grouping to have any influence or recognition within organisations. Issues concerning alliances between different gender groups facing inequalities, in particular non trans women and trans and intersex people, are also pertinent.

References

- Audit Commission (2001) *Delivering Improvement Together: Audit Commission strategy consultation 2001*. London: Audit Commission.
- Bacchi, C. (1999) *Women, Policy and Politics: The construction of policy problems*. London: Sage.
- Cameron, L. (1996) *Body Alchemy: Transsexual Portraits*. USA: San Francisco: Cleis Press.
- Bornstein, K. (1994) *Gender Outlaw: On Men, Women and the Rest of Us*. New York, London: Routledge Publications.
- Boyne, G. (2002) 'Concepts and Indicators of Local Authority Performance: An evaluation of the statutory frameworks in England and Wales', *Public Money and Management*, April-June: 17-24.
- Bullough, V. and Bullough, B. (1993) *Cross Dressing, Sex and Gender*. Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press.
- Butler, J. (1990) *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York, Routledge Publications.
- Chakraborty, T. (2002) 'Patna Eunuchs in Power Play', *Telegraph*, 6.3.2002.
- Seabrook, J. (1997) 'Not "straight", not gay'. *The Pioneer*, 30.9.1997.
- Cunningham, R. (2000) 'From Great Expectations to Hards Times? Managing equal opportunities under new public management', *Public Administration*, 78(3): 699-714.
- Dibben, P. and Bartlett, D. (2001) 'Local Government and Service Users: Empowerment through user-led innovation?', *Local Government Studies*, 27(3): 43-58.
- Dreger, A.D. (ed) (2000) *Intersex in the Age of Ethics*. Maryland: University Publishing Group.

Escott, F. and Whitfield, D. (2002) *Promoting Gender Equality in the Public Sector*. London: Equal Opportunities Commission.

Feinberg, L. (1996) *Transgender Warriors: Making History from Joan of Arc to Dennis Rodman*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Gupta, A. (2002) 'Transgender Law and Civil Rights', *From the Lawyers Collective*, Mumbai.

Halberstam, J. (2002) 'An Introduction to Female Masculinity: Masculinity without men', pp. 355-374 in: R. Adams and D. Savran (eds) *The Masculinity Studies Reader*, Malden, Massachusetts and Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Hambleton, R. (2000) 'Modernising Political Management in Local Government', *Urban Studies*, 37(5-6): 931-950.

Hearn, J. and Collinson, D.L. (1994) 'Theorizing Unities and Differences Between Men and Between Masculinities' pp. 97-118 in H. Brod and M. Kaufman (1994) (eds) *Theorizing Masculinities*. London: Sage.

Hearn, J. and Morgan, D. (1990) *Men, Masculinities and Social Theory*. London: Unwin Hyman.

May 25.

Herdt, G. (ed) (1994) *Third Sex Third Gender: Beyond Sexual Dimorphism in Culture and History*. New York: Zone Books.

Holmes, G. (2003) *Is that a Blank Sheet of Paper, or a List of Crossdressers' Achievements?* Unpublished, see (<http://totalclothingrights.org>).

Hood, C., Scott, C., James, O. et al (1999) 'Regulation inside Government. Waste-Watcher, Quality Police, and Sleaze-Busters'. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kirsch, M.H. (2000) *Queer Theory and Social Change*. London and New York, Routledge.

- Leach, S. and Wingfield, M. (1999) 'Public Participation and the Democratic Renewal Agenda: Prioritisation or marginalisation?' *Local Government Studies*, 25(4): 46-59.
- Lewis, G. (1998) 'Coming Apart at the Seams: The Crisis of the Welfare State', in: G. Hughes and G. Lewis (eds), *Rethinking Social Policy*. London, Routledge.
- Rothblatt, M. (1995) *The Apartheid of Sex: A Manifesto for the Freedom of Gender*. USA: Crown Publishers.
- Lister, R. (1997) *Citizenship: Feminist Perspectives*. (Basingstoke: Macmillan).
- Nataf, Z. (1996) *Lesbians Talk Transgender*. London: Scarlett Press.
- Prieur, A. (1998) *Mema's House, Mexico City: On Transvestites, Queens and Machos*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Prosser, J. (1998) *Second Skins: The Body Narratives of Transsexuality*. USA: Columbia University Press.
- PUCL-K (2003) *Human Rights Violations against the Transgender Community: A Study of Kothi and Hijra Sex Workers in Bangalore, India*. Bangalore: People's Union for Civil Liberties, Karnataka.
- Monro, S. (2005) *Gender Politics: Activism, Citizenship and Sexual Diversity*. London: Pluto Press.
- ___ (2006) 'Sexualities Initiatives in Local Government: Measuring Success' *Local Government Studies*, 32(1): 19-39.
- Ramet, S. (1997) *Gender Reversals and Gender Cultures: Anthropological and Historical Perspectives*. London, New York: Routledge Publications.
- Raymond, J. (1980) *The Transsexual Empire: The Making of the She-Male*. (London: The Women's Press).
- ___ 1994) 'The Politics of Transgender', *Feminism and Psychology* 4(4): pp. 628-633.

- Sanderson, I. (1998) 'Beyond Performance Measurement? Assessing 'value' in local government', *Local Government Studies*, 24(4): 1-25.
- Sommer, F. (2000) 'Monitoring and Evaluating Outcomes of Community Involvement – the LITMUS experience', *Local Environment*, 5(4):483-491.
- Thomas, H. and Lo Piccolo, F. (2000) 'Best Value, Planning and Race Equality', *Planning Practice and Research*, 15(1/2): 79-94.
- Tichelar, M. (1998) 'Evaluating Performance Indicators: Current trends in local government', *Local Government Studies*, 24(3): 29-35.
- Wilchins, R. A. (1997) *Read My Lips: Sexual Subversion and the End of Gender*. Ithaca, New York: Firebrand Books.
- Woodward, K. (1997) 'Feminist Critiques of Social Policy', pp. 83-100 in Lavalette, M., and Pratt, A. (eds): *Social Policy: A Conceptual and Theoretical Introduction*. London: Sage.
- Zandvliedt, T. (2000) 'Transgender Issues in Therapy', pp. 176-189 in; Neal, C. and Davies, D. (eds) *Issues in Therapy with Lesbian, Gay, bisexual, and Transgender Clients*. Buckingham, Philadelphia: Open University Press.

¹Lesbian and gay equality in local government, 1990 and 2001 (2001-2003). This project was funded by the Economic and Social Research Council (project number R000 239293), and I worked on it in collaboration with Davina Cooper (University of Kent) and Jean Carabine (Open University).

Wordcount: 7,751