

Heike Kahlert*

THE SIMULTANEITY OF STABILITY AND CHANGE IN GENDER RELATIONS – CONTRIBUTIONS FROM GIDDENS' STRUCTURATION THEORY

The paper aims, first, to outline a theoretical frame that can be used to explain the simultaneity of stability and change in gender relations and, second, to open a discussion on the theoretical and methodological potential of Anthony Giddens' social theory of structuration for women's and gender studies. After a reflection of Giddens' remarks on the status of gender in sociological theorising and on the reception of his social theory in women's and gender studies, the author gives a short outline of his theoretical core concept of the 'duality of structure'. Then she rethinks this concept from a gender perspective and develops the concept of the 'duality of gender'. Finally the author discusses how the concept of the duality of gender can be used for social analysis.

Keywords: Anthony Giddens, structuration theory, gender, duality of gender, social change

1. INTRODUCTION

One of the main topics in the field of sociological women's and gender studies is the analysis of stability and change in gender relations. Current studies show on the one hand, e.g., that the number of well-educated girls is growing and some more women participate in top positions in the politics, economics and science. These studies highlight change in gender relations. On the other hand, studies focusing on private gender relations and housework show that there seems to be no change in gender relations. They highlight stability in gender relations. At first sight these results draw a paradoxical picture of the state of gender relations in contemporary welfare societies: change or stability. But social practice is much more complex. Therefore it has to be examined simultaneously from different perspectives. The simultaneity of stability and change, as in the case of current gender relations, poses a challenge to theoretical perspectives and analytical tools for social research.

Theoretical and empirical studies from the field of women's and gender studies describe stability and change in gender relations in very different forms and in different methodological frameworks. Nevertheless, mostly they relate to action theories or to structure theories and use an understanding of gender as a structural category or a process-related category. By doing so, they are not able to analyse the simultaneity of stability and change in social practices

* Ludwig-Maximilians-University Munich, Department of Sociology; heike.kahlert@soziologie.uni-muenchen.de

and to pay attention to the different social levels (micro, meso and macro) and their mutual relations and complexities. Consequently, explanations of social stability and social change are investigated with regard to the 'subjective' aspects or to the 'objective' conditions. However, both theoretical approaches are unsatisfactory because of their one-sidedness. Nevertheless, attempts to explain the simultaneity of stability and change in gender relations by analysing complex relations of the two 'sides' and to connect the different levels occur very seldom. They lack a social theory that makes this challenging project possible.

In the paper I argue that Anthony Giddens' structuration theory is quite useful for the project combining those two perspectives and discuss its potentials to analyse the simultaneity of stability and change in gender relations with a multi-level approach. Giddens developed the theory of structuration in the 1970s and early 1980s (see Giddens 1976, 1979, 1984). Up to the early 1990s this theory was discussed very broadly in social theory, but amazingly it has not yet attracted very much attention in the field of women's and gender studies. Currently this theory does not yet seem to be in the centre of social theoretical discussions, neither in sociology as such, nor in women's and gender studies. Therefore the first step in my argumentation deals with the explanation why I suggest relating to structuration theory (2). In doing so, special attention will be given to Giddens' ideas on the importance of gender for sociological theorizing and to the few comments on structuration theory from gender perspectives. Then I will give a short outline of Giddens' concept of the 'duality of structure' that is in the centre of his social theory of structuration (3). Feminist critiques already have shown that this abstract concept is completely 'gender-free': It does not have any gender sensitivity, it does not even mention gender as a concept or category of sociological thinking. Nevertheless, in sociological discussions the concept of the duality of structure has been identified as adequate to bridge the traditional micro-macro-distance in an innovative manner. The next step of my argument consists in rethinking the concept from the gender perspective. Therefore I introduce the concept of the 'duality of gender' as an analytical tool to analyse the simultaneity of stability and change in gender relations and discuss it with respect to its usefulness for structuration theory and for gender theory (4). Finally I sketch how the concept of the duality of gender can be used for social analysis (5). So, the paper aims to outline a theoretical frame that can be used to explain the simultaneity of stability and change in gender relations and to open a discussion on the theoretical and methodological potentials of structuration theory in the field of women's and gender studies.

2. GENDER AS A GENERAL CATEGORY OR AS AN EMPIRICAL TOPIC OF SOCIAL ANALYSIS?

The question whether and where gender as an analytical category belongs to the heart of social theory has been discussed for a long time in the fields of women's and gender studies and of sociology. Neither feminist or gender-sensitive scholars nor more traditionally orientated sociologists have reached a consensus on this question. Some argue that gender has to be placed at the centre of social theory and thus has to gain an epistemological meaning. This position has led to an ongoing and very controversial discussion. Quite more consensual is

the position that gender is an important topic of social analysis and so has to be considered in social analysis and the different fields of academic specialisations.

Firstly in the 4th edition of his very successful introduction to “Sociology” which was published in 2001, Giddens picked up this discussion. In the closing chapter of the book titled “Theoretical Thinking in Sociology” he worked out four “theoretical dilemmas” in social theory, namely the issues of, first, human action and social structure, second, of consensus and conflict, third, the understanding of gender, and fourth, features of modern social development (see Giddens 2001: 666–667). Giddens’ discussion of all of these dilemmas is worth taking into account. With regard to the subject of this article I will concentrate on his ideas with reference to the understanding of gender in sociological theory.

Giddens’ agrees here with the feminist critique that all of the major figures in the past development of sociological theory were men who in their writings paid virtually no attention to the fact that human beings were gendered. He notices that in their works human individuals appear as if they were ‘neuter’ and abstract ‘actors’, rather than differentiated women and men. Also, he is aware of the feminist critique that ‘bringing the study of women into sociology’ is not in itself the same as dealing with problems of gender, “because gender concerns the relations between the identities and behaviour of women *and* men” (Giddens 2001: 672, author’s emphasis).

One of the main theoretical dilemmas with gender in his opinion is the following:

Shall we build ‘gender’ as a general category into our sociological thinking? Or, alternatively, do we need to analyse gender issues by breaking them down into more specific influences affecting the behaviour of women and men in different contexts? Put it another way: Are there characteristics that separate men and women, in terms of their identities and social behaviour, in all cultures? Or are gender differences always to be explained mainly in terms of other differences which divide societies (such as class divisions)? (Giddens 2001: 667).

Well-informed concerning important questions on the intersection of categories of difference and inequality, he leaves open whether gender differences can be illuminated by means of other social concepts, for example class, or whether, on the contrary, social divisions need to be explained in terms of gender. Giddens states:

Since we have very little to build on in relating issues of gender to the more established forms of theoretical thinking in sociology, this is perhaps at the current time the most acutely difficult problem of the four to grapple with (Giddens 2001: 667).

With this statement he makes it clear that sociology has to deal with this problem very seriously, but he leaves his own position in this question open.

To return to structuration theory, which was developed around twenty years earlier, the remarks from the introductory book show Giddens’ learning process with regard to gender. In the construction of structuration theory gender does not yet have a systematic place. Because of this Giddens has already been criticized by scholars from the field of women’s and gender studies since the 1980s. To name some aspects of these critiques: Linda Murgatroyd (1989: 147) accused him not only of virtually omitting half of society (and the relationship between that half and the other half) from his analysis but also, partly by association, half of the activities

carried on in that society. Similarly, Kathy Davis (1991: 82) complained that Giddens does not address the subject of gender, gender relations or power relations between the sexes.

Concerning these critiques Giddens' reactions can be considered as 'friendly openness'. In his reply to his critics Giddens (1989: 282) also replies to Murgatroyd and accepts the force of her observation that he, like many others working in social theory, had simply not accorded questions of gender attention they undeniably deserve. He appreciates that she made some interesting and important points, confesses also that he is not sure how far he would follow her particular approaches and makes some informed remarks on gender and gender identity with regard to psychoanalysis, ethnomethodology and feminist approaches. Since then, for example in interviews or the introduction mentioned above, he very often emphasized the importance of gender for the development of sociology or the social sciences. In his studies on the diagnosis of time, for example in his books on *Modernity and Self-Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age* (1991), *The Transformation of Intimacy: Sexuality, Love and Eroticism in Modern Societies* (1992) and *Beyond Left and Right: the Future of Radical Politics* (1994), he pays some empirical attention to gender relations. But thereupon he did not modify or revise his theory of structuration and/or his methodology. This may be caused in the fact that his social theory was developed before he started his more empirically orientated studies on late modern societies and that he did not go back to this social theoretical works as in his earlier books on structuration theory such as *The Constitution of Society* (1984). However, it could also be a hint that Giddens hesitates or refuses to consider gender a general category in sociological theory.

3. THE DUALITY OF STRUCTURE – AND GENDER?

Deeply influenced by Jacques Derrida's concept of deconstruction, structuration theory aims at conceptualizing the relationship between structure and action as mutually interwoven in social interactions without giving priority to structure or action in an asymmetrical manner. Giddens calls his main idea of the mutually interwoven relationship between structure and action "the duality of structure" (Giddens 1984: 25). The term duality does not mean a dualism. Rather it indicates that macro and micro are two sides of social practice. The concept of the duality of structure enables us to understand structure as produced and reproduced by action. This duality is neither founded in the social object (that means society with its supra-individual structures and institutions) nor in the intentional, conscious subject of reflexive control. Neither of these has priority but both are constituted in recursive practices and therefore, according to Giddens, produced and reproduced. In the structuration theory structure and action cannot exist without each other. The simultaneity of stability and change is part of this duality.

In Giddens' view society consists of structures of relations. These structures are produced and reproduced by individuals in social practices. Giddens starts his theoretical project from social practice, which he understands as a sequence of events and always embedded in a dimension of time and of space: Time is in his view bound to human action, as is space, since human agents have bodies, that take space, orientate themselves in a physical context and

that appear in time for example through physical movements, communication or historical developments. The British sociologist calls the social practices that have the largest expansion in time and space and that assure their continuing existence across time and space ranges 'institutions'. Institutions are a supra-individual and ongoing product of action beyond actions by concrete agents but they are produced and reproduced by social reproduction. They 'survive', are changed and 'die' by social reproduction. Thus structuration is an active historical process that spreads out in time and space. Change and stability both are practices of social reproduction, namely on the action level of reflexive control as intended but also as unintended consequences of social reproduction. Giddens makes clear that each analysis of social stability and social change has to take the dimensions of time and space into account. Change, he writes, is often equalized with time, but stability is not timeless, as he shows us. In turn, time is bound to space.

Starting from social practice, structure appears simultaneously as a precondition of action and naturally included in it as a product of action and as such emerging from it. Structure becomes manifest in social practice through rules and resources. Therefore structure does not exist as an autonomous spatial and temporal phenomenon but always only as structures in human actions or practices, through consciousness or the perception of acting subjects. Structures govern action in space and time. They consist of rules and resources. Rules and resources can be changed in and through social practice first of all by reflexive control of human agents but also by actions experienced in daily life.

Action is orientated to cognitive moments of reflexivity and to the practical ability of individuals in order to provoke changes in the objective world and to actively produced objectivity. Thus acting people are not only able to act in an experienced manner and to use their knowledgeability, but they also are able to use their capability to act in another manner and break with routines. Both by experienced action and by reflexive action change can happen in social practice because we cannot always control how our actions impact on social practice. Accordingly, each action contains the possibility of change. Therefore each action is connected with a certain amount of power. Power in this sense means a transformative capability and thus is an important element of the structuration theory.

Of course structuration theory has been intensely and internationally discussed in sociology (see, e.g., Held, Thompson 1989; Parker 2000), and with regard to such an approach it is no wonder that the discussion was and is controversial, starting from excited reactions and ending with hostile critiques. The critiques cover a broad range. They are aimed at the methodology as such, at the core concepts (see e.g., Archer 1982 on the concept of structuration and King 2010 on connections between Archer and Giddens) as well as at the use of structuration theory in social analysis. Some also criticize Giddens' terms that are open to misunderstanding. That is because he uses terms from different theoretical frameworks and rephrases them in his context, and because the ideas developed in his works on structuration theory seem to be too abstract. Also there have been some attempts to revise structuration theory that expand, develop and refine the core concepts (see Stones 2005). In my view, structuration theory offers a broad potential for social analysis not only of gender related questions but it also is an unfinished project with regard to some central concepts, for example time and space or questions of social differences and inequalities in their meaning

for social theorizing. I also argue that Giddens' writings on (late) modernity can be read as a kind of empirical example for his idea of structuration. Though it seems as if they shape a new phase of his writings they are clearly based on core concepts from structuration theory and give 'life' to them.

In the field of women's and gender studies up to now there have been only few attempts to use ideas from structuration theory to work theoretically on questions of gender or gender relations. Perhaps the most prominent enterprise in this field is R.W. Connell's reception of structuration theory. In the early book *Gender and Power: Society, the Person and Sexual Politics* (1987) Connell was in search of a theory of gender. This theory, Connell (1987: 91) argues, requires a theory of social structure and also needs a concept of structure that can recognize complexities and that grasps the historical dynamic of gender. In this context Connell appreciated Giddens' balanced concept of the duality of structure as "the closest to the requirements of a theory of gender" (Connell 1987: 94). Connell (1987: 94) and also Zarina Maharaj (1994: 43) argue that structuration theory lacks the possibility to analyse social change because of its notion of structure coming from structuralism. Thus, in their views, structuration theory needs to be opened towards history. However, they both overlook Giddens' idea of the structuration of structures in time and space that allows us to consider empirical questions of history. Giddens differentiates between structure and structures. He says explicitly that structure only exists as structures in time and space.

Coming from another theoretical perspective and being more interested in conceptualizing change Rita Felski praises Giddens' structuration theory because of its useful conceptual tools to analyse social change released by the politics of feminism. In this context she also points to the concept of the duality of structure. She reads it as a convincing concept to grasp the relationship between structure and action "as dynamic, not static" and highlights Giddens' idea that:

Structures are thus not only constraining but *enabling*, not simply a barrier to action but a precondition for the possibility of meaningful choices, which are necessarily implicated in even the most radical process of change (Felski 1989: 224, emphasize by the author).

With regard to Giddens' ideas on power that are inherent to structuration theory Kathy Davis (1991) estimates his concept of power as "dynamic, processual and, at the same time, highly complex" (Davis 1991: 71). She also notes that structuration theory is "urgently in need of both empirical and theoretical grounding" (Davis 1991: 83) which for example means to refer to questions of gender, gender relations and power relations between the sexes as mentioned before. After criticizing Giddens' attempts to deal with gender Barbara L. Marshall concludes:

What emerges as most useful for feminists out of Giddens' work is the vocabulary of structuration, which allows for a dynamic theorization of the relationship between structure and agency (Marshall 1994: 19).

Therewith she names a working programme for women's and gender studies, namely the application of Giddens' concepts to gender theory.

4. THE DUALITY OF GENDER

Also influenced by feminist critiques, and in the hope of a lively discussion on gender as general category of sociological thinking, my intention to deal with structuration theory is more ambitious even though still work in progress. My idea is to use structuration theory as a social theory that can and will be informed by gender and because of this has to be revised. It means that I intend to rethink structuration theory from the gender perspective and to inscribe gender as a general category into the structuration theory. For this theoretical enterprise I wish to follow the main idea of structuration theory, namely to connect structure and action and to relate this idea to gender as a category of action and as a category of structure. By leaning on Giddens' concept of the duality of structure I name this concept the *duality of gender*. This concept consists of an integration of several elements from structuration theory and from gender studies that will be explained step by step, starting from Giddens' concept of action with respect to the concept of 'doing gender'.

The concept of doing gender has been developed in ethnomethodological approaches to gender. These approaches try to understand social processes through which gender as social differentiation is produced and reproduced. Thus, gender and gender identity can be considered as ongoing processes of social construction that are inherent to all human activities. In this perspective gender is a social construction that consists of the production and reproduction of ascriptions e.g. what it means to be or behave as male or as female without further reflections about the meaning giving to gender in the social process of production and reproduction. Social analyses that relate to this concept concentrate on the study of reconstructing processes how gender differences are constructed in daily practices. Their analytical perspective is built up of describing the process of constructing gender as a social routine in the production and reproduction of social practice. From this perspective change means change in the process of social construction of the meaning that is giving to gender and/or how gender is understood.

I argue that Giddens' three-dimensional notion of action adds to the action-orientated idea of doing gender in gender studies two more levels of action. According to Giddens who also read Garfinkel's study on the transsexual Agnes (Garfinkel 1984) where the idea of doing gender was worked out, gender is a subject of learning and continuing work. From this starting point the concept of doing gender can be developed further with regard to the three levels of action. Giddens agrees to the ethnomethodological approach to gender that doing gender consists of the production and reproduction of gender as a social routine. That means that people use practical knowledge of rules during the daily production and reproduction of gender in an experienced manner. In daily practices gender is not challenged and thus it is unquestioned reproduced. Experienced production and reproduction form a firm (gender) order. Giddens' notion of self-reflexive actions contains also the idea, that actors can make use of their knowledgeability. Therefore they can decide to act in another manner and break with routines. Thus actors can produce gender in a different way or maybe even withdraw themselves from the process of gender production or reproduction. So they could use the transformative power of action to change the social practices of doing gender. The third level of action, namely the unconscious motives of action, finally make clear that

and why changes in the social practice of doing gender are only possible if the unconscious motives connected to it became accessible to the discursive consciousness and therefore to the reflexive control.

This approach to gender only regards one side of the duality of structure. So it is also necessary to revisit the concept of gender as structure. In gender studies the concept of structure is very frequently perceived from a Marxist perspective. In this perspective gender is a category of stratification and inequality, and the powerful structures of capitalist society are thought as oppressing individuals. This power is mostly analysed as being shaped by men and thus supposed to have more negative impacts on women than on men. Giddens' notion of structure is also influenced by structuralism and he does not only see the oppressive side of structure but also its enabling side. Following this idea, Joan Wolffensperger (1991: 93) developed the concept of "engendered structure". According to her the gendered character of a social system or an institution therefore depends on engendered rules and resources. These can be regarded as media of a "twofold reproduction": if these rules and resources are used in social action, both gender relations and the social system or the institution are reproduced together because social differences between women and men are an integral element of social practices. Considered in this way engendered rules and resources should not only be analysed as media of reproducing the social system or the institution but also as media of reproducing gender relations, she argues. This means that, as gender relations and the social system or the institutions are mutually interwoven in structuration theory, they always are produced and reproduced together.

Even though Wolffensperger presents a valuable revision of Giddens' theory from the perspective of gender, regrettably she only refers to the oppressive side of his concept of structure. Therefore she also neglects the other side of structure, namely the enabling one. Exactly that is in my view one point that makes Giddens' theory very interesting for women's and gender studies and that enlarges its dominant notion of structure. According to Giddens, engendered rules or resources can also be understood as productive, i.e. they can be enabling or bring change forward. So I suggest that Giddens' concepts of *knowledgeability* and *capability* of actors have to be combined with the three-dimensional concept of doing gender developed above, and with Wolffensperger's concept of engendered structure and its twofold reproduction. In this revised understanding, structuration theory is useful for at least three aspects central to gender-informed social analysis. Firstly, it is compatible with historically specific analyses of the multiple and varied influences upon gendered subjectivity and the different levels of doing gender. Secondly, it provides a theory able to conceptualize the potential for critical activity for example on the part of female subjects, within given constraints, who are potentially capable of modifying aspects of existing structures in the process of reproducing them (Felski 1989: 227). Particularly in his later works Giddens (1990, 1991, 1992, 1994) explains how (female and male) individuals can become and behave as critical actors and he reflects broadly on the importance of women's movements to develop a more-or-less autonomous female subjectivity and to change social practices with respect to gender related questions. His ideas on these questions are not far from feminist theoretical reflections on individual and collective female freedom. Thirdly, structuration theory understands change

as mutually interwoven with stability and thus makes it possible to analyse the simultaneity of stability and change, for example in gender relations.

In the last part of the paper I will discuss how the concept of the duality of gender can be used for social analysis.

5. THE DUALITY OF GENDER IN SOCIAL ANALYSIS

The concept of the duality of gender combines basic ideas of women's and gender studies and structuration theory: women's and gender studies teach with their concept of gender as a processual category that gender and gender relations are constructed in daily social practices. They also teach with their concept of gender as a structural category that gender and gender relations historically are constituted and institutionalised as asymmetrical societal socialisation, first of all represented in the gendered division of labour in private and public spheres. Structuration theory teaches that structuration takes place through multi-dimensional actions of reflexive actors who produce and reproduce structures and thereby simultaneously reproduce and change social practice. From this point of view gender can be analysed as being structured in social practice, having two mutually interwoven sides: the side of being socially constructed, be it unquestioned in daily routines or be it reflexive in social action in order to change the meaning of gender, and the side of being institutionalised in unquestioned processes of social production and reproduction. Thus the concept of structuration also makes it possible to connect the concept of the social construction of gender with the concept of the historical constitution of gender and thereby pay attention to the multi-dimensional complexity of social practice. It enriches women's and gender studies by reminding them that engendered structures are not just given, but are also actively made, and that they can be changed by different processes of social production and reproduction. So the concept of gender is deepened and modified.

To conceptualize the duality of gender in this way opens two methodological perspectives to understand the status of gender in sociological analysis that are necessarily linked. First it means to analyse gender and gender relations as a social topic that is structured in social practice. As argued before structuration means to produce and reproduce gender in social practice but also can mean to change gender by changing social production and reproduction. The task for social analysis then is not only to investigate how gender is socially constructed and reproduced in social practice. It also has to investigate how the social construction and reproduction of gender has historically and culturally been institutionalised in social practice and by this has shaped institutions and how change takes place in the social construction and reproduction of gender. This methodological perspective can be found in Giddens' works on gender relations in late modernity.

Many social theorists argue that Giddens' studies on late modernity shape another phase of his works and do not have much to do with his theoretical project of structuration theory. They are right in the sense that he does not care for working out connections between structuration theory and his more analytical and empirical writings about *The Consequences of Modernity* (1990) as well as about social phenomena of late modernity, for example changes

in identity, personal lives, work and welfare. Nevertheless his sociology of modernity is deeply influenced by ideas of structuration theory that was developed as a theoretical and methodological frame to be used for the analysis of modern society. Giddens himself does not interpret his analytical findings on late modern gender relations in terms of structuration theory and he does not always consequently relate to insights from women's and gender studies. Concerning the status he assigns gender in his social analytical writings on late modernity (e.g. Giddens 1991, 1992, 1994) there is no doubt that "we [do] need to analyse gender issues by breaking them down into more specific influences affecting the behaviour of women and men in different contexts" (Giddens 2001: 667). However this is not enough, as I have argued in this paper. This enterprise needs to be rooted in a social theory that is systematically informed by gender in its concepts and its methodology.

That leads to the second and at least equally important perspective to understand the duality of gender, namely to view structuration as being gendered, as the concepts of structuration and of gender are linked with each other and cannot be separated. In this sense gender is a general category that deepens and modifies structuration theory without rejecting its core idea. In this understanding all the concepts of structuration theory have to be revised from the gender perspective. However, the theoretical work cannot stop here. As is known from the field of women's and gender studies, gender is a category of difference but also a category of inequality. Thus, to understand structuration as being gendered means integrating difference in general in it but can also stand for integrating inequality in general in it.

From this point of view the concept of structuration becomes more aware of questions of difference and inequality as such. It also becomes more complex because gender is not the only category of difference and inequality, as can be seen from research on intersectionality. I cannot go more into detail here but wish to briefly note the fact that gender can be conceptualized as a category of difference and of inequality alongside other categories, for example class or 'race', or that gender can be conceptualized as a category that is always already structured by other differences and inequalities, for example class and 'race'. So the concept of the duality of gender opens up the concept of structuration for questions of complex differences and inequalities. In doing so it fulfils the need to implement inequalities into social theories, as, for example, Sylvia Walby (2009) prepares the ground for developing another and still more complex structuration theory.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Archer, Margaret. 1982. *Morphogenesis versus Structuration: On Combining Structure and Action*, "The British Journal of Sociology", 33: 4, pp. 455–483.
- Connell, R.W. 1987. *Gender and Power: Society, the Person and Sexual Politics*, Cambridge, Oxford: Polity.
- Davis, Kathy. 1991. *Critical Sociology and Gender Relations*, in: Kathy Davis, Monique Leijenaar, Jantine Oldersma (eds.), *The Gender of Power*, London, Newsbury Park, New Delhi: Sage, pp. 65–86.

- Felski, Rita. 1989. *Feminist Theory and Social Change*, "Theory, Culture & Society", 6: 2, pp. 219–240.
- Garfinkel, Harold. 1984. *Studies in Ethnomethodology*, Cambridge: Polity.
- Giddens, Anthony. 1976. *New Rules of Sociological Method: a Positive Critique of Interpretative Sociologies*, London: Hutchinson.
- Giddens, Anthony. 1979. *Central Problems in Social Theory. Action, Structure and Contradiction in Social Analysis*, Berkeley, Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Giddens, Anthony. 1984. *The Constitution of Society. Outline of the Theory of Structuration*, Berkeley, Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Giddens, Anthony. 1989. *A Reply to my Critics*, in: David Held, John B. Thompson (eds.), *Social Theory of Modern Societies. Anthony Giddens and his Critics*, Cambridge, New York, Port Chester, Melbourne, Sydney: Cambridge University Press, pp. 249–301.
- Giddens, Anthony. 1990. *The Consequences of Modernity*, Cambridge, Oxford: Polity.
- Giddens, Anthony. 1991. *Modernity and Self-Identity. Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*, Cambridge, Oxford: Polity.
- Giddens, Anthony. 1992. *The Transformation of Intimacy. Sexuality, Love and Eroticism in Modern Societies*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Giddens, Anthony. 1994. *Beyond Left and Right. The Future of Radical Politics*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Giddens, Anthony. 2001. *Sociology. 4th Edition, Fully Revised and Updated*, Cambridge, Oxford: Polity.
- Held, David, John B. Thompson (eds.). 1989. *Social Theory of Modern Societies. Anthony Giddens and his Critics*, Cambridge, New York, Port Chester, Melbourne, Sydney: Cambridge University Press.
- King, Anthony. 2010. *The Odd Couple: Margaret Archer, Anthony Giddens and British Social Theory*, "The British Journal of Social Theory", Issue Supplement S1, 61, pp. 253–260.
- Maharaj, Zarina. 1994. *Subversive Intent: A Social Theory of Gender*, "Transformation. Critical Perspectives on Southern Africa", 9: 24, pp. 40–54.
- Marshall, Barbara L. 1994. *Engendering Modernity. Feminism, Social Theory and Social Change*, Cambridge, Oxford: Polity.
- Murgatroyd, Linda. 1989. *Only Half the Story: Some Blinkering Effects of 'Malestream' Sociology*, in: David Held, John B. Thompson (eds.), *Social Theory of Modern Societies. Anthony Giddens and his Critics*, Cambridge, New York, Port Chester, Melbourne, Sydney: Cambridge University Press, pp. 147–161.
- Parker, John. 2000. *Structuration*, Buckingham, Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Stones, Rob. 2005. *Structuration Theory*, Basingstoke, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Walby, Sylvia. 2009. *Globalization and Inequalities. Complex and Contested Modernities*, Los Angeles, London, New Delhi, Singapore, Washington DC: Sage.
- Wolffensperger, Joan. 1991. *Engendered Structure: Giddens and the Conceptualization of Gender*, in: Kathy Davis, Monique Leijenaar, Jantine Oldersma (eds.), *The Gender of Power*, London, Newsbury Park, New Delhi: Sage, pp. 87–108.

STABILNOŚĆ I ZMIANA W RELACJACH PŁCIOWYCH. PRZYCZYNEK DO ANALIZ Z PERSPEKTYWY
TEORII STRUKTURACJI ANTHONY'EGO GIDDENSA

W artykule dokonano charakterystyki kategorii teoretycznych socjologii, które mogą być zastosowane zarówno w badaniach nad stabilnością, jak i zmiennością relacji społecznych w obrębie płci kulturowej. Ponadto poddano dyskusji teoretyczne i metodologiczne założenia teorii strukturacji autorstwa Anthony'ego Giddensa z perspektywy analiz prowadzonych w obrębie *women's* oraz *gender studies*. W artykule przywołano refleksje Giddensa dotyczące statusu płci kulturowej w teoriach socjologicznych, a następnie dokonano krótkiej charakterystyki kluczowego w jego teorii pojęcia dualności struktury. W kolejnych częściach tekstu autorka poddała to pojęcie ponownej analizie z perspektywy studiów gender oraz rozwinęła koncepcję dualności struktury, aby w końcu zastanowić się nad tym, jak kategoria dualności gender może być wykorzystana w badaniach społecznych.

Słowa kluczowe: Anthony Giddens, teoria strukturacji, płeć kulturowa, dualność płci kulturowej, zmiana społeczna