



This is the Author's version of the paper published as:

Author: Mason, Robyn

Email address:- rbmason@csu.edu.au

Year:- 2007

Title: Building women's social citizenship: A five-point framework to conceptualise the work of women-specific services in rural Australia

Journal Women's Studies International Forum

Volume: 30

Issue: 4

Pages: pp1299-312

ISSN: 0277-5395

URL: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/journal/02775395>

Abstract: **This paper draws on research undertaken as part of a national study of rural women-specific services across Australia, completed in 2001. A detailed review and analysis of feminist citizenship theories was undertaken as part of the research, and a framework for conceptualising the contribution of rural women-specific services, comprising five components, was developed. The analysis and framework are described here, in the context of what is known about Australian rural women and service provision, and making use of general findings from the study. There are five components in the framework: recognition of women's diversity; bridging the public-private divide; addressing women's oppression; acknowledging women's agency; and facilitating women's active participation in social, political and community life. The framework is offered as a tool for conceptualising the work of women's services or projects, as a basis for developing service standards, and to stimulate debate about the usefulness of such an approach.**

Title

Building Women's Social Citizenship: A five-point framework to conceptualise the work of women-specific services in rural Australia

Author

Robyn Mason PhD

Affiliation

Charles Sturt University

Wagga Wagga NSW 2678

Australia

T: +61 2 6933 2478

F: +61 2 6933 2793

E: rbmason@csu.edu.au

Title

Building Women's Social Citizenship: A five-point framework to conceptualise the work of women-specific services in rural Australia

Abstract

This paper draws on research undertaken as part of a national study of rural women-specific services across Australia, completed in 2001. A detailed review and analysis of feminist citizenship theories was undertaken as part of the research, and a framework for conceptualising the contribution of rural women-specific services, comprising five components, was developed. The analysis and framework are described here, in the context of what is known about Australian rural women and service provision, and making use of general findings from the study. There are five components in the framework: recognition of women's diversity; bridging the public-private divide; addressing women's oppression; acknowledging women's agency; and facilitating women's active participation in social, political and community life. The framework is offered as a tool for conceptualising the work of women's services or projects, as a basis for developing service standards, and to stimulate debate about the usefulness of such an approach.

Keywords

feminist citizenship, women-specific services, rural women

Introduction

As an Australian rural woman, social worker and former manager of a rural Centre Against Sexual Assault (CASA), I chose to build on my lived experience and focus my doctoral research on assessing the contribution to women's citizenship by feminist services, that is, services for women run by women (Weeks, 1994) in rural Australia. I wanted to know how women's services, including services against sexual assault, anti-violence services, women's health, legal and information services, facilitated women's progress towards social citizenship. One of my questions was therefore: How can I identify the ways in which women-specific services in rural Australia are

advancing and encouraging rural women's progress towards full participation in their communities? What would such a framework look like?

To answer this question, the first task was to complete a critical review and analysis of feminist approaches to citizenship. That analysis is presented in the context of the study, especially those factors relevant to rural women in Australia. The paper then outlines the components of a framework for conceptualising feminist social citizenship. Findings from the study are used to demonstrate the overall contribution of the participating group of services to women's social citizenship.

Background to the Study

Australia is a highly urbanised nation. The population is concentrated in urban centres in coastal regions in the east and south-east of the continent, and in a smaller region in the south-west. There is considerable debate about what constitutes 'rural'. A broad definition of rural as non-metropolitan or non-capital city has been adopted by some researchers and planners (Dunn, 1989; Haberkorn, Hugom Fisher and Aylward, 1999). Others have attempted to measure rurality by examining issues such as geography (Commonwealth Department of Health and Aged Care, 1999), population numbers and distance from urban centres (Australian Institute of Health and Welfare, 1998), and population diversity and demand for services (Nichol, 1990). Frances Cameron-Jackson (1995, p. 1) argues for a definition of rurality that takes into account 'the subjective views of what ruralism is to rural people'. Similarly, Jane Dixon and Nicky Welch (2000) argue that health outcomes may be influenced by a person's sense of place and rurality. The significance of women's relationship with place and the meanings they attach to it, for example, have been recognised as important factors in the success of community development programs (Regional Women's Advisory Council, 2001).

In the research reported in this paper, two indicators of rurality were employed. First, participants in the study chose to answer a section of the mailed questionnaire on rural services, and so self-selected an interest in rurality. Second, most of the services that participated in the study are located in regional centres in Australia rather than in

CSU Research Output

4

<http://researchoutput.csu.edu.au>

small towns or remote locations, but they service a rural hinterland. For this reason, I adopted the broad definition of rural as non-capital city (Office of the Status of Women, 2002).

Rural people in Australia, as a minority, face difficulties being seen and heard by urban dwellers. Small rural communities bear the brunt of rural decline. In the human services sector this presents problems of service delivery, community ownership and co-ordination (Munn, 1999; O'Toole, Nesbitt and Macgarvey, 2002). Increasingly, 'rural people are expected to live without the same level of services, indeed without the attributes of full citizenship, which metropolitan people expect' (Gray and Lawrence, 2001, p. 135).

The Situation of Rural Women in Australia

Women and rural people have experienced marginalisation in Australia – an urban, male-dominated society. Rural women in Australia are doubly invisible (Teather, 1998), and rural women who are Aboriginal or immigrant suffer a triple dose of invisibility (Alston, 2000). In the literature, rural women have been theorised as marginalised, invisible, subject to sex role stereotyping and prohibited from participating in a wide range of arenas affecting their lives. Their marginalisation and exclusion has been conceptualised by some researchers as a consequence of the intersection of rurality and gender (James, 1989; Poiner, 1990; Dempsey, 1992; Whatmore, Marsden and Lowe, 1994; Alston, 1995). At the same time, they have used their agency to improve their individual and collective situation.

Information from a broad range of data sources about the lives of rural women in Australia (Office of the Status of Women, 2002) reveals that most rural women live in crowded settlements close to the coast, and that there are fewer women than there are men in rural Australia. Rural women see health professionals less often than their city sisters; they volunteer in large numbers; they have less leisure time than men. They are employed in primary industries or in service industries such as retail, education and the human services. One-third of the Australian women in vocational training are rural women, but many young women between the ages of 15 and 24 are leaving rural

areas to take up study or work opportunities elsewhere (Office of the Status of Women, 2002).

Rural women have faded in and out of Australian social policy. Governments have typically taken a narrow view and have seen the role of rural women embedded in the family. This has been reinforced by the Howard Liberal-National Coalition government, in power since 1996. Rural women's participation in local and regional communities has been constrained by problems that they have outlined in reports and consultations over at least the last three decades, including a lack of access to services, transport, childcare, reliable communication systems and the prevalence of violence.

The Study

I was a member of a research team at the University of Melbourne, Australia, conducting a national study of Australian women-specific services. The study, a combination of mail survey and interviews, was completed in 2001, and examined, among other items, the philosophy, activities, organisational structure, target groups and particular challenges experienced by 160 feminist government-funded services in every State and Territory across the nation.. Additional questions relating to issues and challenges for rural service providers were answered by 74 services, based in rural Australia or with an interest in meeting the needs of rural women. The findings indicated that, overall, rural women-specific services are active advocates for women in their communities, acutely aware of the nuances of their rural environment and proudly feminist in their orientation (Mason, 2004).

Why Citizenship?

In a critical review of the available research about rural women, I discerned four possible explanations for the marginalised and powerless situation depicted by various authors. These were: the myth of the rural idyll; the sexual division of labour; rural women as 'other'; and the idea of a rural culture. The myth of the rural idyll includes the notion that rural communities function like happy families, hiding the social reality of living in country towns (Bourke, 2001). Dempsey (1992), in a study that

CSU Research Output

6

<http://researchoutput.csu.edu.au>

made visible the oppression of women in Smalltown, highlighted this kind of mythology. Groups calling for the recognition of social problems such as violence against women are said to challenge the rural idyll of harmony and traditional family life (Poiner, 1990; Teather, 1994).

The sexual division of labour has also been seen as a way of explaining rural women's powerlessness, for example, by Gretchen Poiner (1990), in her study of power in gender and social class relationships. She argued that rural traditional values, such as the ideology of the family, impacted on the daily lives of rural women. Jo Little (2002) argued that traditional attitudes about women's caring role in the family are common in rural communities across developed countries.

A third view in the research sees rural women as 'other'. Depictions of rural life privilege the male mainstream while marginalising and excluding groups and individuals that do not conform, including women (Cloke and Little, 1997). A further explanation offered is the influence of a rural culture. In a study of women and violence in rural Australia, components of the rural culture included a belief in the integrity of marriage, the primacy of the family and maintenance of property transfer between generations (Wendt and Cheers, 2002). In the mid-1990s, Margaret Alston (1995, p. 147) found that 'feminism is generally disparaged in rural communities'.

All of these theoretical explanations have merit, and they go some way towards explaining research findings about rural women in Australia. What they lack is an appreciation of women's agency and how women have struggled to enhance their situation. In the reading, reflection and debate I have engaged in, therefore, theories of feminist social citizenship, an understanding of oppression, and an appreciation of women's agency, have merged to construct a more congruent framework for understanding the experience of rural women as a group, and their efforts to improve their situation in local, regional and wider settings. These efforts include the work of women in women-specific services.

What is Citizenship?

CSU Research Output

<http://researchoutput.csu.edu.au>

A definition of what is meant by citizenship and social citizenship is a necessary first step. In its origin in the ancient Greek *polis*, the concept of citizenship related to residence in the city (Yuval-Davis, 1997). Its earliest meanings included notions of freedom, as city dwellers enjoyed freedom from feudal slavery. T. H. Marshall (1950/1963 p. 87) defined citizenship as a status 'bestowed on those who are full members of a community', and one where all citizens share equal rights and duties. This form of civil citizenship, based on the status of freedom, applied only to men, as Marshall acknowledged, and political rights were later granted to men of property. The word *citizen* carries connotations of respect and dignity, and the values of citizenship have been described as 'weighty, monumental, humanist' (Fraser and Gordon, 1992, p. 45). Pnina Werbner and Nira Yuval-Davis (1993, p. 3) hold that citizenship appeals to visions of the future, the ideal and the aspirational; it is 'the gold standard against which the negotiated order is measured and, inevitably, found wanting'. Interest in citizenship has increased in recent times with nation-states in turmoil and issues of migration challenging governments in Europe and elsewhere, including Australia, where there has been community debate about the rights of asylum seekers, refugees and temporary denizens.

Feminism and Social Citizenship

An exploration of citizenship was not pursued specifically by feminist theorists in the second wave feminist movement that gathered momentum at the end of the 1960s. Feminist theorists were concerned about women's oppression and the need for equality, but did not necessarily frame these concerns in terms of citizenship. Rian Voet (1998, p. 6) believes that citizenship was seen to be about 'power, political relations, the state, the law, and issues of political rights and obligations, but not with relations between the sexes'. She contends that some theorists saw feminism as an exploration of the private, while citizenship centred on the public. In women's historical exclusion from citizenship, Ruth Lister adds, the public, male citizen model was the norm, contrasted with the private, female non-citizen (Lister, 1997a). Lister asks: How can such a heavily gendered concept, based on women's exclusion, be rendered useful to women's interests? How can women be included, rather than simply added on (Lister, 1995)?

CSU Research Output

8

<http://researchoutput.csu.edu.au>

Despite women's history of exclusion from citizenship, in the 1990s some feminist theorists began to explore the usefulness of citizenship theory for explaining women's continued struggle for full participation in social and political life. Marshall defined social citizenship as:

...the whole range from the right to share to the full in the social heritage and to live the life of a civilized being according to the standards prevailing in the society. The institutions most closely connected with it are the educational system and the social services.

(Marshall, 1950/1963, p. 74)

Marshall's definition of a citizen as someone who is a full member of a community leads Lister (1997b) to claim that citizenship is not merely a legal framework, but one that also covers the social relationships among individuals, and between individuals and the state. She suggests that a discussion of citizenship needs to acknowledge that women's social relations differ from men's. Similarly, while the meaning of 'community' in Marshall's definition is contested, Yuval-Davis (1997) contends that the use of 'community' in his conceptualisation opens the way to conceive of citizenship as operating on a number of levels. Yuval-Davis believes that it is possible to conceive of citizenship as a reflection of people's membership of a range of groups comprising local, regional, national, ethnic and international identities. Young (1990) presents similar categories of difference, including geography.

Feminist Citizenship Theory and the Welfare State

The literature on feminist citizenship includes analysis of women's contribution to and relationship with welfare states and how this counts as social citizenship (Lister, 1995; Lister, 1997a; Yuval-Davis, 1997; Lister, 1997b; Werbner and Yuval-Davis, 1999; Siim, 2000). Lister (1995) has argued that, in a paradoxical relationship, welfare states can advance citizenship for women, and at the same time, relegate women to second-class status. Feminists engaged with the state from the beginning of the women's movement, to advance women's interests. Women have campaigned

CSU Research Output

9

<http://researchoutput.csu.edu.au>

successfully for welfare rights and programs, despite their position outside the structures of power. According to Lister (1997a), welfare organizations can be sources of community and political strength for women as workers or service users, especially when the service philosophy facilitates genuine service user involvement. She cites examples where women service users have mobilised to improve conditions for themselves or their children, challenging the definition of need by experts who perpetuate the powerlessness of service users by excluding them from decision-making. As well as being active users of services, Lister notes that women also contribute as providers of innovative programs to meet women's needs. Some of these, such as services for rape survivors or women escaping violence, make public what was previously private, and so breach the public-private divide (Lister, 1997a).

Feminist Citizenship and Women's Caring

While welfare states may provide economic independence for some women, they can bestow a status of economic dependence for others, especially when social policy is built on a male breadwinner model. In gendered states, including Australia, women become the dependent parties, reliant on state benefits to support their work as mothers, or reliant on men, to carry out their unpaid work in the home caring for children and maintaining the household. Economic dependence, whether on the state or on men, is demeaning for women and increases their sense of powerlessness. In response to this problem, Lister supports the recognition and legitimation of women's caring role. The challenge, as Lister acknowledges, is to ascertain how this can be done without locking women into a stereotyped, maternalist position that continues to keep them out of power. Should the traditional male version of social citizenship be universally applied, or should a gender-differentiated version of social citizenship be pursued to accommodate the different role of women (Lister, 1997a)?

A more equitable division of labour between women and men would undoubtedly assist women to improve their social citizenship status. Bettina Cass, for example, has suggested that men should be disqualified from full citizenship unless they do their fair share of care work (Cass, 1994). This approach reframes the problem as one of men's failure to care, rather than women's caring role. Lister (1997a) develops this

idea further, when she argues for a degendering of the care ethic (covering the specific relationships experienced in informal care), and its synthesis with the justice or rights ethic (focusing on a fair share of resources and liberated independence for women). She sees this combination of the two ethics as a means of promoting women's social citizenship in a way that recognises their diversity and their public and private roles. Recognition of women's caring in this way would also serve to promote difference as a positive resource (Young, 1996) rather than as an exclusionary barrier to women seeking to assert their rights to participate as full members of the community, that is, as citizens. For rural women in Australia, for example, marginalised and invisible according to the available research, such an approach would address their exclusion and value their participation, by recognising their roles as unpaid farm workers, carers and nurturers.

Women: equal but different

Questions of equality and difference have been central to the debate about feminist citizenship, most lucidly articulated by Moira Gatens (1991). As Anthias (2002, p. 284) points out: 'A person is treated equally if their difference is recognised, respected and allowed for'. Citizenship theorists, faced with this challenge, have adopted approaches that elevate the private role of women, for example by valuing caring, or dismantle the gendered division of men's and women's roles to redefine and reshape broader roles for both sexes. For as long as citizenship is defined in male terms, extolling masculine virtues, confined to activities in the public sphere or elevating the status of breadwinner or soldier, the expectation is that women will have no choice but to pursue citizenship by becoming the same as men, thereby undermining or pathologising the positive aspects of womanhood (Anthias, 2002)... In this debate, Lister (1997a) argues that concepts arising from male experience fail to take into account women's interests in the private sphere, and how those interests interact with the public sphere in the form of welfare state institutions or community-based politics. As well as formal political and civil activity, a feminist conception of citizenship needs to encompass community activism, where many women are currently engaged in working for community benefit. This kind of community activism and involvement requires time and resources, not currently available to all

women because of their position as unpaid carers or low-wage workers (Lister, 1997a). Rural women in Australia, for example, are constrained by their lack of time and resources to participate in formal decision-making forums in rural communities, such as local government, yet they are engaged in maintaining the social cohesion of communities through their community and caring activity. Often, this contribution is neither recognised nor valued.

Social policy and women's citizenship

Voet (1998) takes a slightly different approach, seeking to redefine the concept of social citizenship in order to facilitate women's equal participation.. She presents a feminist critique of three current social policy approaches and their accompanying versions of social citizenship – social-liberal, communitarian and neo-liberal. First, she argues that a social-liberal approach to citizenship will tend not to see women's low participation in political, business and cultural affairs as a problem. Rather, women's absence in these arenas will be seen as a result of their personal choice. This sentiment echoes Margaret Alston's research on the Australian agricultural industry (Alston, 2000), where men in the industry interpreted women's absence from decision-making bodies as indicative of women's lack of interest. In Alston's analysis, the men in the industry assume that the problem lies with the women rather than the structure. Proponents of a social liberal approach might conclude that affirmative action programs for women have failed and that, despite the removal of discriminatory barriers to their participation, women are simply not suited to positions of power and influence, possibly because they are mothers or biologically otherwise unsuited.

The second approach considered by Voet, communitarian citizenship, has a focus on social participation, but not specifically women's participation, and promotes a traditional view of the family (Voet, 1998). It is therefore, in her view, not likely to benefit women. This approach to community participation is prevalent in the Australian Commonwealth government's approach to regional development, where the emphasis is on community building and community leadership, with little attention paid to gender or power. Leadership courses offered to women assume that

it is their lack of experience and skill that prevents them from taking on responsible roles in the community, politics or business, rather than valuing their existing contribution in its own right.

Finally, Voet (1998) contends that in the neo-liberal framework of citizenship, the individual is 'a bundle of preferences', where the state has a minimal role in order to maximise individual freedom. The interest of neo-liberalism, she claims, is in equal opportunity but not equal outcomes. Equal opportunity legislation in Australia has not enabled rural women to advance their interests significantly in terms of employment and income, or gain positions of power locally or nationally. Again, rural women, already marginalised and excluded, are even less likely to overcome these barriers in a competitive, neo-liberal environment.

Active and sex-equal citizenship

Both Voet and Lister present ways forward in the quest for genuine social citizenship for women. Voet (1998) argues for a feminist citizenship that she calls 'active and sex-equal'. She contends that her ideal model of citizenship will mean the end of second-class status for women and will increase respect for them, by redressing their material inequality and increasing their capacity for social participation. In contrast to Lister's approach, she begins by taking the idea of active citizenship as a worthwhile public good, and then builds a feminist theory around it, rather than starting with the problem of women and difference. Voet's (1998) framework is underpinned by four inter-related ideas. These are active citizenship, sex-equal citizenship, the circulation of elites to ensure power sharing, and women-friendly changes in care and education arrangements for paid workers. She contends that full citizenship entails showing through action, one's status as a citizen, rather than as a subject, and she lists the preconditions for achieving this as freedom, rights and basic material welfare. Voet holds that the ideal of active citizenship implies taking part in decision-making and in paid work. Not everyone would be expected to participate, in her model, but the capacity and encouragement for participation would be an accepted community value. This changes the norm from one where women are simply added on, or where women have to make extraordinary arrangements in order to participate in community life, to

one where they have equal access and equal support for that participation. Changing the premise in this way would also challenge the prejudice and discrimination faced by women in paid employment, including in rural areas, where, as we have seen, a traditional view of women's role in the family has prevailed, applying pressure on women to be the primary unpaid carers of children, and so limiting their opportunities to pursue professional careers or participate in public life.

The second plank of Voet's (1998) framework, sex-equal citizenship, takes a group perspective, where she considers how members of each gender group should participate in being the rulers and the ruled. She advocates equal decision-making by men and women in positions of power and equal access to social and economic resources for both men and women. In a society where active citizenship is the norm, she argues, women's social and economic equality with men will facilitate greater autonomy and power and encourage their greater involvement in taking on responsibility in the community. Her third criterion requires that members of elite decision-making groups should alternate and circulate, not just between genders but also among individuals. Over time, Voet believes, this will result in equal decision making between women and men. Finally, she advocates women-friendly citizenship, achieved through the dissolution of the public-private divide, including the provision of the material conditions that will enable women to be active participants, such as child care services and guarantees of safety.

Voet goes on to set out three essential social conditions for active and sex-equal citizenship: an equal division of paid labour between women and men; the promotion of talented people from lower to higher levels of decision-making; and an equal division of household work and care between women and men. She also advocates mental preparation by women for the task of active citizenship, and urges them to be assertive in promoting their interests (Voet, 1998).

Citizenship as 'differentiated universalism'

Where Voet's conceptualisation begins with a new, publicly agreed upon, definition of citizenship, Lister (1997a) proposes working towards a feminist citizenship through

a synthesis of rights, including social and reproductive rights, (that is, citizenship as a status), and obligations, including involvement in informal politics, (that is, citizenship as a practice). This synthesis is coupled with the breaking down of the dualisms that, she claims, maintain women's second-class status, such as the justice-care and public-private dichotomies. This synthesis is informed by a commitment to inclusiveness and powered by the notion of human agency (to be described below). The guiding principle for Lister is what she calls 'differentiated universalism', where difference is recognised but not seen as a barrier for women. The public-private, justice-care, male-female dichotomies, she contends, need to be re-articulated to unravel their gendered meanings and expose citizenship's false universalism. Lister's framework, in a dialectical approach, makes difference the centrepiece of her conceptualisation. Indeed, she claims that 'a woman-friendly citizenship is ... rooted in difference' (Lister, 1997a, p. 198). In order to realise her guiding principle of 'differentiated universalism', Lister proposes three steps for feminism to claim citizenship.

First, the ways that women have been excluded in the historical development of citizenship need to be exposed. Because of the false universalism under which citizenship has been promoted, women's exclusion has been seen as accidental rather than deliberate, or sheeted home to women as their fault for not asserting their rights. Lister sees women's deliberate exclusion as integral to the way traditional notions of citizenship have evolved. Second, Lister argues that a similar false universalism has been applied to the category 'woman', and that a gender analysis of difference is necessary in order to accommodate women in all their diversity. This should encompass difference in, for example, class, race, disability and sexual preference, and, I would add, geography. Third, she advocates that the clash between difference and universalism, inherent in current conceptualisations of citizenship, be tackled. By seeing this tension as creative and positive, and by applying the principle of 'differentiated universalism', she believes that our understanding of citizenship can be enhanced.

Women's Oppression and Citizenship

Building on these explorations of feminist citizenship, I find that Young's (1990) conceptualisation of oppression provides additional theoretical evidence to explain the exclusion and marginalisation of rural women in Australia. Women's historical exclusion from citizenship and their continuing struggle for full citizenship rights can be interpreted as a form of structural oppression of women as a social group. This conceptualisation is especially useful when considering a group of women with a shared identity, such as rural women, and particularly relevant, as previously noted, in an era when national and international issues of citizenship are challenging governments everywhere.

It is worth quoting in full Young's definition of oppression, a definition that emerged in new social movements in the 1960s and 1970s. She defines oppression as:

... the disadvantage and injustice some people suffer not because a tyrannical power coerces them, but because of the everyday practices of a well-intentioned liberal society.

(Young, 1990, p. 41)

This definition locates oppression and injustice in societies such as Australia – an affluent, industrialised, capitalist society, rather than in a stereotypical 'third world' country or a one-party state. In this way, Young's definition of oppression makes visible the invisible, by exposing the undercurrents of injustice beneath the veneer of equality. In a similar way, women-specific services have worked to expose the structural and personal oppression of women in societies where they have theoretical equality with men. This applies in allegedly peaceful and idyllic rural communities as well as in metropolitan cities in Australia (Coorey, 1989; Alston, 1997; Wendt and Cheers, 2002; Wendt, Taylor and Kennedy, 2002).

Young (1990) outlines the characteristics of five types of oppression experienced by social groups. The first of these is exploitation, including gender exploitation. She

argues that exploitation occurs when one group is advantaged by the work and effort performed by another group. These arrangements are governed by rules about, for example, what constitutes work, how it is remunerated and what happens to profits. For women, it means handing over material products to men as well as exerting energy in providing care and sex for men. Young uses the example of farm women, where women often produce goods that men then take to market where they reap the rewards. Women may also be exploited as paid workers, in low wage jobs, suffer sexual harassment and other forms of discrimination.

Young's second form of oppression is marginalisation, which occurs when 'a whole category of people is expelled from useful participation in social life and thus potentially subjected to severe material deprivation and even extermination' (Young, 1990, p. 53). Women were historically marginalised in their exclusion from citizenship, their incarceration in psychiatric or penal institutions, and their subjection to invasive welfare and medical intervention. Marginalised people may be dependent on others because of disability, poverty or lack of rights. Young argues that they should still be accorded dignity and respect, despite their dependence, in contrast to a view that encourages only autonomous and independent members of society into full citizenship.

The third form of oppression presented by Young is powerlessness. She sees this vividly illustrated in the power of the professional class over the non-professional class. Powerless people do not develop their full potential, do not enjoy control over their working lives and are not treated with respect at work or elsewhere. Young postulates that professional people acquire a certain respectability that opens up many opportunities to them in many areas of society. Non-professional people, by contrast, experience prejudice, particularly in the form of racism and sexism. In small town Australia, Dempsey (1992) found that women fill the majority of the unskilled and semi-skilled positions in the paid workforce, and are rarely in professional roles.

The fourth form Young calls cultural imperialism, which she argues occurs when a dominant group treats another group as if its members are invisible, as the 'Other'. In

Young's view, the values and culture of the dominant group become the norm, seen as representative of the majority. The dominant group constructs others who are different as deviant or inferior in order to prop up its power and perpetuate the different as 'Other'. In the paradox of cultural imperialism, Young points out that the imperialised group experience themselves as being invisible, simultaneously with being marked as different.

Young's final identified form of oppression is violence. She sees this as injustice because of its systemic nature, directed at members of certain groups, such as women or non-white people, simply because of their membership of that group. For this reason, for example, every woman has good reason to fear that she will be raped. Living with such fear and threat affects one's capacity to exercise autonomy and freedom. Women, as research and crime statistics reveal, are most often the victims of violence in their own homes and at the hands of a known perpetrator. Their capacity to live free from fear is significantly diminished, when even their own home is not safe.

Women's Agency

Despite women's earlier exclusion from formal citizenship, their continuing struggles to achieve social citizenship and the oppression they experience, women have not been passive victims but have exercised agency to gain influence and claim social rights. This quality is essential if women are to achieve the active citizenship status advocated by Voet (1998). Women's agency is therefore a central concept in my analysis of women's citizenship theories because it explains how and why some rural women have refused to be compliant or subservient in their second-class state and why rural women-specific services have actively challenged the gender order in rural communities.

Iris Young defines agency in this way:

Individuals are not primarily receivers of goods or carriers of properties, but actors with meanings and purposes, who act with, against, or in relation to one another.

(Young, 1990, p. 28)

Maud Eduards (1994) sees human agency as natural. She believes that people will try to control what is happening to them and around them, rather than remain passive, and she cites research that demonstrates women's struggle against injustice throughout history. She acknowledges, in recognition of the breakdown of monolithic theory, that not everyone has the same capacity for agency, dependent on factors such as class, race, location and so on. A theory of women's agency needs to take account of the diversity of women that we recognise today. Eduards claims that feminism is 'a theory of women's agency and women's collective action', in contrast to other theoretical perspectives where women are seen as individuals or members of a particular class. She argues that only women will work on behalf of other women to achieve change in sexual power relations. Feminism, then, espouses that '*women have agency, and need it as women*' (Eduards, 1994, p. 182, her emphasis). She contends that this form of collective action, by women and for women, has been restricted by the rules of patriarchy that have served to exclude women.

A theory of feminist citizenship, according to Lister (1997a), allows for a rightful recognition of women's agency. Her theorisation involves the interplay of women's agency and the structural barriers to be confronted. Her synthesis of the civic republican and the liberal-rights traditions of citizenship involves a dynamic relationship between rights and political participation 'fired by the notion of human agency' (Lister, 1997a, p. 196). Her description of citizenship agency is enlightening:

To act as a citizen requires first a sense of agency, the belief that one *can* act; acting as a citizen, especially collectively, in turn fosters that sense of agency. Thus, agency is not simply about the capacity to choose and act but it is also about a *conscious* capacity which is important to the individual's self-identity. The development of a conscious sense of agency, at both the personal and

political level, is crucial to women's breaking of the chains of victimhood and their emergence as full and active citizens.

(Lister, 1997a, p. 38, her emphasis)

In this description Lister summarises the journey undertaken by many women who have made the personal the political. Lister acknowledges that assertive action as a citizen requires a strong sense of identity and self-confidence. She suggests that women's activities in the informal sphere, in the neighbourhood and the community can foster these attributes.

Developing a view of citizenship more broadly, Birte Siim (2000) includes various arenas of women's activity when she explores agency in the context of an enabling form of power. She sees agency as the key to citizenship in the way it links state, market and civil society and the many ways women can participate. In her framework, there are two elements to be understood in a study of social and political citizenship. These are, first, the notion of active citizenship across different political arenas, including the neighbourhood, the workplace, social movements and the welfare state; and second, the public-private divide and its accompanying beliefs about gender and the family. Siim argues that these two dimensions of citizenship 'express who the agents are, the kind of politics and where the politics takes place, that is, the interaction of institutions, culture, discourses, policies and human agency' (Siim, 2000, p. 8). Her broad view of citizenship arenas means that women's agency is just as legitimate and empowering for women when it is used at the neighbourhood level, as it is when it is used in parliament. Women's collective agency, Edwards (1994) contends, turns women into political actors, resulting in real political gains, individual and group empowerment and exposure of gendered social relations. Lister (1997a) refers to the way women's rights were linked to the struggle for international human rights in the 1993 Vienna Declaration and the 1995 Beijing Declaration, for example. Women's agency, on a national scale, has resulted in gains for women including a commitment to equal rights in South Africa, and community movements in Northern Ireland. Other documented examples of women's agency include studies of women in Sweden (Hobson, 1999), research on women's services and women's

advocacy in Australia (Weeks, 1994; 1996); work on rural women's networks in Australia, New Zealand and Canada (Teather, 1992a; 1992b; 1998) and histories of women's activism such as Isabel McCorkingdale's (1948) history of the Women's Christian Temperance Union (WCTU) in Victoria, Australia - an organisation that fought for women's suffrage in the nineteenth century - and Marian Sawer's (2003) essays on women and social liberalism in Australia. These are examples of transformative agency (Abrams, 1999) where women work collectively to redress oppression.

A Summary

An integrated theory of feminist social citizenship needs to include several key components. The arguments of feminist citizenship theorists suggest that the alleged universalism of citizenship is predicated on a falsehood, and that women have been deliberately excluded. The public-private divide constrains and restricts women to a private realm where caring is the primary role, and as long as this role is undervalued, women will need to become like men to enjoy the benefits of full participation in the community. In the view of Rian Voet (1998), an ideal of active and sex-equal citizenship incorporates an equal division of labour between women and men, equal decision-making and women-friendly arrangements so that women have the capacity to participate on an equal footing with men. Ruth Lister (1997a) emphasises the need to expose women's exclusion from citizenship, engage in a gender analysis of difference and tackle the dualism of difference and universalism. Lister's principle of differentiated universalism disrupts the public-private dichotomy, and positions difference as a resource, rather than a problem.

An understanding of the barriers to women's participation as social citizens is necessary in order to build social citizenship. Iris Young's (1990) analysis of oppression offers an illuminating explanation. She suggests that oppression is likely to be found in 'the everyday practices of a well-intentioned liberal society' (Young, 1990, p. 41). She describes five types of oppression – exploitation, marginalisation, powerlessness, cultural imperialism and violence. The final component of a feminist approach to citizenship is agency. Despite women's exclusion, marginalisation and

powerlessness, they are not passive victims. Women's agency explains, for example, the establishment of women-specific services and the progress of the women in agriculture movement in Australia. A theory of agency recognises women as actors taking control of their lives, to the extent that this is possible due to factors such as their class, race and location, and takes account of women's diversity, including their rural location. It also makes possible the feminist connection between the personal and the political.

A Framework for Assessing Feminist Citizenship

Following this critical review and analysis of the contribution of key feminist theorists, I suggest that there are five major requirements in a feminist framework for building women's social citizenship in rural women-specific services. They are: the recognition of women's diversity; bridging the public-private divide; addressing women's oppression; acknowledging women's agency; and facilitating women's active participation in social, political and community life. I now briefly discuss each of these components in the context of my research on women-specific services in rural Australia to demonstrate how such a framework can be applied. Findings from the study are reported here in general terms to provide an overall view.

Recognising women's diversity

The first component of a feminist social citizenship framework, I suggest, is the recognition of women's diversity, including location. A conceptualization of women's social citizenship needs to include a consideration of a woman's rural or urban location as a factor affecting her access to citizenship. This requires a shift in thinking, similar to the post-structural shift acknowledging the impact of race, class, ability, ethnicity and sexual preference on women's access to rights and resources. Such a recognition means that geography and distance become factors to consider when exploring the impact of social policy, or when planning services or allocating funding for programs in rural areas. In a challenge to the city-centric nature of service provision, where planning for services is done in the cities and transplanted to a rural location, rural women-specific services recognize women's diversity when they tailor programs specifically to meet rural women's needs

In an example of how service providers demonstrate their understanding of their local context, when asked about their concern for particular groups of women, rural services placed an emphasis on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women, rural women and older women, reflecting the likely location of these groups of women in rural Australia. This was different from the response of metropolitan services, who saw women from non-English speaking countries as their priority group. In a further demonstration of their recognition of rural women's particular needs, the rural services, in response to a question about future issues likely to face women's services, listed transport, access to female doctors and access to birthing choices as the most significant challenges. These are among the problems that have been raised by rural women over many years, and that will be exacerbated in a climate of continuing service withdrawal.

Similarly, services showed that they appreciated the effects of rurality on women's lives and on access to services, when they were asked to list the particular issues they faced as service providers. More than 80% of the rural services listed access as the most pressing issue. This included the loss or lack of services and the lack of choice of services. Service providers reported difficulties for women accessing services in general, and were especially concerned about access to information for women in their regions. Services reported that there were few specialist services, few female clinicians and a dearth of counselling services. There was little choice available for women seeking services, and few services where referrals could be made. Across the country, providers reported inadequate local services, decreasing resources and a loss of services.

More than half the rural services named distance and isolation as the next most significant issue they faced. Here they included notions of remoteness and vastness, as well as social isolation for women living in these areas. Distance prevented women from attending services and restricted workers' capacity to visit outlying areas. It also added to a sense of professional isolation for providers. Almost 40% of rural providers listed the acknowledgement of rural factors in funding and service delivery,

including the urbo-centric nature of service planning and funding, as the next most pressing issue. Their concerns included the extra costs of running a rural service and recognition of rural factors in the service models funded.

These findings about rural service provision are important, not only because the work of these services has not been documented previously, but also because they demonstrate that rural services for women are not simply replicas of urban services in a different location, but are tailored to meet their rural context. In this way, rural women-specific services demonstrate their commitment to recognition of rural women's diversity.

Bridging the public-private divide

The second component of a feminist framework for social citizenship concerns the bridging of the public-private divide. I suggest that this bridging is necessary if we are to move towards Lister's (1997a) 'differentiated universalism' or Voet's (1998) sex-equal citizenship. In recognition of the importance of these processes, one of the major goals of the women's movement is to make visible the hitherto invisible nature of women's lives, by naming and making public the otherwise private experiences of women in families, as mothers, wives and partners, daughters-in-law and unpaid carers. Women-specific services were established to offer women more relevant and responsive services than gender-neutral organizations provided. The service response included acceptance, documentation and recognition of women's lived experiences in the family, the community, the workplace, the hospital, the courtroom and other social institutions. Those services, first established in Australia in the 1970s, have contributed to exposing the neglect and abuse of women by the health and justice systems, the intimate crimes of violence against women, the denial of women's right to information, and the discrimination suffered by women across society.

Rural women-specific services are active participants in the continuing struggle to redress these injustices. In so doing, they attempt to bridge the public-private divide by tackling sensitive and controversial matters such as violence against women in rural communities, rape and sexual assault, divorce, women's sexuality, the gendered

nature of farm inheritance, women's lack of power in families and rural communities, the medicalisation of childbirth and women's rights to legal assistance. These issues are confronting in any location, but are particularly challenging in the rural milieu, where, as previously noted, research has reported that traditional views of women and the family still prevail.

Rural service providers participating in the study reported many ways in which they bridge the public-private divide. Their very existence is a political statement in itself, in that they announce their partisan and women-centred philosophy simply by opening their doors. When they listed the strategies used to ensure that women had access to services, providers included publicity and promotion of the service, outreach and mobile services, and networking and collaboration with other services. These strategies serve to place women's issues, formerly private and hidden, on the public agenda in rural communities. Services reported using newsletters, websites and advertising to promote their work; some ran public meetings and forums to raise issues of importance; free telephone numbers were offered by others to improve access. Some services operate lending libraries and mail books and resources to women in distant areas. Outreach services, offered away from the central base in outlying areas of the service catchment, are another means by which rural services heighten awareness of issues pertinent to women's lives. Services also engaged in networking and collaboration with other services, in order to have a greater impact in communities. Activities in this vein included setting up a network of service providers to work towards better service responses for women; developing partnerships with other specialist women's services or with mainstream organisations; working with community leaders to raise awareness of violence against women; collaborating to run workshops, conferences and joint projects. In these ways, rural women's services are making political statements in rural communities, asserting that issues relevant to women that were previously hidden are legitimate areas for work and struggle.

Making the private public carries risks for women who use services and women who operate them. Work of this nature affects the safety and privacy of service users and staff. There are difficulties associated with confidentiality and privacy in small towns

and this may have an impact on service operation. Services reported that the location of the service, for example, needs to be carefully considered. Women using the service need to feel confident that their privacy will be protected, when entering, attending and leaving the service. A related issue, reported by a small number of services, concerns worker exposure. The manager of the local sexual assault support service, for example, may be known or recognised by many people in the town. This may mean that she struggles to maintain her privacy and safety and that of her family. For women escaping violence, issues of privacy and safety are paramount.

Addressing women's oppression

Addressing women's oppression is the third component in a framework of feminist social citizenship. In Young's (1990) conceptualisation, a commitment to addressing rural women's oppression would need to focus on the ways in which they experience exploitation, marginalisation, powerlessness, cultural imperialism and violence. Services participating in the study addressed these problems in various ways and in varying degrees, depending on their purpose. One could argue that the continued funding of these services, in itself, addresses aspects of rural women's oppression. Services are staffed by professional and semi-professional women, in communities where, often, women are in low-paid and powerless positions (Dempsey, 1992). When asked to respond to a question about their service philosophy, the percentage of support from the rural services was higher than for the metropolitan services for every element of women-centred service philosophy. The rural services had significantly higher responses for offering an empowering approach to practice, ensuring a respectful response to all women, accessibility, and a women-centred analysis of issues. It is obvious that a commitment to redressing the oppression of rural women needs to be accompanied by a commitment to a women-centred service approach. In rural areas, this may be more challenging because of community attitudes. Some services commented on this, saying that police, other services and some community members were unhelpful. In some cases, women's services were perceived to be a community threat, and suffered stigma because of their role. Women running services believed that the very existence of women's services challenged the non-acceptance

by some people of violence against women or the need for equitable resources for women.

The rural services in this study confront women's oppression by standing up for a women-centred approach to practice. In a rural area, philosophical differences between women's services and the mainstream are starkly apparent and are played out in the council chamber, the courtroom, the police station, the hospital and the conference room. In a small community, a women-specific service needs the ideological strength that comes from a shared philosophy, to continue to tackle women's oppression on many fronts. Such a philosophy affords service providers a strong foundation for women-centred advocacy in rural communities. In suggesting changes to improve rural services, providers sought a commitment to a central place for women's services and feminist practice in the rural environment. They wanted to see new resources for women, including multi-purpose women's centres, more women-friendly service arrangements and financial support for rural women to travel to specialist services in the city.

Acknowledging women's agency

The acknowledgement of women's agency is the fourth component in a feminist framework for social citizenship. This recognition is necessary to explain the work that women's services do to meet the needs of their constituency, often above and beyond their stated role or funding allocation. Women who work in feminist services, by definition, recognize women's personal and collective agency, both in their individual practice with women and in the public and community stance they take, with their service users, on matters affecting women's lives. The study did not include interviews with service users, but service providers report examples where women's use of a service can be a first step in regaining control over her life, as she calls on her personal agency and draws strength from the collective agency of the women's service. Personal development of this nature can stem from increased access to information, counselling, joining support groups or working on political campaigns.

The clearest examples of women's collective agency from the study are the networking and collaboration that services are engaged in, as previously noted, and the many achievements reported by participants. The plethora of activity undertaken by this group of small services is impressive, especially in the period under study when services were facing threats to their survival from changes in government policy and cuts to rural service provision. Examples of what services were able to achieve include: restructuring organisations to be more responsive to women; increasing visibility by running education programs in schools, using the media or holding street marches and displays; developing innovations such as setting up a shopfront service or projects for older women, Aboriginal women and immigrant women; running campaigns for law reform, consumer affairs and health on local, state and national levels. These achievements illustrate the power of women's collective agency in advancing the social citizenship of women in rural Australia.

Facilitating women's active participation in social, political and community life

The final component in a feminist social citizenship framework, I suggest, is the facilitation of women's active participation in social, political and community life. Public participation of this nature by women is essential if we are to progress towards the active and sex-equal citizenship advocated by Voet (1998). In rural communities, women's contribution, both paid and unpaid, is often invisible and devalued. The work of women's services may be denigrated and practitioners criticised for confronting difficult issues. The safety and privacy of women who access and provide rural services, as noted above, may be at risk. This creates barriers for women who want to make a public contribution.

The rural services participating in the study seemed undeterred by these factors, in that they took an overtly feminist stance in their communities. As noted earlier, their service philosophy is staunchly women-centred; they want their feminist practice and service models acknowledged and supported; they battle sexist and conservative attitudes in their communities. Although the study did not pursue specific questions of women's public participation, service providers referred to membership of local, regional and statewide networks, lobbying politicians and funding bodies, advocating

to decision makers on behalf of women service users. Some services had management or advisory committees, providing opportunities for women to participate in decision-making about the service. Workers represented women's services on peak bodies or government bodies; they wrote submissions to government inquiries and policy reviews; they hosted public forums and conferences where women played major roles; they engaged in research activity to enhance understanding of issues important to women. In these ways, rural women-specific services asserted their public role as legitimate players in the social and political life of their communities. Women working in rural women-specific services are actively involved in their communities, pursuing a political agenda that will benefit all women.

How useful is the framework?

From this analysis, I conclude that the use of a framework for feminist social citizenship is a new and useful way to conceptualise the study of women-specific services in rural Australia. I cannot conclude that social citizenship has now been achieved for women in rural Australia, nor can I assume that to be a realistic goal. However, I suggest that the framework can serve to reframe our thinking about service provision, moving away from the somewhat meaningless measures of service user throughput required by funding bodies, to thinking about broader service goals in areas where women in rural areas must make an impact if women's equality is to be achieved. In a conceptualisation based on a feminist social citizenship framework, rural women are acknowledged as active agents addressing the issues affecting their lives, and rural women-specific service providers are seen to be active advocates for women in their communities and regions. This conceptualization challenges the research paradigm that has been dominant in the study of rural women and communities in Australia (for example,; Poiner, 1990; Dempsey, 1992), and rural service provision (for example, Macklin, 1995; Crago, Sturmey and Monson, 1996) where the emphasis has been on challenges and difficulties, rather than on the resilience, creativity and energy of rural service users and service providers. Although this is beginning to change, with an increase in social research being undertaken in rural Australia, more work by rural women scholars is necessary to increase our limited understanding of the nature of feminist work outside Australia's capital cities.

Citizenship has lost some of its appeal as a theoretical approach for feminists, so it is my hope that this paper may help to revive interest in its value for conceptualising the feminist project in other areas, such as violence against women, migration issues, women and work, and women's political and social activism on many fronts. As Anthias (2002, p. 275) argues: 'Longings for justice, for equality, for recognition are part of the feminist project'. The framework is presented here to stimulate further interest and debate about how this conceptualisation of feminist social citizenship might make a useful contribution to that project. The framework may well have a more practical application, for example, as a beginning list of standards for a women's service, a way for service users to evaluate their service experience or for practitioners to use as a yardstick for assessing the extent to which their practice contributes to the broader goals of enhancing women's social citizenship. .

Conclusion

This paper has presented a review and analysis of the major theoretical debates in a feminist approach to social citizenship. From this review, a framework for feminist citizenship was presented, comprising five components. These are: the recognition of women's diversity; bridging the public-private divide; addressing women's oppression; acknowledging women's agency; and facilitating women's active participation in social, political and community life. I used the example of rural women-specific services in Australia to demonstrate the application of the framework to a particular field. The framework is presented as a new way of conceptualising rural women and the support services offered to them in rural Australia, and as a potential tool for feminist researchers and practitioners in other fields.

Acknowledgement

The research reported here was co-ordinated and supervised by Associate Professor Wendy Weeks (1943-2004) – feminist, mentor, teacher, scholar and activist. This paper is dedicated to her memory, and to all the women across Australia who participated in and supported the study.

References

Abrams, Kathryn (1999). "From autonomy to agency: feminist perspectives on self-direction." William and Mary Law Review **40**(3): 805-829.

Alston, Margaret (1995). Women on the Land: The Hidden Heart of Rural Australia. Sydney, UNSW Press.

Alston, Margaret (1997). "Violence Against Women in a rural context." Australian Social Work **50**(1): 5-22.

Alston, Margaret (2000). Breaking Through the Grass Ceiling: Women, Power and Leadership in Agricultural Organisations. Amsterdam, Harwood academic publishers.

Anthias, Floya (2002) "Beyond Feminism and Multiculturalism: Locating Difference and the Politics of Location", Women's Studies International Forum, Vol. 25, No. 3, 275-286

Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (1998). Health in rural and remote Australia. Canberra, Australian Institute of Health and Welfare.

Bourke, Lisa (2001). Rural communities. Rurality Bites: The Social and Environmental Transformation of Rural Australia. Stewart Lockie and Lisa Bourke. Sydney, Pluto Press: 118-128.

Cameron-Jackson, Frances B. (1995). "Semantic Complexities in Defining Rurality: Towards a Definition Based on Human Considerations." Education in Rural Australia **5**(1): 1-7.

Cass, Bettina (1994). "Citizenship, Work and Welfare: The Dilemma for Australian Women." Social Politics **1**(1): 106-124.

Cloke, Paul and Jo Little, Eds. (1997). Contested Countryside Cultures: Otherness, marginalisation and rurality. London, Routledge.

Commonwealth Department of Health and Aged Care (1999). Measuring Remoteness: Accessibility/Remoteness Index of Australia (ARIA), Occasional Papers: New Series No 6. Canberra, Commonwealth of Australia.

Coorey, Lyla (1989). Domestic Violence in Rural Areas. 'Crisis in Rural Health and Welfare: Myth or Reality?' 10th National Student Initiatives in Community Health Conference, Wagga Wagga, Charles Sturt University Centre for Rural Social Research, 80-101.

Crago, Hugh, Ruth Sturmey and Jenny Monson (1996). "Myth and Reality in Rural Counselling: Towards a new model for training rural/remote area helping professionals." Australia & New Zealand Journal of Family Therapy **17**(2): 61-74.

Dempsey, Ken (1992). A Man's Town: Inequality between Women and Men in Rural Australia. Melbourne, Oxford University Press.

Dixon, Jane and Nicky Welch (2000). "Researching the Rural-Metropolitan Health Differential using the 'Social Determinants of Health'." Australian Journal of Rural Health **8**(5): 254-260.

Dunn, Peter (1989). "Rural Australia: Are you Standing in it? Putting some definition into 'Rural'." Rural Welfare Research Bulletin(2): 12-13.

Eduards, Maud (1994). "Women's Agency and Collective Action." Women's Studies International Forum **17**(2/3): 181-186.

Fraser, Nancy and Linda Gordon (1992). "Contract Versus Charity: Why is there no social citizenship in the United States?" Socialist Review **22**(3): 45-68.

CSU Research Output

32

<http://researchoutput.csu.edu.au>

Gatens, Moira (1991) Feminism and Philosophy: Perspectives on Difference and Equality, Bloomington & Indianapolis, Indiana University Press

Gray, Ian and Geoffrey Lawrence (2001). A Future for Regional Australia: Escaping Global Misfortune. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Haberkorn, Gerald, Graeme Hugo, Melanie Fisher and Rachel Aylward (1999). Country Matters: Social atlas of rural and regional Australia. Canberra, Bureau of Rural Sciences, Agriculture Fisheries & Forestry.

Hobson, Barbara (1999). Women's Collective Agency, Power Resources, and the Framing of Citizenship Rights, in Extending Citizenship, Reconfiguring States. Michael Hanagan and Charles Tilly. Lanham, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers Inc: 149-178.

James, Kerry, Ed. (1989). Women in Rural Australia. Brisbane, University of Queensland Press.

Little, Jo (2002). Gender and Rural Geography: Identity, Sexuality and Power in the Countryside. Harlow, Pearson Education.

Lister, Ruth (1995). "Dilemmas in engendering citizenship." Economy and Society **24**(1): 1-40.

Lister, Ruth (1997a). Citizenship: Feminist Perspectives. Basingstoke, Macmillan.

Lister, Ruth (1997b). "Citizenship: Towards a feminist synthesis." Feminist Review(57): 28-48.

Macklin, Marie (1995). Breaching the idyll: ideology, intimacy and social service provision in a rural community. Communication and Culture in Rural Areas. P. Share. Wagga Wagga, Charles Sturt University, Centre for Rural Social Research: 71-86.

CSU Research Output

33

<http://researchoutput.csu.edu.au>

Marshall, Thomas H. (1950/1963). Citizenship and Social Class. Sociology at the Crossroads and other essays. London, Heinemann: 67-127.

Mason, Robyn (2004) Australian Rural Women-specific Services: Engendering social citizenship. Unpublished doctoral thesis, Melbourne, University of Melbourne School of Social Work

McCorkingdale, Isobel, Ed. (1948). Pioneer Pathways: Sixty Years of Citizenship 1887-1947. Melbourne, WCTU.

Munn, Peter (1999). Co-ordinating services in a forgotten mining town. Challenging Rural Practice: Human Services in Australia. Linda Briskman and Margaret Lynn with Helen La Nauze. Geelong, Deakin University Press: 141-150.

Nichol, Bill (1990). "What is Rural? The Debate Continues: 'Rural' and 'Remote' and the Question of Definition." Rural Welfare Research Bulletin(4): 4-5.

Office of the Status of Women (2002). Women in Australia 2001. Canberra, Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet.

O'Toole, Kevin, Pat Nesbitt and Anna Macgarvey (2002). "Amalgamation of Health Services in South-West Victoria: Reinvention or Survival?" Australian Journal of Rural Health **10**(1): 51-56.

Poiner, Gretchen (1990). The Good Old Rule: Gender and Other Relationships in a Rural Community. Melbourne, Sydney University Press.

Regional Women's Advisory Council (2001). The Success Factors - managing change in regional and rural Australia. Canberra, Department of Transport and Regional Services.

Sawer, Marian (2003). The Ethical State? Social Liberalism in Australia. Melbourne, Melbourne University Press.

Siim, Birte (2000). Gender and Citizenship: Politics and Agency in France, Britain and Denmark. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Teather, Elizabeth (1992a). "The First Rural Women's Network in New South Wales: Seventy Years of the Country Women's Association." Australian Geographer **23**(2): 164-176.

Teather, Elizabeth (1992b). "Remote Rural Women's Ideologies, Spaces and Networks: Country Women's Association of New South Wales, 1922-1992." Australia & New Zealand Journal of Sociology **28**(3): 369-390.

Teather, Elizabeth (1994). Contesting Rurality: Country Women's Social and Political Networks. Sarah Whatmore, Terry Marsden and Philip Lowe. London, David Fulton Publishers: 31-49.

Teather, Elizabeth (1998). "The Double Bind: Being female and rural: A comparative study of Australia, New Zealand and Canada." Rural Society **8**(3): 209-221.

Voet, Rian (1998). Feminism and Citizenship. London, Sage.

Weeks, Wendy (1994). Women Working Together: Lessons from Feminist Women's Services. Melbourne, Longman Cheshire.

Weeks, Wendy (1996). "Feminist Women's Services within the Non-profit Sector: Some Australian Experience." Third Sector Review **2**: 57-73.

Wendt, Sarah and Brian Cheers (2002). "Impacts of Rural Culture on Domestic Violence." Rural Social Work **7**(1): 22-32.

Wendt, Sarah, Judy Taylor & Marie Kennedy (2002). "Rural Domestic Violence: Moving Towards Feminist Poststructural Understandings." Rural Social Work 7(2): 26-35.

Werbner, Pnina & Nira Yuval-Davis (1999). Chapter 1: Introduction - Women and the New Discourse of Citizenship. Women, Citizenship and Difference. Nira Yuval-Davis and Pnina Werbner. London, Zed Books: 1-38.

Whatmore, Sarah, Terry Marsden & Philip Lowe Eds. (1994). Gender and Rurality. London, David Fulton Publishers.

Young, Iris M. (1990). Justice and the Politics of Difference. Princeton, Princeton University Press.

Young, Iris M. (1996). Communication and the Other: Beyond Deliberative Democracy. Democracy and Difference: Contesting the Boundaries of the Political, Seyla Benhabib. Princeton, Princeton University Press: 120-135.

Yuval-Davis, Nira (1997). Gender and Nation. London, Sage.

Vitae

Robyn Mason (PhD) is a Lecturer in Social Work at the School of Humanities and Social Sciences, Charles Sturt University, Australia. She has practised widely in rural areas and in fields including mental health, sexual assault, aged care, Aboriginal health and community development.