

Campaigns as Gendered Institutions

A Case Study Between B.C. Premier and California Gubernatorial Campaigns

MICHELLE IRVING¹, *Memorial University of Newfoundland*

Abstract. This paper will explore campaigns as gendered institutions using Acker’s framework of gendered organizations. Acker notes political institutions are defined by the absence of women, and campaigns are no different. This paper will explore two case studies: British Columbia’s 2017 Provincial Election and California’s 2010 Gubernatorial Race to identify how gendered institutions operate across electoral races. The framework of gendered institutions is applied by exploring how four components: the historical bias in job evaluation and candidate selection of the preferred “gender” traits; the decisions and procedures that control and construct hierarchies based on gender; the construction of symbols and gender ideology that give legitimacy to the institution and the process of “doing gender”. The case studies demonstrate that campaigns generally seem to be gendered in the same way with the exception of how campaign fundraising operates, which warrants further investigation. Additional research is needed to understand the extent to which campaigns as gendered institutions operate across political systems.

Introduction

For the first time in 2016, during the American Presidential election, the western world saw a candidate from each sex campaign for arguably the most gendered position in the world. Democrat Hillary Clinton and Republican nominee Donald Trump battled it out for over a year. Gender often became a central theme in their campaigns, which highlighted questions about their ability to lead due to their sex and perceived limitations to run the country because of these socialized norms. However, what was less obvious during the campaign was how the process of campaigning itself was gendered; favoring the male candidate who most closely fit within the masculine typology of who is most “natural” and “presidential.” As the political scientist, Georgia Duerst-Lahti noted, white men, “have played an overwhelming role in the political world’s creation and evolution, it is only “natural” that masculine preferences have become embedded in its ideal nature. It takes on a masculine gender ethos,” (Thomas and Schroedel, 2011: 49). The presidential campaign favoured the Republican nominee for his masculinity, his symbolism as a warrior-leader compared to that of the more dove-ish female Democrat, which ultimately contributed to the election of Donald Trump. Given these recent political events, this paper will be asking the question: how does the gendered nature of campaigns change over time and across elections?

Sociologist Joan Acker coined the phrase, “Gendered Institutions,” defining it as a set of, “gendered processes in which both gender and sexuality have been obscured through a gender-neutral, asexual discourse,” (1990: 140). These institutions exist in nearly all social forms – education, economic, legal, military and religious life are all gendered. While the realm of politics

¹ Michelle Irving is in her second year of a two-year Masters program in Political Science at Memorial University of Newfoundland. Her thesis work is focused on the social media accounts of provincial candidates in Western Canada and how their gendered self-presentation, defined by behavior traits and policy issues, relate to stereotypes.

is certainly no exception, the role of the campaign as a gendered institution has been overlooked until recently. Women have been excluded from campaigns, both as candidates and as campaign staff, or considered a ‘novelty’ within them well until the late twentieth century. While campaigns operate across unique political landscapes, in which institutional norms and expectations matter to varying degrees, the underlying processes of campaign institutions operating across political time remain equally gendered across races (Dittmar, 2012: 16). This makes campaigns an ideal case study to explore how gendered power operations contribute to gender disparities in political life.

The underlying gendered processes that Acker identified and defined have led me to question: if we know that all campaigns are institutionally gendered, are they, in fact, all gendered in the same way across all elections? Are some campaigns more susceptible to be institutionally gendered than others? Literature has barely begun to scratch the surface in terms of understanding how campaigns function as gendered institutions, and this paper certainly will not be able to answer all of these questions. My aim, however, is to focus on this specific research question: does the gendered nature of campaigns change over time and across regional elections? I intend to begin to address this question by comparing two case studies: British Columbia’s 2017 Provincial and California’s 2010 Gubernatorial campaign. I hope that using two diverse cases across countries, political systems and time will help to shed light on how gender operates within campaigns to varying degrees. While I expect that gender will operate in a relatively similar way within campaigns in both cases, this analysis will begin to identify systematic ways in which campaigns work to women’s disadvantage due to the level of masculinity built into the institution and encourage more discovery in this field. If we can understand how different campaigns are gendered in similar or different ways, then, ultimately, we can help to identify the institutionalized gendered barriers that candidates face when they elect to run in a political race.

Gendered Institutions

Acker is considered the first to introduce the concept of gendered organizations, arguing that institutions are not gender neutral; rather, assumptions about gender underlie the processes built into the organizational constructs (1990). Acker’s theory of gendered organizations is built on Dorothy Smith’s foundational work, who argues that organizational sociology is built around the worlds of men and their experience and interests arise exclusively in relation to the framework of societal power(institutions) (Smith, 1987: 148). Smith’s contribution in *The Everyday World as Problematic* first highlighted the potential of gendered institutions as an undervalued theoretical perspective, which Acker further developed. Acker claims that the gendered nature of an organization is obscured through the embodied nature of work (1990: 139).

Acker situates gender as, “the patterning of difference and domination through distinctions between women and men that is integral to many societal processes,” (1992: 565). Due to social misunderstandings of gender difference and sex, more specifically gender meaning sex, it is often only associated as a characteristic of individuals and overlooked as a function of the distribution of work in organizations. In Acker’s 1992 article, “From Sex Roles to Gendered Institutions,” she outlines four major components of gendered institutions: (1) a historical bias of the institution in terms of job evaluations and candidate selection of the preferred “gender” character traits; (2) decisions and procedures that control, segregate, exclude and construct hierarchies based on gender and race; (3) construction of symbols and gender ideologies that justify, explain and give legitimacy to institutions; and (4) process of replication and “doing gender” within the organization. Understanding social institutions as gendered, Acker argues, allows us to look at

institutional structures with a new lens to recognize how all aspects of institutions, including their authority and processes are gendered. Elements such as stereotypical expectations for women and men's attributes, behaviour and perceptions, personal relationships, dominant ideologies, and distributions of power and organizational processes all contribute to this gendering process (Thomas and Schroedel, 2011: 48). Through these four processes, Acker argues that gender is a pervasive symbol of power at both the individual and organizational level. Most societies are organized along the lines of gender through institutional structures in various sectors of social life and gendering results in a disadvantage to one sex, depending on which is dominant in the social institution. Furthermore, as Acker delineates, the process of institutional gendering, the structures, behaviours, and ideologies conform to the gender that aligns most with the institution. Often, institutions reward types of masculinity, while feminine preferences are often seen as falling outside the institutional norm and are devalued by the structures in place. Thus, the subordination and exclusion of women have been built into institutional principles, while certain types of masculinity are linked to maintain and perpetuate institutional constructs.

Campaigns as Institutions: Literature Review

There is little literature on campaigns functioning as gendered institutions and some may argue that campaigns perhaps do not fit within the 'gendered institution' label. Early research on political campaigns have debated how effective they are, and if they truly influence the political institutions. Scholars in the 1950's argue that vote choice was determined by party identification, and not impacted by campaigning (Berleson Lazarsdeld and McPhee, 1954), however more recent scholarship has demonstrated that campaigns do play a role in determining candidate success (Dolan, 2005). As Acker has noted, political institutions have been defined by "the absence of women" (1992: 567), and campaigns are certainly no exception. Campaigns are not gender neutral and are defined by masculinity. They are described in terms of warfare and battle and are an integral component of the political institution which, "suffer from compulsory masculinist ideology that serves as the standard for both men and women," (Heldman, 2011: 20). There is more than just a bias within the institution; rather, men and masculinity are the systemic 'norm' and women and femininity are the 'other' of the institution. Campaigns practice the exclusion of femininity from the ideological work of the institution and as a result, cater towards masculine processes due to the fact that the history of campaigns has been constructed by men, about men, and for men.

Political science has historically overlooked how institutionalized gender plays a role in political arenas. Lovenduski was one of the first scholars to explore how gendering organization impacts political science research, noting that the concept of gender needs to be re-considered in terms of how we think and what we know about political life (1998: 335). Lovenduski's groundbreaking paper in the field connects the characteristics of gendered institutions to the field of political science capturing the concept that all institutions are implicated in the shaping of gender relations, including both private and public, such as state organizations (1998).

Kirkpatrick identified in the first comprehensive analysis of women participating in the campaign process, "campaigning requires so many types of behavior believed to be difficult, if not impossible, for women. To campaign it is necessary to put oneself forward, to "blow one's own horn," to somehow demonstrate one's superiority and dominance. What can conventionally well-behaved ladies do in such an arena?" (1974: 86). This demonstrates the issue of campaigns as more

than just a built-in bias against women and femininity, but rather systematic institutional omission and practice of exclusion of women from the political and campaigning arena (Smith, 1987).

Given the masculine bend in all aspects and processes of politics, this can explain why campaigns are often overlooked. When campaigns are discussed as an 'institution,' it is generally only in regard to the American presidential campaign, often considered to be the most gendered office in the world. Heldman delves into the masculinity and cultural barriers that follow during a presidency campaign (2011). She argues that the masculinist ideology is exclusively a male prerogative, and female candidates are at an automatic disadvantage as they cannot embody and demonstrate their commitment and power to the creed of masculinity (Heldman, 2011: 21). Through the use of language in popular culture, the "feminization" of campaign opponents, the cultural female objectification, and masculinity defined traits associated with the office of the presidency, Heldman argues female candidates are shackled to normative constraints on who can hold public office, ensuring campaigning is not an equal playing field. Conroy builds on Heldman's work and slightly contradicts some her findings. Conroy explores how the hierarchy of masculinity plays a role in American presidential campaigns and its relation to electoral success (2011). Her analysis finds that masculinity traits, whether present in male or female candidates, often finds more electoral success, which works against strong feminized candidates. Conroy's results found that the presidency is so entwined with masculinity that gender becomes a major yet often overlooked factor in presidential elections (Heldman, 2011: 22).

There is some foray into exploring how campaigns for other offices are gendered institutions, although this research is limited. Dittmar (2012) explores how campaign actors in Gubernatorial races shape perceptions of gender through campaign strategies and messages and how, and in what way, gender matters in political campaigns. Her research questions whether gendered institutions have the potential to be "re-gendered" through internal processes created by campaign teams, including redefining what it means to be a candidate so that women can break from the masculinized candidate mold.

While some may argue that campaigns cannot be considered an institution due to their short time frame, I would argue that the constraint of time actually offers a chance for more disruption in terms of gender due to the short and sporadic nature of their existence. This is one major difference between campaigns compared to other political institutions, as campaigns may be more malleable and susceptible to change more willingly. Yet, campaigns still function, "according to norms, processes, and motivations distinct to electoral settings, and are influenced by a unique group of institutional actors," (Dittmar, 2012: 19). Hence, they play a crucial role in propagating power disparities, especially given their "gatekeeping" role to the other political institutions associated with elected office.

Methods

I chose to look at two different case studies – British Columbia's 2017 Provincial and California's 2010 Gubernatorial campaigns – to explore the question, "do campaigns as gendered institutions, change across regions?" These case studies were chosen for a number of reasons. Both Canadian Provincial and American Gubernatorial races are similar in the power of the position and provide comparable results in terms of desired electoral position. While there has been some limited research done on the impact of institutional gender in American campaigns at a Presidential and Governor level, there is no such research on Canadian campaigns. Thus, comparing two cases across countries will demonstrate (i) if institutionalized gender exists across political systems and

(ii) if it exists in the same way in varying types of electoral campaigns and political systems. While there are several differences between these races, I believe that there is enough overlap to demonstrate the institutional gender aspect as a function of campaigns. On a more granular level, B.C. and California were chosen because of similar geography and political leanings. While their populations are different (California is the largest state population, B.C. is the third largest province in Canada), they both have similar economic and cultural traits and are likely to share similar political issues in campaigns, such as environmental protection, and housing affordability. Additionally, both regions are significant players in their countries' political, economic and cultural spheres.

Both campaigns had a strong right-wing female candidate (Christy Clark for B.C. Liberals and Meg Whitman for the Republicans), running against a left-wing male opponent, (John Horgan for the NDP in B.C. and Jerry Brown for the Democrats in California). In both cases, the more right-wing parties (Liberal and Republican) were also both incumbent positions. Christy Clark had been elected B.C. Premier for nearly 8 years, while in California, Arnold Schwarzenegger had been the Republican governor in California completing his 8-year term limit. This opened the door for Meg Whitman to step in as the new Republican nominee in 2010.

While it is important to note that B.C. has four political parties, compared to the two-party system in California, it is easy to argue based on the history of politics in B.C. that it has been a mostly two-party province for decades; between the B.C. Liberals and NDP. The two other parties, Conservatives and Greens are not a notable factor in the comparison as they fluctuate between being dormant to gaining at most one seat in the legislature per term.

These case studies also differ somewhat in terms of timing. Due to the timing of elections for each race, it would not be possible to compare two recent electoral races taking place in the same year that is similar across other measures, identified above. Other differing variables that have been excluded from the case study comparison include the role of outside actors, such as American super PACs that can finance their own ads outside of the campaign, and the role of the leader which differs slightly across each race. Technically, a candidate for governor is responsible for their own race and not state-wide races, whereas, in provincial elections, the outcome of the party province-wide determines who will be elected Premier. However, in both cases, the candidates for Governor/Premier end up campaigning for their party's candidates across the region in an attempt to ensure a majority in the legislature once elected.

It is also significant to note that the undertaking of this research is not to argue that this methodology or these particular cases are considered the optimal way to study institutional gender in campaigns, but rather, intended to demonstrate how institutionalized gender exists within campaigns and to varying degrees across different political systems, regions and time. This approach will contribute to the dearth of literature on gendered campaigns and demonstrate how crucial further study is needed within this area to understand the full effect of gendered campaigns on candidates.

I will analyze each case study using Acker's four components of gendered institutions. I will operationalize each component in the following way:

- (1) a historical bias of the institution in terms of job evaluations and candidate selection by evaluating the history of the electoral office incumbents and previous candidates who have run
- (2) decisions and procedures that control, segregate, exclude and construct hierarchies based on gender and race, by evaluating the financial contributions for each candidate in the campaign to determine hierarchies in terms of business and political support for each campaign

(3) construction of symbols and gender ideologies that justify, explain and give legitimacy to institutions through the use and effectiveness of ‘going negative’ in terms of ad campaigns for each candidate in the campaign and;

(4) the process of replication and "doing gender" within the organization by evaluating the media and public perception of each candidate during campaigns debates to determine how each candidate performed or strayed from their expected gender traits (West and Zimmerman, 1987).

B.C. and California Case Studies

According to the B.C. Elections Act, few requirements are actually in place to run a campaign, and the gendered aspects, certainly, are not apparent. According to Elections B.C., candidates must be a Canadian citizen, over the age of 18 on voting day and not have a criminal record that precludes them from being able to run or vote (Elections BC, 2016: 2). However, in most cases, many unofficial requirements exist, which arguably make the prospects for feminized candidates more difficult. In general, these include “prior political experience, name recognition, party support, adequate funding and fundraising abilities, strong appeal for the base of the party...and strong leadership and communication skills,” (Han, 2011: 5). According to California state laws, to run for governor, candidates must be 25, an American citizen and a resident of the state for five years preceding the election day (California Secretary of State, 2018). Similarly to B.C., many unofficial requirements exist that have been layered on top of these basic candidate guidelines. As a result, a number of informal qualifications limit the pool of potential candidates who participate in campaigns. The gendered nature of campaigns are exposed through the layering of these cultural norms during candidate selection, which are often linked to features of hyper-masculinity, which is traditionally intertwined with the political arena.

Historical Bias in Job Evaluation

The 2017 British Columbia Provincial election saw the nearly 8-year incumbent for the Liberal party, Christy Clark, face off against rival party leader, John Horgan for the NDP party, and Andrew Weaver, B.C. Greens. NDP was the main opponent for the Liberal party, with the Greens as an outlier that only ever gathered a single seat each election (Shaw, 2017a). In terms of Acker’s components of a gendered institution, the B.C. premiership had to date 40 elections since its inception as a province. Women have led a party and been Premier only twice in its history. Christy Clark, who became Liberal leader in 2011 was the first female B.C. leader to run a successful campaign and elected Premier in addition to winning a campaign in two consecutive elections (2013 and 2017) (Elections B.C., 2018). Historically, the Premier position has been generally defined by the lack of women until only recently in British Columbia. While women have been cabinet members for a longer period of time, these are subordinate positions to the masculine role of Premier. Acker identifies this gendered hierarchy as key components of a historical bias in a job evaluation towards masculinity within an institution (1992). One could argue that the two successful campaigns led by Christy Clark could still be considered a novelty for the position. Clark represents a right-wing party in B.C. that has focused on more ‘masculine’ policies including cuts for small businesses and a focus on economic growth, which are generally considered more congruent with masculine traits and values. This aligns itself with the idea that leaders are, “expected to distance themselves from femininity and uphold the ideals of masculinity, which embody strength, independence, determination, and single-mindedness,” (Conroy, 2011:

138). Yet, one could also make the argument that while Clark bucks the trend of the historical bias in terms of sex, there is some argument that her presented 'gender' supports the preferred masculine ideals upheld in campaigning and politics.

In terms of historical bias in the job evaluation, California has never had a female governor. Neither candidate was in the incumbent position. Although a Republican held the governor position for the past eight years, and Brown had previous political experience; Whitman was an outlier: new to politics and a former president and CEO of the tech giant eBay (Nagourney, 2010). Whitman could be considered an exception to the rule of the typical female running for an elected position in that she was able to run because she had previous access to another gendered institution: corporations. She had managed to reach a leadership position within another highly gendered organization, giving her enough cultural and social capital to make the move across institutions and still be considered a legitimate, viable candidate. Whitman was the third woman in a twenty-year period to unsuccessfully run for governor in California. Like B.C., the history of the office has been defined by the lack of female presence at the helm. Whitman, also similarly to Clark, represented the more right-wing party of the two candidates in the Gubernatorial race, which arguably focuses on more 'masculine' policies, such as supporting the economy by freezing bills that may impact it, e.g. greenhouse gas emission cuts (Ballotopedia, 2011). However, she also supported abortion rights, a more controversial position that is not considered a 'masculinized' issue in the political realm. Whitman demonstrates both masculine traits that align with the historical job requirements of the governorship yet has clear deviations into "feminization" of the position. Her attempt to buck the trend and become the first female governor of the state demonstrates internalized institutionalized bias towards female candidates, as media and public attention placed on Whitman focuses on her 'uniqueness' and as an outlier candidate. Brown had previously been the California governor in late 1970's, his win in 2010 made him a governor holding three non-consecutive terms in California. He previously held the attorney general position in California, giving him exceptional amount of political capital and historical success within the political institution compared to that of Whitman.

In comparing these two campaigns in terms of job evaluation bias, it becomes obvious that the political position is a major factor in terms of the gendered institution. Even though campaigns aren't officially gendered by job evaluations, they interact with several other gendered institutions; such as the ability to raise money, project power, and align with an acceptable masculine and feminine norm framework. Feminized candidates must negotiate this gendered political landscape and campaign bias through a number of means, which, as already noted, effectively limits the participation of both women and more 'feminized' candidates in this institution.

The Process of Replication and "Doing Gender" Within the Organization

When exploring how Clark 'does' gender (West and Zimmerman, 1987) in terms of campaign debates, the analysis demonstrates that she is held to a higher standard than male opponent, John Horgan and masculinity is idealized. Visually, Clark plays up her traditional feminine traits, with full hair and make-up and in a bright teal suit on television. This is in stark contrast to the two male opponents in demure blue suits (FactPoint video, 2017). The debate highlights the bind that Clark is in to 'do gender'; when she responds to a comment about the budget from the NDP opponent, John Horgan, she is immediately interrupted by Horgan several times. He accuses the moderator of working for Clark and unfairly giving her extra time, although she is still within her designated time (FactPoint video 2017: 6:59). Within the first ten minutes,

Horgan repeatedly speaks over Clark during her allocated time within the debate, and an exasperated Clark pauses several times to collect herself and combat this while still portraying the appropriate soft, patient feminine norms expected from a woman. Eventually, Clark responds to Horgan's interruptions by laying her hand on his arm in a soft and 'feminized' fashion and tells him to "calm down" (Shaw, 2017a). This feminized response demonstrates Acker's point about doing gender and remaining within the masculine hierarchy of the political institution. Even though Clark's campaign platform is focused on more traditional masculine concepts in politics, she remains a physical representation of feminine norms. Horgan utilizes the hierarchy of masculinity to his advantage in the debate by reproducing the gendered understructure of society's institutions allowing him to interrupt Clark without cause or recourse, (Acker, 1992: 567). His operation of the masculinity hierarchy ensures that Clark is put in her place as a woman, effectively removing her space to speak openly, by repeatedly speaking over her. Horgan knows that in 'doing gender' appropriately, Clark will never be able to respond aggressively, or in any fashion that threatens this hierarchy. It is worth highlighting that this type of exchange never occurs across the two male candidates during the debate, Horgan and Weaver, who both display more preferred displays of masculinity, both in physical and performative manifestations.

In California, the debate highlights how both candidates "do gender" and most prominently demonstrates the gendered nature of campaigns. An earlier campaign scandal which involved a Democrat campaign worker leaving a voicemail and referring to the Republican nominee, Meg Whitman, as a "whore" is highlighted during the debate. The moderator notes that Brown has never apologized or shown remorse for that scandal, and Brown excuses the incident, "he doesn't apologize for how the term was used," (C-Span, 2010: 30:16) but apologizes that a private conversation with a 'gargled transmission' was illegally obtained, and he is sorry to Whitman that the word was said. When Whitman attempts to demonstrate that the term is offensive not to only her as an individual, but to all female voters and Californians, Brown shuts her down saying that using the word "whore", "doesn't represent anything that happens outside of a campaign," (C-Span, 2010: 31:46). This exchange demonstrates how, "gender is difficult to see when only the masculine is present," (Acker, 1990: 142) in politics. Even with a culturally offensive term designated to women, this term is simply reduced to institutional campaign behaviour. Within the context of institutions, men believe their behaviour represents general human behaviour in structures and processes of organizations. Thus, this term is simply seen as part of politics-as-usual and a process operating outside of gender. Brown equates that Ms. Whitman isn't a whore because she is a woman, but rather because she is in the political race and his opponent; therefore, it's not offensive to her or women. Whitman can only respond by 'doing gender' and responding in a way that fits within culture's idealization of feminine nature (West and Zimmerman, 1987: 130). Her response demonstrates this problematic institutional bind because she must perform within the confines of her femininity. She cannot respond, other than politely suggesting to Brown that this is offensive to all women and then move on.

Both case studies demonstrate the gendered aspect of campaigns and how the process of replication of 'doing gender' contributes to the institution and maintains the masculine hierarchy in politics. Neither Horgan or Brown are impacted by their sexist comments towards their female opponents or their hyper masculine actions displayed in these debates, demonstrating the hierarchy of masculine norms within campaign institutions. As Acker notes, "gender is difficult to see when only the masculine is present," (1990: 142). Neither Clark nor Whitman can break the "feminization" of their gender and respond to comments to demonstrate to the public the full

effect and disadvantages that gendering in campaigns has towards candidates who do not fit within the expected masculine norm of politics.

Decisions and Procedures that Control, Segregate, Exclude and Control Hierarchies Based on Gender

Using financial contributions as a marker determining the decisions and procedures that control and exclude based on gender demonstrates some malleability in terms of gender institutions within campaigns. One would generally expect in a gendered institution that financial contributions to campaigns would be higher and more supportive of the more masculine idealized campaign. However, in analyzing the data from B.C. elections, top donors for Clark's Liberals include mostly private resource companies and companies which would flourish under international trade, which aligns with Liberal policies (Carman, 2017). In contrast, the NDP's fundraising mostly comes from unions, which again, aligns with their policies and platforms directly. What is interesting is that Clark's Liberals have nearly three times as much fundraising capital as the NDP's with the median donation at \$360 dollars, compared to NDP's \$200 (Carman, 2017). These results highlight the potential malleability of institutionalized gender within campaigns, as the Liberals are highly funded. This may be due to the party politics component, and supporters may be funding the general party platform, more than the candidate themselves. Further research is needed on this front to conclusively determine how financial contributions play a role in terms of decisions and procedures that control, segregate, exclude and construct hierarchies based on gender. However, one can infer that there may be some malleability as Clark has been the leader of the party for nearly 8 years; to some extent, donors are supporting her leadership. Campaign funding contributions are the sites of concrete institutional functioning. Because, "Processes and practices of different types can be analytically distinguished, although they are inherently connected elements in ongoing social life," (Acker, 1992: 567) in theory fundraising should be more exclusionary to Clark's Liberals given her inherent femininity. However, in part, because fundraising supports both the party and the leader it is difficult to discern if Clark is being included and gender perhaps does not matter as much in this component, or if the focus for donors is more on the long-term party policies.

In California, the financial contributions are equally as significant and ambiguous in terms of revealing how campaigns are gendered. It is also worth highlighting as a difference across races that in theory, in California, donors have a wider range of options in terms of donations. If they do not support their party candidate for Governor, they can donate to Democratic or Republican candidates for other state offices. Across the Whitman and Brown campaigns, Whitman raised substantially more funds, with the caveat that most of her funding came from her own contributions. Of her total \$176 million raised through her campaign; she self-funded over \$119 million of that dollar amount, which she attributed to making her a more 'independent' candidate and able to more freely act in the interest of voters than on behalf of large-scale contributors (National Institute on Money in State Politics, 2018a). However even when factoring out her own contribution, she still raised \$57 million of donor funding. Her top donors included \$4 million from securities investment, and nearly \$3 million from the real estate sector, (National Institute on Money in State Politics, 2018a). Brown's funding differs significantly. He raised only \$40 million with his top donors being the Democratic party at \$8.7 million. General unions contribution \$7.6 million and lawyers and lobbyists contributing \$4.5 million (National Institute on Money in State Politics, 2018b). Again, the funding aspect to the campaign lacks clarity to draw distinct

conclusions on the impact of genders function in a campaign. One would expect that Brown would have raised more given his political capital and previous experience in politics; yet Whitman raised much more, even when factoring out her own personal contribution.

Both Clark and Whitman fundraised the most in each campaign, which based on Acker's framework, one would expect an increased financial contribution to align within the gender hierarchy of the institution, which in the political case, is masculinity. Future research is needed to explore how financial contributions function within the framework of gendered campaigns, as neither case is overtly conclusive. Based on these results, fundraising could be more divided across masculine focused policies rather than the gender of the candidate, as both Whitman and Clark support traditionally 'masculine' issues compared to both Horgan and Brown. Future research exploring how fundraising within individual races functions across time may help to further understand its function in constructing gender hierarchies in campaigns.

Construction of Symbols and Gender Ideologies that Justify, Explain and Give Legitimacy to Institutions

In terms of Acker's component of the construction of symbols and gender ideologies that justify, explain and give legitimacy to institutions, the use of candidates going negative through ads during the campaign is explored. Negative ads are sufficient gender symbols that legitimize campaigns given the fact their messages, images, and traits symbolize the ways in which they choose to communicate both their own gender traits and their opponents to the public (Dittmar, 2015) and can influence the degree to which a woman or feminine candidate can be normalized. Dittmar found that gender functions most importantly in informing campaign strategy, (2015: 2), therefore we can expect that it would have an impact on the distribution of negative ads.

In the 2017 B.C. Provincial campaign, negative ads were frequently used throughout the campaign. Horgan and the NDP created a number of attack ads that depicted Clark as a corrupt leader who bends for her corporate donors, while Clark's Liberals portrayed Horgan as being in the pocket of the unions. The negative ads only increased throughout the campaign, as the NDP released a video linking Clark to the suicide of a fired health researcher in 2012. The Liberals sent out a "truth truck" which crashed NDP events in the region with anti-Horgan information and signs (Shaw, 2017a). While this election was highly charged with numerous negative attacks, compared to previous elections, the negative symbols in terms of media representation and favor, seemed to generally work in the hands of Horgan and backfire on Clark (Shaw, 2017a). This demonstrates within campaign ads, "deeply embedded unconscious gendering is operational," (Thomas and Schroedel, 2011: 45) which seems to benefit the hierarchy of the preferred political masculine ideals. Horgan is not punished by the media or public for going negative, while Clark's negative tactics are questioned by media and she is considered doing, "too much politics and not quite enough policy initiative," (Shaw, 2017b).

In California, negative ads functioned slightly differently. While both candidates produced their own negative ads, a union PAC backing Brown also launched numerous negative attack ads early on in the election attacking Whitman for her spending record as a CEO, and tax break plans (Ballotopedia, 2011). The only official negative ads Brown released compared Whitman physically to Pinocchio, and showed her nose growing 'by the millions' highlighting her billionaire status with her plans to cut taxes to only benefit the wealthy. Whitman's official attack ads focused on Brown's previous political record and did not allude to his physical appearance (Ballotopedia, 2011). The PAC ads were unique, given they were produced on behalf of Brown, and not approved

by Brown, they could be far more aggressive in their language. However, it was Brown's negative ad which commented on Whitman's appearance and traits as a billionaire that demonstrated the embedded gendering within campaigns. Whitman did not have a super PAC supporting her campaign, and therefore her aggressive ads came directly from her, which specifically focused on spending records in Brown's past.

There is a deeply embedded gendering at play in campaigns, which becomes prominent when comparing the function of negative ads across these cases. The consequences for the ideal masculine candidates seem to be far less substantial or nonexistent compared to their feminine counterparts, demonstrating the systematic gendering within campaigns. Negative ads are understood as 'just part of campaigning' which is a noticeable disadvantage to feminine candidates who are limited in the type of negative ads they use, and how frequent they can run them before being held to a higher standard in the public's eye. Whereas masculine candidates have the freedom to attack both policy and physical appearance of their feminized opponents, demonstrating the symbolic power of masculinity within campaigns.

Conclusion

Acker introduced the concept of the gendered institution and research has been fruitful in exploring the ways in which these social institutions exist and impact individuals and cultural norms. The exploration of campaigns in this paper was intended to review the institution with a relatively new lens. Campaigns are an especially important institution because they essentially determine who has access to the other institutions of political power. In other words, they principally act as a first gate to keep certain people (e.g. women and feminized candidates) out of other, more powerful, institutions that are also very gendered. Exploring two case studies: B.C. 2017 Provincial and California's 2010 Gubernatorial campaign allowed for the exploration of institutionalized genders existence across political systems, and how it exists in varying ways, shaping electoral campaigns and political systems in the process. This research demonstrated how both campaigns are gendered in relatively similar ways. However, the gendered function of financial contributions in a campaign is not as clear as other aspects of campaigns. Based on the debate component of 'doing gender', one could argue that there is potentially more leeway (less gendering) in Canadian elections with a more direct link to the party than the individual. Further research is needed in this area of study given the dearth of literature. In particular, understanding how the role of super PACs and financing impacts and plays a role in the gendering of a campaign would be valuable as this paper barely scratched the surface. What this research most clearly points out is that further research is needed to understand the extent to which campaigns as gendered institutions operate across all political systems and regions. To re-gender the political realm, campaigns must first be addressed and to do so, it is imperative to further understand how gender operates in all types of campaigns across time, space and electoral race.

References

- Acker, Joan. 1990. "Hierarchies, Jobs, Bodies: A Theory of Gendered Organizations." *Gender and Society* 4(2): 139– 58.
- Acker, Joan. 1992. "From Sex Roles to Gendered Institutions." *Contemporary Sociology* 21(5): 565-69.

- Ballotopedia. 2011. "California Gubernatorial Election, 2010." *Ballotopedia*.
https://ballotpedia.org/California_gubernatorial_election_2010 (April 1, 2018).
- Berleson, Bernard, Paul F. Lazarsfeld and William N. McPhee. 1954. *Voting*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Carman, Tara. 2017. "Political Donations: Following the money in B.C. politics." *CBC News*, April 21. <http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/political-donations-following-the-money-in-b-c-politics-1.4076285> (April 1, 2018).
- California Secretary of the State. 2018. *Summary of Qualifications and Requirements for the Offices of Governor and Lieutenant Governor*. <http://elections.cdn.sos.ca.gov/statewide-elections/2018-primary/2018-governor-lt-governor.pdf> (April 1, 2018).
- Conroy, Meredith. 2011. "Political Parties: Advancing a Masculine Ideal." In *Rethinking Madam President*, ed. Lori Cox Han and Caroline Heldman, Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- C-SPAN. 2010. *California Gubernatorial Debate*. <https://www.c-span.org/video/?295957-1/california-gubernatorial-debate> (April 1, 2018).
- Dittmar, Kelly E. 2012. *Campaigns as Gendered Institutions: Stereotypes and Strategy in Statewide Races*. Rutgers The State University of New Jersey-New Brunswick.
- Dittmar, Kelly E. 2015. *Navigating Gendered Terrain: Stereotypes and Strategy in Political Campaigns*. Temple University Press.
- Elections B.C. 2018. *Electoral History of B.C.* <http://elections.bc.ca/resources/electoral-history-of-bc/> (April 1, 2018).
- Elections B.C. 2016. *Guide for Candidates*. <http://elections.bc.ca/docs/guidebooks/856-Guide-for-Candidates.pdf> (April 1, 2018).
- FactPoint Video. 2017. "British Columbia Leaders' Election Debate – 20 April 2017." <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=G9BWk-CcNKM> (April 1, 2018).
- Han, Lori C. 2011. "Is the United States Really Ready for a Woman President?" In *Rethinking Madam President*, ed. Lori Cox Han and Caroline Heldman, Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Heldman, Caroline. 2011. "Cultural Barriers to a Female President in the United States." In *Rethinking Madam President*, ed. Lori Cox Han and Caroline Heldman, Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Kirkpatrick, Jeane J. 1974. *Political Woman*. New York: Basic Books.
- Lovenduski, Joni. 1998. "Gendering Research in Political Science." *Annual Review of Political Science* 1(1): 333–56.
- National Institute on Money in State Politics. 2018a. *Whitman, Margaret C (MEG)*. <https://www.followthemoney.org/entity-details?eid=29169anddefault=candidate> (April 1, 2018).
- National Institute on Money in State Politics. 2018b. *Brown, JR, Edmund G (JERRY)*. <https://www.followthemoney.org/entity-details?eid=70023anddefault=candidate> (April 1, 2018).
- Nagourney, Adam. 2010. "California Governor Profile." *New York Times*, Dec 10. <https://www.nytimes.com/elections/2010/governor/california.html> (April 1, 2018).
- Shaw, Rob. 2017a. "B.C. Election 2017: A recap of the wild ride so far." *Vancouver Sun*, May 5. <http://vancouversun.com/news/politics/b-c-election-2017-a-recap-of-the-wild-ride-so-far> (April 1, 2018).

- Shaw, Rob. 2017b. "Voters punished B.C. Liberals for too much politics, not enough leadership, says former minister." *Vancouver Sun*, May 11.
<http://vancouversun.com/news/politics/voters-punished-b-c-liberals-for-too-much-politics-not-enough-leadership-says-former-minister> (April 1, 2018).
- Smith, Dorothy E. 1987. *The Everyday World as Problematic*. Toronto: The University of Toronto Press.
- Thomas, Sue and Jean R. Schroedel. 2011. "The Significance of Social and Institutional Expectations." In *Rethinking Madam President*, ed. Lori Cox Han and Caroline Heldman, Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- West, Candace, and Don H. Zimmerman. 1987. "Doing Gender." *Gender and Society* 1(2): 125–51.