

Institut für Politikwissenschaft
1. Supervisor WWU: M. phil. Stephanie Friedrich
2. Supervisor WWU: Dipl. – Pol. Eva Katharina Sarter

Universiteit Twente
School of Management and Governance
1. Supervisor UT: Dr. G.H. Reussing

Summer term 2011

Bachelor Thesis for Public Administration and European Studies

Topic: Is the voluntary student organization MUIMUN
shaped by underlying gender inequality and male
dominance?

A gender analysis based on the European instrument Gender
Mainstreaming

Handed in by:
Lea Spörcke

Public Administration / European Studies
Semester number: 6
Student number WWU: 354888
Student number UTwente: s1121529

Date of submission: 15.06.2011

Table of contents

1.	Introduction	3
2.	Background information about Model United Nations and MUIMUN	5
3.	Theory of Gender and Organizations	6
4.	Gender Mainstreaming as a European Concept	11
5.	Methodology of the Gender Analysis	13
6.	Internal Gender Analysis	
6.1	Results of the Internal Gender Analysis	15
6.2	Interpretation of the results of the Internal Gender Analysis	18
7.	External Gender Analysis	
7.1	Results of the External Gender Analysis	19
7.2	Interpretation of the results of the External Gender Analysis	26
8.	Conclusion	28
	Bibliography	30
	Annex	36

1. Introduction

“Gender oppression is common to most, if not all, organizations but it takes unique forms within each organization according to their local histories, symbolic languages and senses of commitment or opposition.” (Ramsay and Parker, 1992:259). This assumption by Ramsay and Parker is a fundamental critique on the self-conception of most organizations as well as on the classic organizational theory. These presume modern organizations to be based on the bureaucratic principles established by Max Weber: Horizontal division of labour, hierarchies, clear divisions between the public and the private, rationality, formal rules and technical superiority. Arbitrary established rules, such as rules based on gender are expected to be replaced by rational bureaucratic rules (Rastetter 1992:88; Pringle, 1993:160). Therefore, Max Weber called organizations to be gender neutral (Ramsay and Parker, 1992:253). The assumptions of this gender neutrality have been widely accepted. All classical organizational theories such as the Scientific Management and also the Human Relations Approach expect organizations to be gender neutral and neglect gender as a structuring category (Witz and Savage, 1992:5 ; Rastetter, 1994:87/88).

Nevertheless, since the seventies feminist researchers began to show that organizations were not gender neutral. They proved that organizations were shaped by gender inequalities which were reproduced in everyday work practices, in unequal payment and unequal positioning of men and women. Three main approaches to explain these patterns were developed. Kanter argued that stereotypical images of women’s behaviour in fact are apply for both genders in positions with lack of opportunity, powerlessness and unbalanced number of sexes (Kanter, 1977:131-207). Ferguson gave a radical feminist critique of bureaucracy as an organization of oppressive male power (Acker, 1990:84). Pringle proceeded to a post structural theory of gender in organizations. She based this on gendered discourses of power and the control of construction of sexuality and pleasure (Witz and Savage, 1992:27 and 32). Due to this academic recognition of gender differences gender equality became an important principle in organizations. The European Union, the United Nations and various NGOs today clearly advocate gender equality in their charters, statutes and campaigns.

With the aim to support the ideals of the UN gender equality is also one goal of Münster University International Model United Nations – in short MUIMUN. This organization is a student association which seems to have good preconditions

for gender equality. It is a voluntary organization, many women are involved, it has flat hierarchies and also puts an emphasis on diversity and cooperation instead of mere rationality and control.

Yet, many theorists state that gender inequality is a persistent underlay of all organizations. They consider the mainstream to be androcentric even if particular measures are introduced to reduce gender inequality. They call this to be even valid in voluntary organizations which are diverting much from formal bureaucratic organizations. As Acker states: „all organizations have inequality regimes” (Acker 2006:443). This indeed seems to be validated by MUIIMUN. Gender division in the vertical and the horizontal work inside the MUIIMUN organization team are persistent. Representative persons and active delegates seem to be mostly males. Thus, it is questionable if MUIIMUN promotes gender equality internally and externally. This paper will be operated with the hypothesis that MUIIMUN is an organization, which although its preconditions for gender equality are quite well is nevertheless shaped by the underlying gender inequality and male dominance.

In this work, gender is defined as a social construction. This means that the social gender instead of the biological sex is emphasized. Gender as social construction recognizes “gender” as a process to construct political and social differences, different abilities and asymmetries of power (Kreisky, 2005:33). Hence, the gendered differences and gendered power asymmetries in MUIIMUN are analysed. This will be carried out by a Gender Analysis methodologically based on Gender Mainstreaming.

After this introduction the second section of this work provides background information about Model United Nations and MUIIMUN. The third section explains why gender is a crucial category in organizations. For this purpose the theory of the abstract worker by Joan Acker and the concept of hegemonic masculinity from an organization-cultural perspective are introduced. In the fourth section the concept of Gender Mainstreaming will be laid down. At first it will be explained why Gender Mainstreaming can be seen as European concept. Afterwards its general principles will be described. In the fifth section the methodology of the Gender Analysis is introduced. In the sixth section, the Gender Analysis of the inner organizational work of MUIIMUN will be conducted and interpreted. In the seventh section, the organization is analysed externally in its public image and role positioning during the conference. After that, interpretations will be made about to what extent underlying assumptions of gender shape the external representation. Since the

author has been involved in the MUIMUN team 2011 own experiences and perceptions are included in this work. At last, the conclusion will give a short summary and state, if the assumption that MUIMUN as a modern voluntary organization is shaped by the underlay of gender inequality and male dominance could be validated.

2. Background information about Model United Nations and MUIMUN

The Model United Nations (MUN) have been established in 1947 as the successor of the Harvard Model League of Nations period (McIntosh, 2001:270). The MUNs are mostly described as a conference program or an operational simulation in which students or pupils gain experience in international diplomacy (Muldoon, 1995:28). They act as ambassadors representing a foreign country in debates on economic, political and societal issues (McIntosh, 2001:270). Therefore, they are assigned to one committee of the UN and negotiate for the position of their represented country according to the rules and structures of the UN.

The development of MUNs has been predominantly furthered by students. Thus, the MUNs mostly depend on voluntary work with little professional and limited financial support (Muldoon, 1995:30). MUN simulations do not have to conform to a special form. The different simulations diverge in terms of the number of participants, committees simulated and duration. While academic interest in MUNs has remained quite low, the popular interest in it rises and with it the number participants and amount of MUNs (Muldoon, 1995:30). Today there are various MUN conferences in nearly all parts of the world. They all have objectives which include learning about the processes of the United Nations, international diplomacy and develop solutions for current political issues.

MUIMUN is the MUN conference of Münster. It is organized by students of the Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität (WWU) and the University of Applied Sciences Münster. The first conference took place in 2007. Since then, MUIMUN has hosted about 200 delegates and simulates six to seven UN committees each year. The organizations team decides on the conference theme and on the committees simulated. Each committee is coordinated by a chairperson and a vice chairperson, who are responsible to maintain order to the official rules of procedure (McIntosh (2001, 2001:270). These rules followed in the debate are modelled according to the real UN. They allow the students to represent their positions in three different modes with the aim to convince the other delegates. The conference runs five days

and always takes place in spring at the end of the semester break. It usually starts with an introduction to the rules of procedure and the official opening ceremony. The working sessions are scheduled from nine am until five pm and accompanied by various social events in the evenings. The conference ends with the closing ceremony on the fifth day. On one afternoon, “MUIMUN meets experts” takes place. Here, the delegates can choose to participate in topical orientated or methodological workshops.

First strategies to implement a MUN in Münster have been developed by interns of the Innovation Office of the WWU in 2005 (MUIMUN 1). Since then, MUIMUN has been planned and executed by a team of students from different faculties of University and University of Applied Sciences of Münster. MUIMUN took place for the fifth time in April 2011. Legally, it is a student association of the WWU Münster. Compliant with its self-conception, MUIMUN represents international understanding, international exchange of ideas, modern diplomacy, international and interdisciplinary competences and academic networking (MUIMUN 2).

The planning process starts one year before the conference is conducted. The organization team meets once a week to solve main questions, develop new ideas and exchange news. But a lot of the organizational work is done in smaller planning teams, of which every team member chooses one to participate. In 2011 these teams have been 1. Coordination 2. The Secretariat 3. Delegates’ Service 4. Events 5. Finance 6. Fundraising 7. Innovations 8. Logistics 9. Public Relations 10. Scholarship and 11. Website. Each team has a director who acts as the contact person for the other teams and has the final responsibility for the work of his team. Two teams have superior positions. Firstly, the Coordination Team supervises the whole preparation process. Secondly, the Secretariat is responsible for the thematic structure and functional design of the conference. The MUIMUN 2011 started in May 2010 and was comprised of forty students. Among these, twelve were males and twenty-eight females.

3. Theory of Gender and Organizations

The key question seems to be why gender as a social constructed category should matter at all in an organization as MUIMUN. To answer this it is to refer to basic assumptions of the social gender. The social construction of gender implies at least two dimensions which occur in organizations. The first dimension is a division

in the private sphere and the public sphere. The private sphere has a female connotation. This means women are responsible for the private area as the household and tasks related to reproduction. The public sphere is connoted male, meaning men are the ideal citizen and responsible for the public spheres as culture, politics and paid work (Lang, 2004:67, Becker – Schmidt 2007:28, Hearn and Parkin 1987:8). Organizations belong to the public sphere and thus are traditionally male dominated domains. Hence, they are likely to construct and reconstruct gender assumptions and male dominance based on the division between public and private sphere. Secondly, the social construction of gender includes power relations. This means systematic asymmetries between men and women form male hegemony and dominance in all areas of the society (Klinger, 2005:90 ff). If gendered power relations exist everywhere, then they are also prevailing in organizations. Obviously, these assumptions contradict the self-conception of modern organizations and the organizational theories of gender neutrality of organisations (Kahlert, 2003:74).

Current research focuses on dismantling androcentrism as organizational method. Androcentrism means that masculinity is the hegemonic organizational principle accompanied by a degradation of female attributes. This is internalized by men and women and comes along with supposedly gender-neutral organizational work (Kreisky, 2004:27). But researchers show that excluded or invisible gender dimensions are in fact structural elements of the organization (Rosenberger and Sauer, 2004:257 f). Two theories about these processes will be introduced here. The first theory is the concept of the abstract worker developed by Joan Acker; the second theory is the concept of hegemonic masculinity as used by many researchers on gender and organizational culture. Both theories are overlapping in some points.

Joan Acker is one of the main theorists who emphasizes how assumptions about gender underlie organizational structures. Acker argues that gender is constructed and reproduced in organizations in at least five interacting and interrelating processes. Firstly, there is the construction of divisions along lines of gender such as horizontal and vertical division of labour. Secondly, constructions of symbols and images exist in organizations that explain, express, reinforce and oppose those divisions. Thirdly, gendered social structures are produced by interactions between the genders which include patterns of dominance and submission. Fourthly, organizational processes produce gendered components of individual identity and thus understandings of the gendered structure of the organization and perceptions of gender-appropriate behaviour. Fifthly, gender is

implicated in the fundamental, on-going processes of creating and conceptualizing social structures and a constitutive element of organizational logic, which is reproduced daily in practical work and the writings of organizational theorists (Acker, 1990:85 f).

According to Acker, this gendered nature of the organization is masked through an embodied nature of work. This means, organizational jobs are presumed to be abstract and independent from its occupant (Acker, 1990:81). The ideal worker for these abstract jobs is a free, independent, rational and productive individual with little responsibilities outside the organization (Rastetter, 1994:84). Thus “the closest the disembodied worker doing the abstract job comes to a real worker is the male worker whose life centres on his full-time, life-long job, while his wife or another women takes care of his personal needs and his children” (Acker, 1990:87). Therefore, assumption of reproductive capacity (Mills, 1993:35) and men’s reliance on domestic support (Burton, 1992:186) restructure assumptions of the private-public division in organizations. Hence, males are expected to fit better to organizational jobs, while women lack capacities for participation (Acker, 1992:257; Acker 1990:88). Thus, with the ideal worker being implicitly a man the organization is androcentric. Consequently, male work is valued higher. An assumed congruence between hierarchy, responsibility and job complexity then leads to job segregation and the placement of women in jobs at the lower end of the hierarchy and men in high power positions (Acker, 1990:88). As long as organizations are supposedly gender neutral there is no need to change gendered power relations (Acker, 2006:452). Hence men often reject the gendered nature of organizations.

The second approach is working with the organizational culture concept of hegemonic masculinity. Here, theorists use the gendered organizational culture as its initial point. Research on gendered organizational culture examines how an underlying image of hegemonic masculinity disadvantages femaleness in organizations. The theory of hegemonic masculinity assumes norms and demands of heterosexual, white, rational, strong, technical competent, emotionally controlled men with minimal domestic responsibility to be prevailing in an organization (Lange, 1998:60 f). The hegemonic masculinity is built on constructed gendered competencies, on an assumed nature of men and women and an assumed natural distinction between the public and the private (Martin, 1990:344).

These assumptions can be explained by a male-bias. Since men were historically not only dominating the organizations but also the organizational theory they built the ideal image of worker in an organization according to their self-images (Mills, 1992:103, Lange, 2004:45). Furthermore, Itzin explains the development of the hegemonic masculinity with a materialist analysis. The underlying image of hegemonic masculinity reflects and reproduces the gendered power relations of the wider society. "What happens in the wider society happens in organizations" (Itzin, 1995:262).

According to the organizational culture researchers the image of hegemonic masculinity is expressed in the organizational culture. Gheradi defines organizational culture as

"symbol[s], beliefs and patterns of behaviour learned, produced and created by the people who devote their energies and labour to the life of an organization. It is expressed in the design of an organization and of work, in the artefacts and services that the organization produces, in the architecture of its premises, in the technologies that it employs, in its ceremonials of encounter and meeting, in the temporal structuring of organizational course of action, in the quality and conditions of its working life, in the ideologies of work, in the corporate philosophy, in the jargon, lifestyle and the physical appearance of the organization's members" (Gheradi, 1995:13).

Everything in organizational culture expressed in one of the points mentioned in the quotation above not conforming to hegemonic masculinity is degraded. Since women can never comply with hegemonic masculinity due to their gender, female connoted competencies, attributes and work are valued less than male's work (Döge (2000) p.28). Thus, hierarchical structures emerge with males at the top in power positions and females at the bottom. Furthermore, female competences are constructed in contrast to masculine competencies. So, women are not assumed to be rational but emotional and associated with service and care (Regenhard, 2000:30). Thus, learned beliefs and behaviours about gender competencies lead to a structural horizontal division of labour.

In sum, both approaches suggest that organizations and organizational work are gendered. They emphasize that jobs are created according to the underlying assumptions about maleness and femaleness. These are based on the constructed divisions of public and private and include power asymmetries. Both are reflected in the organizational culture and manifest themselves in organizational structures. The

abstract worker concept as well as the organizational culture concept of hegemonic masculinity show that male work is valued higher and more prestigious than female work and therefore hierarchical and horizontal divisions of gender appear in organizations and create patterns of difference in the appearance of males and females.

An important question is if these assumptions are also valid for voluntary civil organizations. Voluntary organizations often include social and democratic goals (Maddock, 1999:19 f). Thus, gender inequality more often is seen as illegitimate (Acker, 2006:452). Furthermore, most voluntary organizations work in a less hierarchical way and have replaced values of rationality and control by values such as emotionality, communication and diversity (Maddock, 1999:19 f). So, they are seen as different from traditional bureaucratic organization. Hence, a widespread assumption is that women's complaints about inequality are not valid anymore (Cockburn, 1991:66).

But this clearly obscures the underlying inequality and images of male dominance which are still persistent in voluntary organizations (Newman, 1995:18 ff). The mere fact that hierarchies are flat does not necessarily lead to equal valuation of male and female work. Also, the fact that organizational values such as rationality are supplemented by values like emotionality does not necessarily change the underlying assumptions about male and female work. In contrast, Campbell and Sheriff argue that the assumptions about Weber's rationality as the ideal mode of work are still valid in voluntary organizations. Furthermore, voluntary organizations often have limited financial resources and are completely dependent on the voluntary work. Hence, the focus is on the organizational goals, not on gender equality in the organization (Newman 1995:18 ff). Moreover, the mere introduction of gender equality principles in charters and statutes is insufficient. The image of hegemonic masculinity has not been questioned in depth in voluntary organizations and is thus nevertheless persistent. This is also proved by Maddock, who examined that women still are seldom found in leading positions (Maddock, 1999:184). She even argues that women in fact are often found in voluntary civil organization but that those are taken over by men if successful (Maddock, 1999:19). Hence, for voluntary organizations it is valid that gender structures the organizational work and the organizational outcome and that males and females still have to respond to the "masculine ethic" (Campbell and Sheriff, 1992:41)

4. Gender Mainstreaming as a European Concept

The previous part has shown that organizations are not gender neutral but androcentric in their mainstream. This has been recognized by the concept of Gender Mainstreaming. Gender Mainstreaming became a keyword in gender political discussions and especially in the EU. But is it a European concept? In fact, the origins of Gender Mainstreaming emerged on the Third World Conference on Women 1985 in Nairobi. They were then further developed during the Fourth World Conference on Women 1995 in Beijing and adopted by the United Nations (Weg, 2006:11). Thus, Gender Mainstreaming is not an instrument developed by the EU. But as Huschke put it the “Gender-Mainstreaming-Boom” is European (Huschke, 2002:102).

This is shown by the various legislations and programs on Gender Mainstreaming established by the EU. Gender Equality politics were translated into primary European Law due to the Gender Mainstreaming Boom (Gröner, 2002:92). The Treaty of Amsterdam of 1997 provided equal pay between both genders and enforced gender equality policy components in social and economic EU legislation (Defeis, 1999:5). The Charta of Fundamental Rights prohibits discrimination in general in article 21 and proclaims gender equality in article 23. Furthermore, the Lisbon Treaty regards gender equality as one of the main European principles. In the Common Provisions of the Treaty on the European Union article 2 prohibit discrimination in general and in article 3 promotes gender equality in particular. Furthermore, various programs such as the European Employment Strategies, the EU Structural Funds, or the European Development Policy employment comprise Gender Mainstreaming (Ehrhardt and Jansen, 2003:35). Established committees to deal with Gender Mainstreaming policies are for example the Advisory Committee on Equal Opportunities, which regularly takes position on community policies regarding gender equality, and the Interservice Group on Gender Equality (Englert, 2009:120). In all, Gender Mainstreaming has become a guiding principle of the EU, which is included into the mainstream as a key principle of the EU (Gröner, 2002:91; Huschke, 2002:87 and 102 f).

But what is actually meant by Gender Mainstreaming? Since the EU is the pioneer in implementation the definition of Gender Mainstreaming in this work refers to the EU definition. At first European Commission also defines “Gender” as the term for the social constructed identities, differences and role models of men and women (European Commission, 2008:1). With “Mainstream” the significant

and dominant conceptions, opinions, practices and trends in a certain sector are defined. The mainstream determines how positions, power, resources and opportunities are distributed. (European Commission, 2004:10). Gender Mainstreaming sees gender as a category which needs to be considered and integrated into the mainstream (Thürmer-Rohr, 2001:24). The definition of Gender Mainstreaming the EU refers to is provided by the Council of Europe: “Gender mainstreaming is the (re)organisation, improvement, development and evaluation of policy processes, so that a gender equality perspective is incorporated in all policies at all levels and at all stages, by the actors normally involved in policy-making.” (Council of Europe, 1998:15). This shows the important paradigm shift done by Gender Mainstreaming: it assumes all areas of policy, politics and polity to be androcentric instead of being gender neutral (Ehrhardt and Jansen, 2002:5). Thus all areas are relevant for gender equality. Gender Mainstreaming is seen as a joint task which requires men and women to develop new norms together (Döge, 2006:32). Nevertheless, women politics are not abolished (Ehrhardt and Jansen, 2002:8).

Gender Mainstreaming comprises various dimensions. It is a strategy for the structural process of change. Secondly, it is a cross-sectional process. Thirdly, it is an analytical process and fourthly it is a method of the implementation of gender equality (Huschke, 2002:89). The main goal of Gender Mainstreaming can be defined as gender democracy. Gender democracy aims at the democratic relation between the genders in politics as well as in society in general, which is based on the principles of equality and participation of men and women and which is free from hierarchy between the genders (Schambach and von Bargen, 2001:11; Huschke, 2002:80).

Today, the principle of Gender Mainstreaming is often recognised by Non-Profit –Organizations (Jung, 2006:33). It should be achieved in a double way, internally with regard to the personnel and externally with regard to the addressees (Ehrhardt and Jansen, 2002:14). Internally, Gender Mainstreaming can change the organizational culture by discovering hegemonic masculinity and promoting diversity instead (Ehrhardt and Jansen, 2002:11). This can lead to a promotion of diversity and the development of unrecognized human potentials and social innovation (Weg, 2002:84). Most of all, it can help to achieve more democracy and social equality in organizations (Weg, 2002:66 f).

Externally, Gender Mainstreaming can create a modern corporate image of the organization. If measures and programs are revised according to their gender

dimensions accuracy and quality will be improved. Furthermore, if the different impacts on men and women as addressees are considered then the organizational output is more purposeful for both genders (Ehrhardt and Jansen, 2002:14). Thus the organizational outputs in terms of effectivity and efficiency are enhanced (Ibid.).

5. Methodology of the Gender Analysis

So, the question is how Gender Mainstreaming can be achieved in organizations. There is no determined set of methods or instruments to implement Gender Mainstreaming (Kahlert, 2003:11). Thus, many different methods and instruments have been developed over time. These generally are comprised of different steps which can be vaguely defined as gender-analysis, definition of goals, planning of strategies, implementation and, monitoring and evaluation (Ehrhardt and Jansen, 2002:25). Indispensable in all approaches is a Gender Analysis (Huschke, 2002: 120; Burbach and Döge, 2006:191, Müller, 2007:28). In this context the Council of Europe stated: “The main point with gender issues in everyday policies is that they are not recognised as such” (Council of Europe 1998:27). Hence, the Gender Analysis is used to recognise these gender issues.

Broadly defined, a Gender Analysis is a gender-based data collection, data analysis and evaluation of the existence and extent of gender differences (Kahlert, 2003:12). It is a cross-sectional analysis of the organization and consequently captures the structure as well as the organizational culture. Determined strategies and tools do not exist. Theorists have developed different starting points and focus areas for the analysis. Hence, different approaches have been combined to conduct a Gender Analysis of MUIMUN.

The analysis is systematically divided into an internal and an external analysis. The internal analysis focuses on gender as the determining category in the organizational work. The external analysis focuses on how gender as the category determines the public image of MUIMUN and has different impacts on the addressees. The internal and external representation of gender equality reflects the question of accessibility and attraction for men and women to participate in, sponsor or support MUIMUN. This is the basis for MUIMUN, since the conference cannot be conducted if nobody participates and the organizational team does not receive logistical, financial and ideological support. So, due to the importance of a modern image, the internal and external analysis only regard what is externally visible.

At first, the internal analysis will be conducted with different combined approaches. Firstly, hierarchical and horizontal divisions of labour are examined as suggested by various approaches. For example the Swedish 3-R method prescribes an examination of the representation of men and women as affected people, as decision makers, and as implementers (Weg, 2002:78). Ehrhardt and Jansen recommend analysing the integration of men and women in all positions (Ehrhardt and Jansen, 2002:15). Burbach also recommends regarding the horizontal and vertical positioning of jobs in organizations (Burbach, 2006:55). Another point to be evaluated is the distribution of power and influence (Burbach and Döge, 2006:191). The different approaches capture the horizontal and vertical division of labour between men and women as conceptualized by Joan Acker. Thus, the horizontal and hierarchical distribution of males and females in MUIIMUN will be examined to analyse whether and to which extent there are striking gender divisions. Secondly, according to Steinhage it is important to regard if gender equality is a component of the overall aims of the organization (Steinhage, 2006:165). Also Kersefischer and Schollas suggest regarding gender specific criteria in organizational goals (Kersefischer and Schollas, 2006:44). Thus the overall aims are to be examined next. These are regarded to explore whether gender equality belongs to the goals of MUIIMUN.

Secondly, the external analysis is conducted. Huschke recommends to examine which gender roles the organization represents externally (Huschke, 2002:111). To achieve that, the distribution of males and females as representative persons, how males and females act during the conference and in which role the organizational team appears will be regarded. Next, Kersefischer and Schollas suggest having a look at gender specific considerations in the projects and programs (Kersefischer and Schollas, 2006:44). Also the EQUAL guideline recommends examining organizational programs and practices (European Commission, 2004:10 ff). Hence, projects and programs of MUIIMUN are regarded to see if contents of debates and workshops include a gender component. This will show if MUIIMUN recognized that a universal approach is in fact always a male constructed approach not including the female perspective (Acker, 1990:88). Thirdly, as Ehrhardt and Jansen suggested, it is also important to examine the promotion of gender equality in the public image of the organization (Ehrhardt and Jansen, 2002:15). A survey was conducted among the delegates to get further impressions about the public image of MUIIMUN. They received an evaluation survey at the last day of the

conference, which has been returned by the chairpersons. The survey delivered the delegates' perceptions of the participation in the sessions, about gender sensitivity of the contents and whether gender equality was considered in the organization. It has been created according to survey methods of Brake, Bühner, Kühl et al. and Mummendey. The answers are analyzed according to the gender of the delegates. At first, the data is compared between males' and females' replies. This is done by univariate statistics and considering peculiarities in the tables. Afterwards with bivariate statistics (Phi and Cramer's V) it is examined if tendencies are in fact a correlation. The interpretation of the strength of the correlation is done according to the interpretation standards given by the Zentrum für Informationsverarbeitung Münster. Since the level of measurement for gender is nominal, only nominal statistics are used.

The Gender Analysis of MUIMUN will mainly concentrate on the organizational year and the conference in 2011. Comparisons to the year before will only be made in the internal analysis and in some points of the external analysis. This is partly due to a lack of documentation of the first four conferences. If comparisons of the five years are made, the year of 2007 mostly had to be left out since there was nearly no written documentation available. Furthermore, the external analysis concentrates on the year 2011 to make comparisons with the conducted survey. The analysis is based on the Delegates' Handbook in which the horizontal as well as the vertical positions of the team members are stated. Furthermore the Study Guides are regarded, which give information about the chairpersons, vice chairpersons and the debated topics. In addition information found on the website www.muimun.org are considered and also some internal documents such as the evaluation survey and the charter. Moreover, personal knowledge and experience is included in the analysis.

6. Internal Gender Analysis

6.1 Results of the Internal Gender Analysis

Hierarchical division of labour

At first, the hierarchical positions of men and women are regarded. Therefore, it is examined if males and females are represented equally in higher positions in the hierarchy. MUIMUN is a volunteer organization that tries to keep flat hierarchies. There is de jure no head of the organization. Nevertheless, the Coordinator and the Secretariat in fact are higher positions with more decision-

making power. The Coordination Team has the most insight into the organizational procedures and the work of the different teams. During the organizational process, they carry the final responsibility. In 2011 one male and one female comprised the Coordination Team. In 2010, 2009 and 2007 the coordinator was only one male. In 2008 the Coordination Team was composed of two persons, one male and one female. In sum, five men and two women were in the Coordination Team over time. Three times the Coordinator was just one man alone while never only one women.

The Secretary General and the Deputy Secretary General have the decision-making power for the topical arrangement and substantial structure of the conference. In 2011, Secretary General and the Deputy Secretary General were both male. In 2010, in 2008 and in 2007 the Secretary General was female and the Deputy was male. In 2009, the Secretary General was male and the Deputy female. In sum, six males and four females were in the Secretariat. Females were three times in the higher position of the Secretary General and men two times. However, there has never been a completely female Secretariat but once a complete male Secretariat.

The next hierarchical positions that might be of interest are the positions of the directors of the smaller teams. They coordinate the smaller teams and have final responsibility for the work of this team. Among the eleven teams in 2011 three teams decided not to have a director (Coordination, Finance and Events). Among the other eight teams four directors were males and four directors females. Thus, the director positions were nearly balanced in total numbers. Nevertheless, four of twelve males had a director position while four of twenty-eight females had a director position. So, proportionally more men than women had director positions. Compared to the year 2010 among twenty –nine team members were ten males and nineteen females. Among these three males and seven females were in the director positions. Here, proportionally more females were directing. In 2009, of thirty team members twelve were male and eighteen female, with four male directors, one team not having a director and five female directors. Here, proportionally more males had director positions, but the difference was very small. In 2008, there were twenty team members, six male and fourteen female, with three male directors and seven female directors. So in proportion, the positions of the directors in was proportionally equally divided between males and females in 2008.

Horizontal division of labour

Secondly, it's worthwhile to have a look at the horizontal positioning of the teams. Therefore, the distribution of male and female team members in particular important teams will be regarded. In the literature on horizontal division of labour the jobs concerned with technics are called to be mostly occupied by males (Alvesson, 1997:91). One team which mainly has technical tasks is the Website Team which organizes the internet performance. In 2011, one man was doing this job on his own. However, in 2010 this job was filled with one man and two women, in 2009 this job was filled with two males, in 2008 with one male and one female. So over the years, five men comprised in the Website Team and three women. Regarding the general gender distribution in MUIMUN proportionally more men were in the Website Team.

On the other hand, the literature considers jobs which are most similar to service and care to be female jobs (Maddock, 1999:68 f, Gheradi, 1995:15). To proof this, the Delegates' Services and the Scholarship Team are regarded. The Delegates' Service supports the delegates before and during the conference. Indeed, in 2011 the Delegates' Service was composed of one male and seven females. In 2010, it was composed of four females and one male. In 2009, two males and three females comprised the Delegates' Service. And in 2008 this job was done by two females. In sum, four males were working in the Delegates' Service and sixteen women.

The Scholarship Team organizes the scholarships and cares for the scholars during the conference. Thus, it is also service team. In 2011 it was comprised of four females. In both 2010 and 2008 two females comprised the Scholarship Team. In 2009, two females and one male composed the Scholarship Team. In sum, the Scholarship Team has been completely female with only one exception.

Gender Equality in the objectives

It is also important to have a look at whether gender equality is included in the objectives of MUIMUN (Ehrhardt and Jansen, 2002:15). Therefore, the objectives laid down in the MUIMUN charter established in 2010 are regarded. In § 2 purposes and goals are laid down. Although gender equality is not mentioned as particular point in these, the article adopts the ideals and goals of the United Nations, which include gender equality as laid down in the anti-discrimination clause in article 1.3 of the Charter of the United Nations. Furthermore, the MUIMUN charter

in §5 names equality and equal rights to be the principle of the MUIMUN work. Additionally, § 7 (5) 9 assigns the creation of a balanced gender ration in the MUIMUN positions to the tasks of the executive board.

6.2 Interpretation of the results of the Internal Gender Analysis

Hierarchical division of labour

Three positions have been examined to make predictions about the hierarchical positioning in MUIMUN. The examination has shown that the position of the Coordinator was male dominated, while in the Secretariat more males were involved during the last five years, but the females have the higher positions three times out of five times. Nevertheless it is striking that none of these positions was led by women alone and also that proportionally more males were involved in the hierarchically higher positions. The distribution of the director positions was varying during the years. Two times the distribution was nearly equal, one time female dominated and one time male dominated.

The fact, that the important coordination position was male dominated proves Ackers assumptions that males are assumed to be most fitting to do organizational jobs high in the hierarchy, responsibility and job complexity. This is also validated with the proportional amount of male in the Secretariat. Furthermore, this assumption fits to the distribution of the director positions in 2011 and 2009, but not in 2010 and 2008. So, partly the assumptions that males are higher in hierarchy as made by the concept of the abstract worker and the organizational culture concept of hegemonic masculinity can be proved. What is striking is that in sum in the 2011 team the overall distribution of all three types of positions were male dominated. So, it is questionable if the trend goes in the direction of male getting more involved into the organization. Since MUIMUN simultaneously becomes more and more professional this would prove the assumption of Maddock that women often get involved in organization but that these are taken over by men if successful (Maddock, 1999:19).

Horizontal division of labour

For the horizontal lines of division four significant teams have been analysed. The assumption by Acker, Alvesson and Billing that technical positions have been called to be mostly occupied by males has been proved by the finding that the Website Team always has been male-dominated. Also the assumption by Gheradi and Maddock that positions of service and care are mostly occupied with females

has been proved by the clearly female dominated Delegates' Service and Scholarship Team.

Gender Equality in the objectives

The analysis of the charter shows that the team recognized gender equality as an important feature of organizational work. With including it in the charter, they promote gender equality in its overall goals. This proves Ackers assumption that voluntary organizations try to minimize gender inequality (Acker, 2006:452). Nevertheless, it might also show as assumed by Newman that with the adoption of gender equality in the charter further engagement with gender equality stopped (Newman, 1995:18 ff).

In sum, the assumptions of the abstract job theory by Joan Acker as well as the hegemonic masculinity by the gender organizational culture approaches have been proved. MUIMUN as well as other organizations is not gender neutral. Male and female work is valued differently and jobs with main responsibility, complexity and highest hierarchy are still male positioned – even though this occurs with exceptions. The hypothesis that different valuation leads to a horizontal division of labour can be also proved by the internal analysis. But the differences have not been that big. This can be explained by what researchers examined in studies about voluntary organization and gender: the flat hierarchical structure and the purposed emphasis on non-bureaucratic values of rationality and control minimize gender inequality (Acker, 2006:452). This is seen in the adoption of gender equality in the charter where inequality is purposeful addressed and in the relatively flat hierarchy. Nevertheless, there are still gender based differences in hierarchical and horizontal positions. This fits into the assumption of Newman that organization can not completely divert from the reflection of the societal gendered power structures (Newman, 1995:18 ff).

7. External Gender Analysis

7.1 Results of the External Gender Analysis

Roles represented by males and females

The external analysis will concentrate at first on the roles in which men and women appear during the MUIMUN conference as recommended by Huschke (Huschke, 2002:111). Therefore, the distribution of males and females in representing MUIMUN externally will be analysed.

Surely, most representative are the patrons of MUIMUN. Those symbolically support the conference to attract supporters and participants. In 2007, Prof. Klaus Töper, former Executive Director of the UN Environmental Programme and Under Secretary General of the UN, took patronage of the conference. In 2008, the former German Minister of State Dr. Christoph Zöpel was patron of MUIMUN. In 2009, Dr. Frank-Walter Steinmeier, then German Minister of Foreign Affairs, and in 2010 Dr. Thomas de Maizière, at that time German Federal Minister of the Interior, were patrons. In 2011, former German Diplomat and State Secretary of the Federal Foreign Office, Dr. Gunter Pleuger, was the patron of the MUIMUN conference. So, in five years of MUIMUN men had the patronage for the conference without exception.

The lecturers for the “MUIMUN meets experts” workshop afternoon are also representative persons. Nine workshops were offered in MUIMUN 2011. From these, two workshops were given by women and seven by men. So, more men were experts giving workshops.

The chairpersons of the committees are external representatives too. Each committee has one chairperson and one vice chairperson. They coordinate the sessions of their committee, maintain order to the official rules of procedure and prepare the topics to be discussed. Thus, they have a superior position in the committees. In MUIMUN 2011, seven committees were simulated with each having one chairperson and one vice chairperson. In addition, the three General Assembly committees merged for the big General Assembly in the last two days with one additional chairperson. In sum, there were fifteen chairpersons in MUIMUN 2011. Nine chairpersons were male and six female. There is a hierarchy between chairperson and vice chairperson. Among the seven chairpersons only two were female while among the seven vice chairs five were female. Furthermore, in four committees the combination was that of a male chairperson and a female vice chairperson. In one committee (ECOSOC) there was a male chairperson with a male vice chairperson and in another (the GA 2nd) a female chairperson and a female vice chairperson. Only in the Security Council there was a female chairperson with a male vice chairperson. The chairperson of the big General Assembly was also a male. So, more males were in chairing positions and more male occupied the higher chairing positions.

Another point that might be interesting to regard is in which role the organizational team appears during the conference (Huschke, 2002:111). This is

about which roles were represented by the team externally during the conference. This gives external impressions to what extent the team itself regards gender equality as important. What has been mentioned before is that in 2011 the Secretariat was completely male. Through their presence in the sessions and their management and guidance of the opening and closing ceremony they are in the most visible and most representative positions. However, as mentioned in the internal analysis, although for the last five years as a whole, more males have been in the Secretariat more often females had the higher position of the General Secretary.

Other roles of team members which are highly visible for the delegates are those concerned with service tasks. As mentioned in the internal analysis females are dominating in the Delegates' Service and the Scholarship Team. This service-role is also given in the Food-Team which serves the food during the conference. The Food Team in 2011 only existed during the conference week and consisted of women only. In this context the distribution of the add-staffs should be regarded as well. The add-staffs are volunteers who help out during the conference, pass notes between the delegates during the debates and help out wherever they can. So, in fact they are service personal during the conference. Seven students were volunteering in MUIMUN 2011. Among these, two were males and five were females.

Now, the analysis will focus on the delegates. In total, 187 delegates participated in the MUIMUN conference 2011. Among these 95 delegates were male and 92 delegates were female. Thus, the participation of male and female students is almost equal in numbers. If a country is represented in several committees by different students (delegation) then one of them has to hold an opening speech about the general position of the country represented. This means, that one student out of a group of five to seven persons presents the group. In 2011, fifteen students hold these speeches. Out of these fifteen students, eleven were males and four females. That means, although the participation of males in females in MUIMUN is nearly equal, males were predominating in the opening speeches.

Gender Equality in the contents

As Kerssenfischer and Schollas claim it is also important to examine the programs. (Kerssenfischer and Schollas, 2006:44). This shows, whether the organization deals with the subject of gender equality and regards it as an important subject for its addressees to deal with. To carry out this analysis the topics of the

debates were regarded. For each committee two different topics are prepared. An exemption is the big General Assembly where the topics of the three GA committees are brought together and discussed in a big group. The Economic and Financial Committee (GA2nd) had prepared the topics A) “Permanent sovereignty over natural resources in politically unstable areas” and B) “Preventing cross-border transfers of illicit assets generated by corrupt practices”. The Social, Humanitarian and Cultural Affairs Committee (GA3rd), had prepared the two topics A) “Global migration and population imbalances” and B) “Keeping culture alive – accountability for human heritage and cultural identity”. The Legal Committee (GA6th) prepared the topics A) “Extending Criminal Accountability of heads of states (universal jurisdiction)” and topic B) “The Human Rights dimensions of accountability at a global level”. The Comisión Económica para América Latina y el Caribe (CEPAL) had the topic A: “ALCA, ALBA or a third power promoting the economic integration of the regional development of Latin America”¹ and the topic B: “The combat against drug trafficking and the implementation of alternative measures for the drug production in Latin America”². In the Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) the two topics proposed were A) “Establishing a food security policy for post war areas” and B) “Setting a roadmap to climate smart agriculture”. The Economic and Social Council prepared the topics a) “Developing strategies to settle and avoid currency disputes” and B) “Promoting social entrepreneurship”. The Security Council could work on topic A) “Assessing the impact of climate change on international security” and B) “Resolution of the Kashmir issue”. The delegates received a study guide for further research on the topics before the conference starts. In those the chairpersons gave an introduction to the topic and summed up the most important points of it. To see if gender, gender equality or different gender impacts were included the study guides were analysed. From the fourteen topics suggested only in the study guide for the GA3rd topic “Global migration and population imbalance” were gender equality and gender impacts discussed. This was in the context of marriage fraud. In the other study guides gender stayed unmentioned.

Another topical scope to be examined was the workshops. Therefore, the descriptions on which the delegates had to base their decisions in which workshop

¹ Translated from the Spanish original: “ALCA, ALBA o un tercer fuerte y real proceso de integración económico para el desarrollo regional de América Latina”

² Translated from the Spanish original: “El combate al narcotráfico e implementación de medidas alternativas a la producción de las drogas en Latinoamérica”

to participate were evaluated. Nine workshops were offered in MUIMUN 2011. The topics have been: 1) Solution-Focused Problem Solving 2) Introduction to Rhetoric 3) The Economics of Globalisation 4) International humanitarian assistance and the question of humanitarian intervention 5) Intercultural Management 6) Moderation Skills 7) Civil-military Cooperation 8) Representation of Interests of a small country in the United Nations and 9) Communication in groups. Gender, gender equality or different gender impacts or strategies were neither mentioned in any of the descriptions nor included in the title (MUIMUN 2).

Survey about the delegates' images and perceptions

As mentioned before, a survey was conducted to receive impressions about the image which MUIMUN represented among the delegates. 135 out of 187 delegates returned their survey. Survey sheets have been filled in and returned. Among these 67 respondents are male and 68 female. The survey started with questions about self-perceptions about the participation in the committees. At first the delegates were asked if they participated in the General Speakers List. They could answer with not at all, one time, two times, three times or more than three times. Usually, most of the discussion is not in the General Speakers List, thus it is not expected that delegates participated in here too often. But also, in the general Speakers List the speaking time is usually the longest and the delegates have to go to the front to speak. The answer males gave most often was that they spoke twice (mode = 3) whilst the females answered most often that they spoke once (mode = 2). Furthermore, the group of people who did not speak at all is bigger in the females' group (23, 4 %) than in the males' group (11, 5 %). However, with bivariate statistics calculated no correlation has been found (Phi and Cramer's $V = 0,185$).

Next the participation in the Moderated Caucus is examined. In this mode, discussions are more fluent and spontaneous, the speaking time is shorter and the delegates speak from their place. The first question was, whether the delegates have participated actively. They could answer from strongly agree, agree, rather agree, rather disagree, disagree and strongly disagree. The male group most often answers strongly agree and agree (mode = 1 and 2) while for the female group the answer given most often was rather agree (mode = 3). Thus it seems that males participated more actively in the Moderated Caucus. Indeed, concerning the participation Phi and Cramer's $V = 0,292$ prove that there is a weak correlation between gender and participation. The second question was whether the delegates have been able to

convince other delegates of their positions. The answer possibilities were the same. Among both, males and females, the most answered by rather agree (mode = 3). The distribution within the table shows that among men 21, 6 % more were strongly agreeing that they were convincing whilst among the female group only 6, 5% were strongly agreeing that they were convincing. So, again it seems that males were performing more actively in the Moderated Caucus than females. For the second question Phi and Cramer's V with values of both 0,286 prove that there is a weak correlation between gender and participation in Moderated Caucus.

At last, Unmoderated Caucus needed to be examined. This mode is about background negotiations, preparing drafts and amendments and finding groups of delegates with similar positions and convince them of one's own positions. The delegates were asked if they have been able to enforce the position of their country represented in the Unmoderated Caucus, what they could answer with the agreement ranking. Univariate statistics (mode = 3) and the table do not show big differences between males and females. Nevertheless, 23 % of the males but only 12, 5 % of the females answered with strongly agree. Nevertheless, no correlation calculated by Phi and Cramer's V= 0,154.

The delegates also were asked if gender equality appeared in the contents discussed or prepared. Since the contents apply to all delegates, no comparisons between the genders are made. At first they were asked if the topics which had to be prepared for the committees encouraged them to include gender equality issues in the pre-conference research. Here, 78, 9 % answered with no and 21, 1 % with yes (mode = 2). This shows that most people did not include gender in their pre-research. But it is interesting to have a look at which topics encouraged to include gender research. Therefore, the data is also analyzed according to topic and committee. But neither statistics nor tables show any correlation between the committee where the delegates were in and a pre-research on gender topics.

Next, the delegates were asked if gender equality issues came up during the debates in the committee. 18, 9 % answered with yes and 81, 1 % answered with no. If the data is split according to the committees it is obvious that in all committees the mode is 2 meaning that gender equality issues did not come up during the debates. The only exception is the FAO where the mode was one and 84, 6 % of the delegates proved that gender equality issues came up.

Furthermore, the delegates were asked if gender equality issues have been discussed in the workshop they attended. They could again answer with the range of

agreement from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The answer given most often has been “strongly disagree” (mode = 6). The table shows that only 17, 3 % discussed gender equality at all. Unfortunately, the survey did not ask which workshop was attended. Hence it was not possible to find out in which workshops gender equality has been discussed.

Then questions should give an impression of the roles of females and males in the conference. The delegates have been asked about their assumptions how many males and females participated in the conference. This question is about visibility of both genders during the conference. They could answer with clearly more males, more males, slightly more males, equal representation, slightly more females, more females and clearly more females. Here, firstly the overall assumptions are regarded. The answer given most often is that there were more male delegates (mode = 2). In detail 54, 6 % assume there to be more male delegates, 30, 3% assume there to be equal presentation. In comparison the answer given most often by male delegates was that male and female students were equally present (mode = 4). In contrast, the answer given most often was that there are more male delegates (mode = 4). Phi and Cramer’s V with 0,339 prove that there is a medium strength relationship between gender and assumption of the gender of students present at MUIMUN.

The last question should clarify the assumption about gender equal decision-making power in the organizational team. The delegates could answer with males or females to have more or slightly more decision-making power, that they have equal decision-making power or that they do not know. Here again, at first the overall assumptions are regarded. The answer given most often was that they have equal decision-making power (mode = 3). 25, 2 % of the respondents answered that they do not know. 14, 2 % assumed males to have more decision-making power and 17, 5 % assumed males to have slightly more decision-making power. In comparison between the genders the mode was the same for both but the table shows 38,3 % of the females assumed males to have more decision-making power while only 25, 4 of the males supposed males to have more decision-making power. The weak correlation between gender and decision-making power is proved by Phi and Cramer’s V =0, 225.

7.2 Interpretation of the results of the External Gender Analysis

Hierarchical and horizontal division of labour externally represented

The different roles of male and females have been examined first in the external analysis. The examination has shown that chairpersons, workshop experts and patrons were predominantly male. Since the patron should radiate dignity and success and the chairpersons as well as the workshop experts have a superior position near to a lecturer there is again a hierarchical division of presence between males and females.

Furthermore, the analysis showed the roles represented by the organizational team. Most visible was the completely male Secretariat in 2011. Nevertheless, the hierarchical division in the Secretariat cannot be completely validated. The reason is that although more often males have been in the Secretariat, females more often occupied the higher position. In addition, the delegates were asked in the survey if they assume males or females to have more decision-making power. Although most delegates assumed the decision-making power to be equal for males and females, one third of the participants assumed the male team members to have more decision-making power. Thus, at least for one third of the delegates, there is hierarchical division of labour externally represented. Furthermore, females assumed males to have more decision-making power. This can be explained with Joan Acker. Acker explored that men do not tend to see their gender privilege and therefore undervalue their hegemony (Acker, 2006:452).

For roles of the delegates it seems that although the number of male and female participants is nearly equal the males were more active and visible. This is confirmed by the opening speeches which were mostly given by males. Also, this is partly confirmed by the survey which shows that males participated more actively and could enforce their positions better in the Moderated Caucus. Nevertheless, this is not valid for the General Speakers List and the Unmoderated Caucus. But as the survey shows, more than half of the participants assumed that more males were participating in the conference. These points illustrate that in general males seemed to be more visible and took a more active role in the conference than females. So, it is striking, that there are gendered roles in the participation. Male's representation has been valued higher although there is no formal hierarchy in the participation and males and females actually are working on the same tasks in. This is a phenomenon which is explained by Burton. She argues that even if men and women do identical tasks, male work is valued higher due to the attributes and values which are

associated with them (Burton, 1992:191). Also, Maddock argues that in organizations a hierarchy emerges automatically and therefore each activity has its gender tag (Maddock, 1999:90). So, also within the participants a gendered hierarchy emerged which was externally represented.

In sum, for the roles of the delegates, the organizational team and also the representative persons, it is striking that there is a gendered hierarchical division externally represented by all of the three groups. It can be argued, that male's work has been valued higher and males have been assumed to fit better in these positions. Thus, the roles represented externally prove the theoretical assumptions of the abstract worker as well as the organizational culture concept of hegemonic masculinity. Men receive a higher valuation for their work and higher prestige from the organization. It is therefore valid for the external representation that they are found more often in hierarchically high positions.

What has been also discussed in the internal analysis is that the positions related to service were mostly occupied by females. This is also represented externally by the MUIMUN organization team since all positions of helpers and service were occupied by females. So, a horizontal division of labour is also represented externally. Different valuation based on different construction of appropriate male and female jobs led to positions of service and care which always have a touch of subordination to be occupied by females (Maddock, 1999:68 f, Gheradi, 1995:15).

Gender equality in the programs

In a second step the programs for the addressees have been regarded. Firstly, contents of the debates neither mentioned gender dimensions in the title nor in the study guides. The only exception was the topic A of the GA 3. However, the survey showed that this did not specially encourage the delegates of GA3 to include gender in their pre-conference research not even where it was mentioned. More than three quarters of the delegates did not include gender at all in their pre-conference research and four-fifth stated that gender equality did not appear in their debates. Only for the FAO gender equality issues were important. Secondly, also for the workshop contents the descriptions did not include gender equality issues. Furthermore, in the survey four-fifth stated that gender equality issues were not mentioned in their workshop. This shows that MUIMUN does not reflect any topical involvement of gender equality. Thus, it neglects gender equality issues as

important part of its programs and the topics discussed. This proves the thesis of Joan Acker that awareness about gender and gender inequality tend to disappear in voluntary organizations or are seen as something that is beside the point of the organization (Acker, 2006:452). Furthermore, this shows that MUIIMUN has not recognized in its programs that the general, universal picture is always constructed male. The female perspective is left out. Therefore, in fact it would be important to include a gender perspective (Acker, 1990:88).

All in all, the external analysis shows that MUIIMUN represents non-involvement with gender equality teams in its programs and gendered roles in the conference. So, what has been proved again is that male and female work is valued differently. This is proven by the hierarchical and horizontal division of labour as laid down by the concept of the abstract worker and organizational culture concept of hegemonic masculinity. On the other hand it shows that gender equality is not regarded as important feature for the addressees and is left out of the debate.

In sum, these findings form the public image of MUIIMUN. The external analysis shows that even modern voluntary organizations with the self-conceptions of gender neutrality cannot completely divert from the reflection of the societal gendered power structures and thus still reproduces gendered relations (Newman, 1995:18 ff). The public image of MUIIMUN is not an image of gender equality. This must be stated, although most parts of the external analysis have been done for the year 2011. Thus a persistent underlay of inequality and male dominance is proved and also externally represented in MUIIMUN.

8. Conclusion

Gender is a social construct which includes assumptions about a division between the public and the private and about asymmetric gendered power relations which exist in all spheres of society. Therefore, MUIIMUN as a public and societal organization has been examined for its androcentrism. Hence, two approaches in gender and organization theory have been used: The concept of the abstract worker and the organizational culture concept of hegemonic masculinity. Both approaches assume organizations to be gendered. Gendered assumptions of abilities and of an ideal worker lead to a different work valuation for male and female work. Thus, horizontal and hierarchical division of labour for males and females in organizations emerge. It has also been argued, that voluntary organizations might try to minimize gender inequality but that nevertheless a gender inequality prevails.

To validate these assumptions, the thesis has examined if MUIIMUN is shaped by the underlay of gender inequality and male dominance. This has been done by a Gender Analysis which is methodologically based on Gender Mainstreaming as defined by the EU. The internal analysis has shown that the organizational team and processes indeed are shaped by gender inequality. Hierarchical and horizontal divisions of labour are still existent although gender equality has been adopted in the charter and MUIIMUN is a voluntary organization with flat hierarchies. The external analysis has shown that gendered role patterns also are represented externally. For the role of the patrons, delegates and organizational team members hierarchical and horizontal divisions of labour occur during the conference. Furthermore, in the contents of the debates and the workshops gender and gender equality are not included. Also, MUIIMUN does not externally represent a topical engagement with these topics. Consequently, externally represented gendered divisions of labour and non-engagement with gender topics shape the public image of MUIIMUN. This is at least valid for the year 2011. Altogether, this shows that MUIIMUN failed to include gender and gender equality topics in its own organizational work as well as in the external representation. In sum, the hypothesis that MUIIMUN is an organization, which although its preconditions for gender equality are quite well is nevertheless shaped by the underlying gender inequality and male dominance, can be validated.

For succeeding studies it would be interesting to examine how decisions about the representative positions were made. Furthermore, it would be interesting to ask the team members about their motivations for their horizontal and vertical positions in the teams. So, a subsequent study should focus on qualitative research. For MUIIMUN the conducted analysis can be important to rethink the public image as well as the organizational processes with regard to gender equality. It should be kept in mind to achieve more effective and efficient work, enhanced democratic and social values, equality and a better working atmosphere. This could attract more sponsors and delegates and helps to establish more accurate programs and debates for males and females. So, succeeding research should focus on the next steps of the Gender Mainstreaming process. Nevertheless, this Gender Analysis already can be assumed to be a first step in the direction of gender equality. As many theorists on Gender Mainstreaming state, Gender Analysis is a sensitizing first step and thus already is the changing moment in the organization (Döge, 2003:8).

Bibliography

A) Literature

Acker, J. (1992). Gendering Organizational Theory. In A. J. Mills and P. [Tranced-] Sheriff (Ed.), *Gendering Organizational Analysis* (pp. 248 – 260). London: SAGE Publications.

Acker, J. (1990). Hierarchies, Jobs and Bodies: A theory of Gendered Organizations. *Gender and Society*, 4 (2), 81 - 95.

Acker, J. (2006). Inequality Regimes: Gender, Class and Race in Organizations. *Gender and Society*, 20 (4), 441 - 464.

Alvesson, M. and Billing Y.D. (1997). *Understanding Gender and Organizations*. London: SAGE Publications.

Becker-Schmidt, R. and Knapp G. (2007). *Feministische Theorien zur Einführung*. Hamburg: Junius.

Brake, A. (2009). Schriftliche Befragung. In S. Kühl, P. Strodtholz and A. Taffertshofer (Ed), *Handbuch Methoden der Organisationsforschung: Quantitative und Qualitative Methoden* (pp. 392 - 411). Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

Bühner, M. (2011). *Einführung in die Test- und Fragebogenkonstruktion*. München: Pearson Studium.

Burbach, C. (2006). Genderperspektiven in der Personalentwicklung am Beispiel der Hannoverschen Landeskirche. In C. Burbach and P. Döge (Ed.), *Gender Mainstreaming: Lernprozesse in wissenschaftlichen, kirchlichen und politischen Organisationen* (pp. 50 -60). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Burbach, C. and Döge, P. (2006). Gender - Bildung in Organisationen. In C. Burbach and P. Döge (Ed.), *Gender Mainstreaming: Lernprozesse in wissenschaftlichen, kirchlichen und politischen Organisationen* (pp. 185 - 194). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Burton, C. (1992). Merit and Gender: Organizations and the Mobilization of Masculine Bias. In A. J. Mills and P. [Tranced-] Sheriff (Ed.), *Gendering Organizational Analysis* (pp. 185 – 196). London: SAGE Publications.

Campbell, E.J. and [Tranced-] Sheriff, P.(1992). Room for Women: A Case Study in the Sociology of Organizations. In A. J. Mills and P. [Tranced-] Sheriff (Ed.), *Gendering Organizational Analysis* (pp. 31 – 45). London: SAGE Publications.

Cockburn, C. (1991). *In the way of women: Men's resistance to sex equality in organizations*. New York: ILR Press.

Council of Europe (Ed.) (1998). *Gender Mainstreaming: Conceptual framework, methodology and presentation of good practices*. Strasbourg.

Defeis, E. (1999). The Treaty of Amsterdam: The Next Step Towards Gender Equality? [Electronic Version]. *Boston College International and Comparative Law Review*, 23 (1). Retrieved May 18, 2011, from <http://lawdigitalcommons.bc.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1197&context=iclr&sei-redir=1#search=%22Defeis+Gender+Equality+Amsterdam%22>

Döge, P. (2003). Gender Mainstreaming als gemeinsamer Lernprozess von Männer und Frauen: Blockaden und Ansatzpunkte [Electronic Version]. In D. Janshen and M. Meuser (Ed.), *Schriften des Essener Kollegs für Geschlechterforschung*, 1 (3). Retrieved June 6, 2011, from http://www.uni-due.de/imperia/md/content/ekfg/peter__doege_gender_mainstreaming.pdf

Döge, P. (2000). Männerbildung als Beitrag zur Geschlechterdemokratie: Erwerbs(Arbeits-)Mann und MachtMann als Blockaden. *DIE Zeitschrift für Erwachsenenbildung*, 4, 28 - 30.

Döge, P. (2006). Von der Gleichstellung zur diskriminierungsfreien Gestaltung von Geschlechterkulturen: Gender Mainstreaming als Männlichkeitskritik. In C. Burbach and P. Döge (Ed.), *Gender Mainstreaming: Lernprozesse in wissenschaftlichen, kirchlichen und politischen Organisationen* (pp. 25 - 35). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Ehrhardt, A. and Jansen M. (2003). *Gender Mainstreaming: Grundlagen, Prinzipien, Instrumente*. Wiesbaden: Hessische Landeszentrale für politische Bildung.

Englert, D. (2009). *Soziale Innovation durch Gender Mainstreaming?* Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

European Commission (Ed.) (2004). *EQUAL Leitfaden zu Gender Mainstreaming*. Luxemburg.

European Commission (Ed.) (2008). *Gender Equality: Programming guide for Strategy Papers*. Brussels.

Gherardi, S. (1995). *Gender, symbolism and organizational cultures*. London: SAGE Publications.

Gröner, L. (2002). Frauen gestalten Europa. Gender Mainstreaming in der Europäischen Union. In R. Roemheld (Ed.), *Wie geht es Ihnen Madame Europe? Gendering in Politik und Verfassung in der Europäischen Union* (pp. 91 – 97). Herbolzheim: Centaurus.

Hearn, J. and Parkin W. (1987). *“Sex” at “work”: The Power and Paradox of Organisation Sexuality*. Brighton: Wheatsheaf Books.

Huschke, J. (2002). *Gender Mainstreaming: Eine neue frauenpolitische Initiative der EU oder nur ein weiteres Schlagwort? Ein aktueller Diskussionsbeitrag*. Osnabrück: Der Andere Verlag.

Itzin, C. (1995). Gender, culture, power and change: A materialist analysis. In C. Itzin and J. Newman (Ed.), *Gender, Culture and Organizational Change: Putting Theory into Practice* (pp. 246 - 272). London: Routledge.

Jung, D. (2006). Gender Mainstreaming – eine Strategie zur betrieblichen Veränderung für kleine und mittelständische Unternehmen. In Bundesministerium für Arbeit und Soziales (Ed.), *Gender Mainstreaming: Grundlagen und Strategien im Rahmen der Gemeinschaftsinitiative EQUAL*. Bonn.

Kahlert, H. (2003). *Gender Mainstreaming an Hochschulen: Anleitung zum qualitätsbewussten Handeln*. Opladen: Leske + Budrich.

- Kanter, R. M. (1977). *Men and Women of the Corporation*. New York: Basic Books.
- Kerssenfischer, I. and Schollas, T. (2006). Die Nordelbische Kirche und die Umsetzung des Gender Mainstreaming Verfahrens. In C. Burbach and P. Döge (Ed.), *Gender Mainstreaming: Lernprozesse in wissenschaftlichen, kirchlichen und politischen Organisationen* (pp. 39 - 49). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Klinger, C. (2004). Macht - Herrschaft – Gewalt. In S.K. Rosenberger and B. Sauer (Ed.), *Politikwissenschaft und Geschlecht* (pp. 83 - 105). Wien: WUV Facultas.
- Kreisky, E. (2004). Geschlecht als politische und politikwissenschaftliche Kategorie. In S.K. Rosenberger and B. Sauer (Ed.), *Politikwissenschaft und Geschlecht* (pp. 23 - 43). Wien: WUV Facultas.
- Kühl, S, Strodtholz P. und Taffertshofer A. (Ed). (2005). *Quantitative Methoden der Organisationsforschung: Ein Handbuch*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Lang, S. (2004). Politik – Öffentlichkeit – Privatheit. In S.K. Rosenberger and B. Sauer (Ed.), *Politikwissenschaft und Geschlecht* (pp. 65 - 81). Wien: WUV Facultas.
- Lange, R. (2004). Gender Mainstreaming – Ein Ansatz zur Veränderung von Männlichkeitsdiskursen in Organisationen? *Sozialwissenschaften und Berufspraxis*, 27 (4), 409 – 418.
- Lange, R. (1998). *Geschlechterverhältnisse im Management von Organisationen*. Miring: Hemp.
- Martin, J. (1990). Deconstructing organizational taboos: The suppression of gender conflict in organizations. *Organization Science*, 1 (4), 339-359.
- Maddock, S. (1999). *Challenging Women: Gender Culture and Organization*. London: SAGE Publications.
- McIntosh, D. (2001). The Uses and Limits of the Model United Nations in an International Relations Classroom. *International Studies Perspectives* 2 (3), 269-280.
- Mills, A. J. (1993). Gender, Sexuality and Organization Theory. In J. Hearn et al. (Ed.), *The Sexuality of Organization* (pp. 29 – 44). London: SAGE Publications.
- Mills, A. J. (1992). Organization, Gender, and Culture. In A. J. Mills and P. [Tranced-] Sheriff (Ed.), *Gendering Organizational Analysis* (pp. 93 – 111). London: SAGE Publications.
- Muldoon, J.P. Jr. (1995). The Model United Nations Revisited. *Simulation & Gaming*, 26 (1), 27 – 35.
- Müller, H. (2007). *Gender Mainstreaming im Mehrebenensystem der EU: Erfolge und Grenzen regionale Politik-Innovationen*. Hamburg: Lit Verlag.
- Mummendey, H. (1987). *Die Fragebogenmethode*. Göttingen: Hogrefe.

Newman, J. (1995). Gender and cultural change. In C. Itzin and J. Newman (Ed.), *Gender, Culture and Organizational Change: Putting Theory into Practice* (pp. 11 - 29). London: Routledge.

Pringle, R. (1993). Bureaucracy, Rationality and Sexuality. The case of Secretaries. In J. Hearn et al. (Ed.), *The Sexuality of Organization* (pp. 158 - 177). London: SAGE Publications.

Ramsay, K. and Parker, M. (1992). Gender, bureaucracy and organizational culture. In M. Savage and A. Witz (Ed.), *Gender and Bureaucracy* (pp. 253 - 276). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Rastetter, D. (1994). *Sexualität und Herrschaft in Organisationen: Eine geschlechtervergleichende Analyse*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Regenhard, U. (2000). Abschied von der männlichen Organisation: Neue Organisationskonzepte und Geschlechterordnung. In H. Riebe, S. Düringer and H. Leistner (Ed.), *Perspektiven für Frauen in Organisationen. Neue Organisations- und Managementkonzepte kritisch hinterfragt* (pp. 14 - 47). Münster: Votum.

Rosenberger, S. K. and Sauer, B. (2004). Glossar. In S.K. Rosenberger and B. Sauer (Ed.), *Politikwissenschaft und Geschlecht* (pp. 251 - 272). Wien: WUV Facultas.

Schambach, G. and von Bargen, H. (2001). Einleitung: Geschlechterdemokratie in der Heinrich-Böll-Stiftung. In Heinrich-Böll-Stiftung (Ed.), *Geschlechterdemokratie: Vielfalt der Visionen – Visionen der Vielfalt* (pp. 11 – 20). Berlin: Heinrich-Böll - Stiftung.

Steinhage, R. (2006). Gender Mainstreaming in Organisationen: Die Berücksichtigung geschlechtsspezifischer Interessen und Bedürfnisse. In U. Strautmann und C. Zimmermann-Lotz (Ed.), *Personenzentriertes Coaching und Supervision: Ein interdisziplinärer Balanceakt* (pp. 160 -176). Kröning: Roland Asanger Verlag.

Thürmer - Rohr, C. (2001). Geschlechterdemokratie. In Heinrich-Böll-Stiftung (Ed.), *Geschlechterdemokratie: Vielfalt der Visionen – Visionen der Vielfalt* (pp. 21 – 33). Berlin: Heinrich-Böll – Stiftung.

Weg, M. (2002). Gender Mainstreaming als gleichstellungsfördernde Politikmethode. In R. Roemheld (Ed.), *Wie geht es Ihnen Madame Europe? Gendering in Politik und Verfassung in der Europäischen Union* (pp. 63 – 90). Herbolzheim: Centaurus.

Witz, A. and Savage, M. (1992). The gender of organizations. In M. Savage and A. Witz (Ed.), *Gender and Bureaucracy* (pp. 3 - 65). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

B) Documents used for the internal and external analysis

a) Delegates' Handbooks

Münster University International Model United Nations (2011). *Delegates' Handbook: March 28 - April 1, 2011: Humanity vs. Greed – A Roadmap to Global Accountability*. Münster: MUIMUN.

Münster University International Model United Nations (2010). *Delegates' Handbook: April 5 – April 9, 2010: Global Crises as Global Chances? Redefining Perspectives on Trade, Governance and Social Responsibility*. Münster: MUIIMUN.

Münster University International Model United Nations (2009). *Delegates' Handbook: March 30 - April 3, 2009: Scarcity: A challenge for Security and Development*. Münster: MUIIMUN.

Münster University International Model United Nations (2008). *Delegates' Handbook: April 1 - April 5, 2008: Power Politics, Trade and Peace Building*. Münster: MUIIMUN.

b) Study Guides

Batel, T. and Dröge, B. (2011). Study Guide: The Economic and Social Council. Münster: MUIIMUN.

Retrieved at April 25, 2011, from
http://muimun.org/studyguides/2011/Study_Guide_ECOSOC.pdf

Dogar, A.H. and Mokry, C. (2011). Study Guide: The Sixth Committee of the General Assembly. Münster: MUIIMUN.

Retrieved at April 25, 2011, from
http://muimun.org/studyguides/2011/Study_Guide_GA6.pdf

Khilji, U. and Trejo Ramírez, M. P. (2011). Study Guide: Security Council. Münster: MUIIMUN.

Retrieved at April 25, 2011, from
http://muimun.org/studyguides/2011/Study_Guide_SC.pdf

Malik, S.H. and Salz, P. (2011). Study Guide: The Third Committee of the General Assembly. Münster: MUIIMUN.

Retrieved at April 25, 2011, from
http://muimun.org/studyguides/2011/Study_Guide_GA3.pdf

Möllmann J. and Rühl J. (2011). Study Guide: The Second Committee of the General Assembly. Münster: MUIIMUN.

Retrieved at April 25, 2011, from
http://muimun.org/studyguides/2011/Study_Guide_GA2.pdf

Schiller, M. and Shah, R.B. (2011). Study Guide: Food and Agricultural Organization. Münster: MUIIMUN.

Retrieved at April 25, 2011, from
http://muimun.org/studyguides/2011/Study_Guide_FAO.pdf

Villena, J.C. and (2011). Münster: MUIIMUN
MUIIMUN Dokumente: Study Guide: Comisión Económica para América Latina y el Caribe.
Münster: MUIIMUN.

Retrieved at April 25, 2011, from
http://muimun.org/studyguides/2011/Study_Guide_CEPAL.pdf

c) Information from the MUIMUN website

MUIMUN 1: http://www.muimun.org/muimun_how_it.html

MUIMUN 2: http://www.muimun.org/german_auf_einen_blick.html

MUIMUN 3: <http://muimun.org/workshop.html>

Annex

A) Survey Questionnaire

For the survey a special questionnaire was established, which was attached to the MUIMUN evaluation. Nevertheless, two questions from the evaluation have been used. These were

- 1) You are
 - male
 - female

- 2) Which committee were you in?
 - Economic and Social Council
 - General Assembly 2
 - General Assembly 3
 - General Assembly 3
 - Security Council
 - CEPAL
 - FAO

The questionnaire for the gender was constructed after I developed first ideas about the gender analysis. Since some points changed in the thesis questions have been left out which did not fit to my scientific interest anymore. These are the questions which have been given to the delegates accompanied by the introduction for the survey:

“In addition, we ask you to answer to some further questions. In the following you will find various questions and statements about your experiences at MUIMUN. Please answer the following questions as openly and spontaneously as possible since your answers will become an integral part of a research thesis which examines the organisational development of MUIMUN. This questionnaire is about your personal perceptions, **there is no right or wrong**. Please respond to all questions. Your data protection and anonymity is guaranteed.

Please answer some questions about the committee sessions

The committee I am in was

- first preference
- second preference
- third preference
- I don't remember my preference list

I have spoken in the **General Speakers**

List

- not at all
- 1 time
- 2 times
- 3 times
- more than 3 times

I have actively participated during the **Moderated** Caucus

- strongly agree
- agree
- rather agree
- rather disagree
- disagree
- strongly disagree

I have been able to convince other delegates of my country's opinion in the

Moderated Caucus

- strongly agree
- agree
- rather agree
- rather disagree
- disagree
- strongly disagree

During the **Unmoderated** Caucus

- male delegates were dominating the discussions
- male delegates were slightly dominating the discussions
- there was no domination
- female delegates were slightly dominating the discussions
- female delegates were dominating the discussions

I have been able to enforce my country's position in the **Unmoderated** Caucus

- strongly agree
- agree
- rather agree
- rather disagree
- disagree
- strongly disagree

I have been able to include my positions in a **draft** resolution

- strongly agree
- agree
- rather agree
- rather disagree
- disagree
- strongly disagree

I have been able to include my positions in the resolution adopted by my committee

- strongly agree
- agree
- rather agree
- rather disagree
- disagree
- strongly disagree
- We did not pass a resolution

Please answer some questions about the contents discussed at MUIMUN

The MUIMUN committee topics have encouraged me to include gender equality issues in my pre-conference research

- yes
- no

Gender equality issues came up during the debates in my committee

- yes
- no

For the topics of my committee, gender equality issues are important

- strongly agree
- agree
- rather agree
- rather disagree
- disagree
- strongly disagree

Gender equality issues have been discussed in my **workshop**

- strongly agree
- agree
- rather agree
- rather disagree
- disagree
- strongly disagree
- I did not attend a workshop

Please answer four last questions about the organization, you're almost finished now 😊

The chairs manage well to call on equally male and female delegates, who wish to speak.

- strongly agree
- agree
- rather agree
- rather disagree
- disagree
- strongly disagree

At the MUIMUN conference

- there are clearly more male delegates
- there are more male delegates
- there are slightly more male delegates
- male and female students are equally represented
- there are slightly more female delegates
- there are more female delegates
- there are clearly more female delegates

My impression is that in the MUIMUN **organisation** team

- there are clearly more male team members
- there are more male team members
- there are slightly more male team members
- male and female team members are equally represented
- there are slightly more female team members
- there are more female team members
- there are clearly more female team members

It seems that in the MUIMUN **organisation** team

- male members have more decision making power
- male members have slightly more decision making power
- male and female members have equal decision making power
- female members have slightly more decision making power
- female members have more decision making power
- I don't know

B) Results of the survey

In this section the data and results of the questions interpreted in the thesis are listed. The arrangement follows that of the analysis. It starts with univariate statistics and the tables. Then bivariate statistics follow.

a) Participation

i) Participation in the General Speakers List

Question: I have spoken in the General Speakers List

- not at all
- 1 time
- 2 times
- 3 times
- more than 3 times

Univariate statistics comparing males and females

male	N	Gültig	61
		Fehlend	6
	Modus		3
female	N	Gültig	64
		Fehlend	4
	Modus		2

gender			Häufigkeit	Prozent	Gültige Prozente	Kumulierte Prozente
male	Gültig	Not at all	7	10,4	11,5	11,5
		Once	14	20,9	23,0	34,4
		Twice	17	25,4	27,9	62,3
		Three times	7	10,4	11,5	73,8
		More than 3 times	16	23,9	26,2	100,0
		Gesamt	61	91,0	100,0	
	Fehlend	System	6	9,0		
Gesamt			67	100,0		
female	Gültig	Not at all	15	22,1	23,4	23,4
		Once	16	23,5	25,0	48,4
		Twice	14	20,6	21,9	70,3
		Three times	8	11,8	12,5	82,8
		More than 3 times	11	16,2	17,2	100,0
		Gesamt	64	94,1	100,0	
	Fehlend	System	4	5,9		
Gesamt			68	100,0		

Bivariate statistics with gender as independent variable and participation as dependent variable

		Wert	Näherungsweise Signifikanz
Nominal- bzgl. Nominalmaß	Phi	,185	,372
	Cramer-V	,185	,372
Anzahl der gültigen Fälle		125	

ii) Participation in the Moderated Caucus

Question: I have actively participated during the **Moderated** Caucus

- strongly agree
- agree
- rather agree
- rather disagree
- disagree
- strongly disagree

Univariate statistics comparing males and females

male	N	Gültig	61
		Fehlend	6
		Median	2,00
		Modus	1 ^a
female	N	Gültig	62
		Fehlend	6
		Median	3,00
		Modus	3

- a. Mehrere Modi vorhanden. Der kleinste Wert wird angezeigt.

gender			Häufigkeit	Prozent	Gültige Prozente	Kumulierte Prozente
male	Gültig	Strongly agree	20	29,9	32,8	32,8
		Agree	20	29,9	32,8	65,6
		Rather agree	12	17,9	19,7	85,2
		Rather disagree	6	9,0	9,8	95,1
		Disagree	3	4,5	4,9	100,0
		Gesamt	61	91,0	100,0	
	Fehlend	System	6	9,0		
Gesamt			67	100,0		
female	Gültig	Strongly agree	8	11,8	12,9	12,9
		Agree	18	26,5	29,0	41,9
		Rather agree	24	35,3	38,7	80,6
		Rather disagree	7	10,3	11,3	91,9
		Disagree	4	5,9	6,5	98,4
		Strongly disagree	1	1,5	1,6	100,0
	Gesamt	62	91,2	100,0		
Fehlend	System	6	8,8			
Gesamt			68	100,0		

Bivariate statistics with gender as independent variable and participation as dependent variable

		Wert	Näherungsweise Signifikanz
Nominal- bzgl. Nominalmaß	Phi	,292	,063
	Cramer-V	,292	,063
Anzahl der gültigen Fälle		123	

iii) Self-perception of persuasiveness in the Moderated Caucus

Question: I have been able to convince other delegates of my country's opinion in the **Moderated** Caucus

- strongly agree
- agree
- rather agree
- rather disagree
- disagree
- strongly disagree

Univariate statistics comparing males and females

male	N	Gültig	61
		Fehlend	6
	Median		3,00
	Modus		3
female	N	Gültig	62
		Fehlend	6
	Median		3,00
	Modus		3

gender			Häufigkeit	Prozent	Gültige Prozente	Kumulierte Prozente
male	Gültig	Strongly agree	13	19,4	21,3	21,3
		Agree	17	25,4	27,9	49,2
		Rather agree	20	29,9	32,8	82,0
		Rather disagree	6	9,0	9,8	91,8
		Disagree	3	4,5	4,9	96,7
		Strongly disagree	2	3,0	3,3	100,0
		Gesamt	61	91,0	100,0	
	Fehlend	System	6	9,0		
Gesamt			67	100,0		
female	Gültig	Strongly agree	4	5,9	6,5	6,5
		Agree	16	23,5	25,8	32,3
		Rather agree	23	33,8	37,1	69,4
		Rather disagree	16	23,5	25,8	95,2
		Disagree	2	2,9	3,2	98,4
		Strongly disagree	1	1,5	1,6	100,0
		Gesamt	62	91,2	100,0	
	Fehlend	System	6	8,8		
Gesamt			68	100,0		

Bivariate statistics with gender as independent and participation as dependent variable

		Wert	Näherungsweise Signifikanz
Nominal- bzgl. Nominalmaß	Phi	,286	,073
	Cramer-V	,286	,073
Anzahl der gültigen Fälle		123	

iv) Self-perception of persuasiveness in the Unmoderated Caucus

Question: I have been able to enforce my country's position in the **Unmoderated** Caucus

- strongly agree
- agree
- rather agree
- rather disagree
- disagree
- strongly disagree

Univariate statistics comparing males and females

male	N	Gültig	61
		Fehlend	6
	Median		3,00
	Modus		3
female	N	Gültig	64
		Fehlend	4
	Median		3,00
	Modus		3

gender			Häufigkeit	Prozent	Gültige Prozente	Kumulierte Prozente
male	Gültig	Strongly agree	14	20,9	23,0	23,0
		Agree	15	22,4	24,6	47,5
		Rather agree	21	31,3	34,4	82,0
		Rather disagree	9	13,4	14,8	96,7
		Disagree	1	1,5	1,6	98,4
		Strongly disagree	1	1,5	1,6	100,0
		Gesamt	61	91,0	100,0	
	Fehlend	System	6	9,0		
Gesamt			67	100,0		
female	Gültig	Strongly agree	8	11,8	12,5	12,5
		Agree	21	30,9	32,8	45,3
		Rather agree	22	32,4	34,4	79,7
		Rather disagree	10	14,7	15,6	95,3
		Disagree	2	2,9	3,1	98,4
		Strongly disagree	1	1,5	1,6	100,0
		Gesamt	64	94,1	100,0	
	Fehlend	System	4	5,9		
Gesamt			68	100,0		

Bivariate statistics with gender as independent and participation as dependent variable

		Wert	Näherungsweise Signifikanz
Nominal- bzgl. Nominalmaß	Phi	,154	,704
	Cramer-V	,154	,704
Anzahl der gültigen Fälle		125	

b) Contents

i) Gender Equality issues in pre-conference research

Question: The MUIMUN committee topics have encouraged me to include gender equality issues in my pre-conference research

yes

no

Univariate statistics for the complete group

N	Gültig	123
	Fehlend	12
Modus		2

		Häufigkeit	Prozent	Gültige Prozente	Kumulierte Prozente
Gültig	yes	26	19,3	21,1	21,1
	no	97	71,9	78,9	100,0
	Gesamt	123	91,1	100,0	
Fehlend	System	12	8,9		
Gesamt		135	100,0		

Univariate statistics comparing committees

committee			Häufigkeit	Prozent	Gültige Prozente	Kumulierte Prozente
GA2	Gültig	yes	3	14,3	16,7	16,7
		no	15	71,4	83,3	100,0
		Gesamt	18	85,7	100,0	
	Fehlend	System	3	14,3		
	Gesamt		21	100,0		
GA 3	Gültig	yes	6	23,1	26,1	26,1
		no	17	65,4	73,9	100,0
		Gesamt	23	88,5	100,0	
	Fehlend	System	3	11,5		
	Gesamt		26	100,0		
GA 6	Gültig	yes	5	19,2	19,2	19,2
		no	21	80,8	80,8	100,0
		Gesamt	26	100,0	100,0	
Security Council	Gültig	yes	3	23,1	27,3	27,3
		no	8	61,5	72,7	100,0
		Gesamt	11	84,6	100,0	
	Fehlend	System	2	15,4		
	Gesamt		13	100,0		
FAO	Gültig	yes	4	30,8	30,8	30,8
		no	9	69,2	69,2	100,0
		Gesamt	13	100,0	100,0	
CEPAL	Gültig	yes	2	14,3	15,4	15,4
		no	11	78,6	84,6	100,0
		Gesamt	13	92,9	100,0	
	Fehlend	System	1	7,1		
	Gesamt		14	100,0		
Ecosoc	Gültig	yes	3	14,3	15,8	15,8
		no	16	76,2	84,2	100,0
		Gesamt	19	90,5	100,0	
	Fehlend	System	2	9,5		
	Gesamt		21	100,0		

ii) Gender Equality issues in the debates

Question: Gender equality issues came up during the debates in my committee

yes

no

Univariate statistics for the complete group

N	Gültig	122
	Fehlend	13
Modus		2

		Häufigkeit	Prozent	Gültige Prozente	Kumulierte Prozente
Gültig	yes	23	17,0	18,9	18,9
	no	99	73,3	81,1	100,0
	Gesamt	122	90,4	100,0	
Fehlend	System	13	9,6		
Gesamt		135	100,0		

Univariate statistics comparing committees

committee			Häufigkeit	Prozent	Gültige Prozente	Kumulierte Prozente	
GA2	Gültig	yes	1	4,8	5,6	5,6	
		no	17	81,0	94,4	100,0	
		Gesamt	18	85,7	100,0		
	Fehlend	System	3	14,3			
		Gesamt	21	100,0			
GA 3	Gültig	yes	4	15,4	18,2	18,2	
		no	18	69,2	81,8	100,0	
		Gesamt	22	84,6	100,0		
	Fehlend	System	4	15,4			
		Gesamt	26	100,0			
GA 6	Gültig	yes	2	7,7	7,7	7,7	
		no	24	92,3	92,3	100,0	
		Gesamt	26	100,0	100,0		
Security Council	Gültig	yes	3	23,1	27,3	27,3	
		no	8	61,5	72,7	100,0	
		Gesamt	11	84,6	100,0		
	Fehlend	System	2	15,4			
		Gesamt	13	100,0			
FAO	Gültig	yes	11	84,6	84,6	84,6	
		no	2	15,4	15,4	100,0	
		Gesamt	13	100,0	100,0		
CEPAL	Gültig	yes	2	14,3	14,3	14,3	
		no	12	85,7	85,7	100,0	
		Gesamt	14	100,0	100,0		
Ecosoc	Gültig	no	18	85,7	100,0	100,0	
		Fehlend	System	3	14,3		
			Gesamt	21	100,0		

iii) Gender Equality issues in the workshop

Question: Gender equality issues have been discussed in my **workshop**

- strongly agree
- agree
- rather agree
- rather disagree
- disagree
- strongly disagree
- I did not attend a workshop

Only univariate statistics for the complete group

N	Gültig	110
	Fehlend	25
Modus		6

		Häufigkeit	Prozent	Gültige Prozente	Kumulierte Prozente
Gültig	Strongly agree	2	1,5	1,8	1,8
	Agree	8	5,9	7,3	9,1
	Rather agree	9	6,7	8,2	17,3
	Rather disagree	14	10,4	12,7	30,0
	Disagree	27	20,0	24,5	54,5
	Strongly disagree	50	37,0	45,5	100,0
	Gesamt	110	81,5	100,0	
Fehlend	System	25	18,5		
Gesamt		135	100,0		

c) Gender Roles

i) Assumption about the number of male and female delegates

Question: At the MUIMUN conference

- there are clearly more male delegates
- there are more male delegates
- there are slightly more male delegates
- male and female students are equally represented
- there are slightly more female delegates
- there are more female delegates
- there are clearly more female delegates

Univariate statistics for the whole group

N	Gültig	119
	Fehlend	16
Median		3,00
Modus		2

		Häufigkeit	Prozent	Gültige Prozente	Kumulierte Prozente
Gültig	Clearly more males	5	3,7	4,2	4,2
	More males	37	27,4	31,1	35,3
	Slightly more males	23	17,0	19,3	54,6
	Equal representation	36	26,7	30,3	84,9
	Slightly more females	11	8,1	9,2	94,1
	More females	4	3,0	3,4	97,5
	Clearly more females	3	2,2	2,5	100,0
	Gesamt	119	88,1	100,0	
Fehlend	System	16	11,9		
Gesamt		135	100,0		

Univariate statistics comparing males and females

male	N	Gültig	59
		Fehlend	8
		Median	3,00
		Modus	4
female	N	Gültig	60
		Fehlend	8
		Median	3,00
		Modus	2

gender			Häufigkeit	Prozent	Gültige Prozente	Kumulierte Prozente
male	Gültig	Clearly more males	1	1,5	1,7	1,7
		More males	14	20,9	23,7	25,4
		Slightly more males	15	22,4	25,4	50,8
		Equal representation	23	34,3	39,0	89,8
		Slightly more females	2	3,0	3,4	93,2
		More females	2	3,0	3,4	96,6
		Clearly more females	2	3,0	3,4	100,0
		Gesamt	59	88,1	100,0	
	Fehlend	System	8	11,9		
	Gesamt	67	100,0			
female	Gültig	Clearly more males	4	5,9	6,7	6,7
		More males	23	33,8	38,3	45,0
		Slightly more males	8	11,8	13,3	58,3
		Equal representation	13	19,1	21,7	80,0
		Slightly more females	9	13,2	15,0	95,0
		More females	2	2,9	3,3	98,3
		Clearly more females	1	1,5	1,7	100,0
		Gesamt	60	88,2	100,0	
	Fehlend	System	8	11,8		
	Gesamt	68	100,0			

Bivariate statistics with gender as independent and number of delegates as dependent variable

	Wert	Näherungsweise Signifikanz
Nominal- bzgl. Nominalmaß Phi	,339	,033
Cramer-V	,339	,033
Anzahl der gültigen Fälle	119	

ii) Assumption of decision making power in the conference team

Question: It seems that in the MUIIMUN **organisation** team

- male members have more decision making power
- male members have slightly more decision making power
- male and female members have equal decision making power
- female members have slightly more decision making power
- female members have more decision making power
- I don't know

Univariate statistics for the whole group

N	Gültig	119
	Fehlend	16
Median		3,00
Modus		3

		Häufigkeit	Prozent	Gültige Prozente	Kumulierte Prozente
Gültig	More males	17	12,6	14,3	14,3
	Slightly more males	21	15,6	17,6	31,9
	Equality	46	34,1	38,7	70,6
	Slightly more females	2	1,5	1,7	72,3
	I don't know	33	24,4	27,7	100,0
	Gesamt	119	88,1	100,0	
Fehlend	System	16	11,9		
Gesamt		135	100,0		

Univariate statistics comparing males and females

gender			Häufigkeit	Prozent	Gültige Prozente	Kumulierte Prozente
male	Gültig	More males	8	11,9	13,6	13,6
		Slightly more males	7	10,4	11,9	25,4
		Equality	27	40,3	45,8	71,2
		Slightly more females	2	3,0	3,4	74,6
		I don't know	15	22,4	25,4	100,0
		Gesamt	59	88,1	100,0	
	Fehlend	System	8	11,9		
Gesamt			67	100,0		
female	Gültig	More males	9	13,2	15,0	15,0
		Slightly more males	14	20,6	23,3	38,3
		Equality	19	27,9	31,7	70,0
		I don't know	18	26,5	30,0	100,0
		Gesamt	60	88,2	100,0	
		Fehlend	System	8	11,8	
	Gesamt			68	100,0	

Bivariate statistics with gender as independent and decision – making power as dependent variable

	Wert	Näherungsweise Signifikanz
Nominal- bzgl. Nominalmaß Phi	,225	,196
Cramer-V	,225	,196
Anzahl der gültigen Fälle	119	