

Equality Means Business?
Governing Gender through Transnational Public-Private Partnerships

by
Elisabeth Prügl and Jacqui True

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in
Review of International Political Economy on January 13, 2014, available online:
<http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/09692290.2013.849277>

Abstract

From the World Bank's "gender equality is smart economics" to the Economist's "womenomics" and Nike's "girl effect", feminism seems to have well and truly penetrated the business world. Government action on behalf of gender equality is well institutionalised but private corporations appear as a new actor in this cause. This article asks: What do businesses and their public partners do in order to advance gender equality? What motivates their engagement now and how does it fit into existing public and private relationships of power? What do they mean for feminist agendas? How legitimate are they? And how effective are they?

To address these questions the article examines four exemplary initiatives involving businesses in advancing gender equality and women's empowerment: the Goldman Sachs 10,000 Women Global Initiative, the World Economic Forum's Women Leaders and Gender Parity Program, the European Union's Programme on Gender Balance in Decision-making Positions, and the UN Global Compact-UNIFEM Women's Empowerment Principles for Business. Our purpose is to conceptually locate these initiatives as new private forms of governance involving partnerships with governments. We assess these initiatives employing criteria of feminist evaluation finding decidedly ambiguous results. We argue that the new attention to gender equality in business and global economic governance is both an expression of and a key process in the transformation of states and corporations in the context of global competition and restructuring.

Equality Means Business?

Governing Gender through Transnational Public-Private Partnerships

The World Bank considers gender equality to be “smart economics”; the Economist (2006) has coined the term “womenomics” referring to the large boost that women’s participation in the labor market has added to global growth (more than the growth of China, India and the Internet combined!); while Nike Corporation touts the “girl effect” signaling the massive payoffs for families, communities and indeed corporations that comes with supporting girls’ education in developing countries. Feminism seems to have well and truly penetrated the business world! Business initiatives to advance the economic position of women are proliferating, leading Diane Stone (2010) to coin the term “global policy feminism” and Adrienne Roberts (2012) to speak of the emergence of “transnational business feminism”. While there has long been attention to achieving gender parity in political representation, moving women into economic power and decision-making positions is a relatively recent concern. And while government action on behalf of gender equality has long been expected, private corporations appear as a new actor in this cause.

The attention to gender equality in business and economic circles is surprising. Men continue to overwhelmingly dominate economic decision-making positions including on corporate boards, as business executives, government financial regulators, trade negotiators and central bankers around the world. Furthermore, business leaders, steeped in logics of profitability, have long been suspicious of social policies that may interfere with economic rationalities. Yet in the wake of globalization we are witnessing new roles of business as power has increasingly shifted away from legislatures toward a range of technocratic and private actors, and corporations are behaving more like states, building corporate patriotism, emphasizing “soft issues” such as their value to society, causes such as poverty eradication, labour standards, environmental sustainability, gender equality, and delivering welfare services (Fransen and Burgoon 2012; Locke and Romis 2010; Porter and Craig 2004). In contrast states are behaving more like traditional corporations, branding themselves, using business-speak, downsizing and privatizing. Ironically, gender

quotas guaranteeing women political representation in national parliaments and legislatures have been advocated by feminist and mainstream political analysts just as power has shifted away from the realm of state policymaking to the realm of private and globalized economic interests. The new attention to gender equality in the business world thus forms part of what many scholars of international political economy refer to as the neoliberal transformation of the state and governance in the context of globalization.

What do businesses and their public partners do in order to advance gender equality? What motivates their engagement now and how does it fit into existing public and private relationships of power? What do they mean for feminist agendas? How legitimate are they? And how effective are they?

In this article we seek to conceptually locate transnational business initiatives for gender equality and the empowerment of women in literatures on public-private partnerships and feminist international political economy. We furthermore explore the legitimacy and effectiveness of four exemplary initiatives, assessing the promise and problems they raise for feminist agendas aimed at the transformation of gender relations. Our purpose is not to provide definitive answers, but to arrive at a more detailed set of questions that can guide future research on the topic and on a proliferation of similar gender-equality oriented business initiatives and knowledge networks emerging nationally, regionally and globally (cf. Young and Scherrer 2010).

Despite the turned up rhetoric about gender equality being good for business, initiatives focusing on gender equality or women's empowerment constitute a minor part of existing public-private partnerships at the international level. According to figures from the UN Fund for International Partnerships, the largest portion of financing has gone into the area of children's health, followed by environmental issues. Women and population programs are third on the list, accounting for just 13 percent of all funding contributed (Thematic Financing n.d.). In a similar vein, a 2009 McKinsey survey showed that only 19 percent of companies contacted were "doing anything specifically focused on women, either directly or indirectly" (*The Business of Empowering Women* 2010: 10). To our knowledge there is no international database listing existing partnerships. Yet, compared to the long-term lack of attention to gender

equality in economic and business circles, these numbers are significant. Several international initiatives are coming together to cheerlead the business case for gender equality. Public sector leadership comes from the World Bank, the European Union, and the United Nations, while in the private sector the World Economic Forum and business consultancies such as Ernst and Young, Accenture, Deloitte and McKinsey are seeking to recruit companies for the cause of women's empowerment. There are also corporate social responsibility initiatives by multinational corporations (such as Nike's 'Girl Effect' program focused on improving the education and health of girls in developing countries).¹ These do not necessarily take the form of partnerships; but they are clearly influenced by them and by broader global policy debates framing gender equality as good for business.

For this article we have selected four initiatives involving businesses and public actors in advancing gender equality and women's empowerment that we consider illustrative of existing efforts. These initiatives have been highly visible and have received significant publicity. They also are distinctive in that they involve highly influential public and private actors that have been able to attract support from powerful partners. The four initiatives are: 1) the Goldman Sachs 10,000 Women Global Initiative, 2) the World Economic Forum's Women Leaders and Gender Parity Program, 3) the European Union's Programme on Gender Balance in Decision-making Positions, and 4) the UN Global Compact-UNIFEM Women's Empowerment Principles for Business. The programs have different degrees of public and private involvement. Goldman Sachs is a private firm and through its 10,000 Women initiative seeks to offer practical business and management education to women in developing countries. The firm partners with business schools, private and non-profit organizations in order to provide this education, a public good in developing countries, while sending a message to other firms and policy-makers. The World Economic Forum is a non-profit institution that invites key stakeholders and leaders mostly from private

¹ The New York Times, "Nike Harnesses 'Girl Effect' Again" November 10, 2010. <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/11/11/giving/11VIDEO.html>

sectors, but also including public and non-profit sector representatives, to collaborate in order to produce changes towards more gender equity both in public policy and in the conduct of firms. The other two programs are initiated by public bodies – the United Nations and the European Union – and reach out to private actors to make commitments and/or join in a network for a common purpose. The EU's program pursues the goal of bringing more women into positions of decision-making, including gender balance in business leadership. The Women's Empowerment Principles amount to a global corporate code of conduct with regard to enhancing gender equality that has been developed through an international process of multi-stakeholder consultation. All four initiatives operate through networks involving multiple stakeholders with some overlapping membership among them. They differ in their emphasis on agenda setting, formulation of new standards and benchmarks, or implementation of programs (cf. Van der Vleuten and Verloo 2012); however, they all share an interest in leveraging social change.

Conceptualizing Transnational Business Initiatives Governing Gender

Business initiatives to advance gender equality and women's empowerment have been conceptualized as public-private partnerships (e.g. Bexell 2012) and the literature on such partnerships provides a useful entry point to understanding the involvement of business in such initiatives. At the international level this literature has been applied particularly productively to investigating new forms of private involvement in the areas of the environment (e.g. Andonova 2006; 2010; Andonova et al. 2009), public health (Reich 2002) and development (Bull and McNeil 2007; Pattberg et al. 2012). There is some debate over the role of civil-society organizations in these partnerships, about their public or private character and thus about the novelty of these partnerships (Schäferhoff et al. 2009: 454; Reich 2002: 4). But what is new is the fact that actors driven largely by private and economic motives have entered the realm of public policy-making and are participating in making rules and implementing policies in the name of the public interest.

Public-private partnerships come in many different forms. They are hybrid governance networks located between purely private and purely public

ideal types (e.g. Andonova et al. 2009; Stevenson 1991). As artifacts of a new form of governance, they are amenable to an investigation from diverse perspectives of governance theory. Rationalists hypothesize that public-private partnerships contribute to the provision of a public good, and often propose that they are functional in the sense that they fill a gap in existing governance structures: they are able to answer demands for governance that states and international organizations cannot fulfill. Others have questioned this assumption, suggesting that partnerships arise not in areas where there is need but in areas where powerful interests push their agendas (Andonova 2006). In the area of gender politics, the rationalist perspective may fail also for other reasons: Gender inequality is not merely a cooperation problem among actors; rather it constitutes a problem of values, social organization, and power relations that is difficult to adequately capture within a rationalist theory of institutions. Business partnerships need to be assessed according to the way in which they shape such gender constructions through norm creation, diffusion, translation and through processes of learning, the way in which they reflect contestations of social forces, and the way in which they participate in governing individual conduct. Feminist constructivist approaches yield insight on these social and politics dynamics and on how far and in what ways governance arrangements produce change in gender relations.

Feminist studies of international governance provide one set of tools to conceptualize such change. First, such studies have recognized the changed forms of governance beyond the state, bringing into view transnational networks of different kinds. These include transnational advocacy networks as much as transnational knowledge networks linking various forms of expertise, transnational executive networks harnessing corporate power to set policy agendas, and global public policy networks that deliver global public goods (Keck and Sikkink 1998; Stone 2010; True and Mintrom 2001). Second, feminists have joined constructivists in proposing an understanding of change in gender relations by reference to changes in international rules, norms, institutions, ideas and discourses (Locher and Prügl 2001; Joachim 2007; Whitworth 1994). This has included an effort to overcome the static conception of international norms that characterizes much constructivist scholarship with a more dynamic

conception of norms as processes that are internally and externally-contested (Krook and True 2012). Feminists have also tried to bridge IR theories of how social relations shape the emergence and reception of international norms within and across states with feminist theories of how hegemonic gendered identities become embodied and normatively prescribed (Agathangelou and Ling 2004; Towns 2010; ---). Feminist scholars have developed understandings of the way in which international norms transform, translate, and morph in various ways: through interpretations at the international level (Zwingel 2013; Krook and True 2012; Elgstrom 2000); through the translation efforts of activists in local contexts (Zwingel 2012; 2013; Levitt et al. 2013; Sabat 2013); and through mechanisms of power in governance institutions (Hoskyns 2008; True 2008; 2009). Understanding public-private partnerships can draw on these approaches putting at the center questions about the normative and political processes they set in motion.

In the area of political economy a range of interdisciplinary literatures provide an understanding of the way in which state and economic transformations have been gendered. First are studies that have developed neo-Gramscian formulations linking changes in gender relations to state policies of economic restructuring and the emergence of new hegemonies between business and government elites (Rai 2004; Bakker and Gill 2006; True 2003). These changes are explicitly conceptualized as “neoliberal” transformations of social forces, states and world order. Neoliberalism in this literature is defined as a political program of market liberalization, deregulation and privatization, made possible through new constellations of social forces and reflected in new material conditions, institutions and ideas (cf. Cox 1981). Transnational business feminism (TBF), is seen as such a new constellation, bringing together public and private actors, including feminist organizations, capitalist states, regional and international funding institutions, NGOs and TNCs, “that converge on promoting women’s equality, particularly in the Global South” (Roberts 2012: 87). Though predating the 2008 Global Financial Crisis, this governance form of feminism has emerged as a cure for the risk-taking, testosterone-driven masculinity associated with the excessive speculation leading to the global financial crisis while

incorporating women in developing countries in capitalist markets and their ongoing expansion (Prügl 2012, Roberts 2012).

Others have employed Foucaultian ideas to illustrate the way in which international discourses produce gendered identities, embed these identities in logics specifying problems and ends, and deploy a set of technologies to achieve desired institutional or biopolitical results (Bexell 2012; Reese 2012; Caglar 2009; Kinsella 2005). In this discursive understanding, neoliberalism encompasses a cultural element, a rationality in the Foucaultian sense comprised less of a political program or material class project than of new mechanisms of government. These mechanisms, generally referred to as “governmentality,” are distinctive in that they seek to produce responsible, self-monitoring selves and set in operation market forces in order to govern populations from a distance (Bexell 2012; Griffin 2013; Ferguson 2009; Larner 2000). They call on the subject to reform itself for the sake of various governmental projects. From this perspective, the business case for gender equality and the public-private partnerships that support it are part of a governmental rationality that reduces gender to a micro-economic factor rather than a structural feature of macro and global economies. Women and men are seen to be firmly anchored in heteronormative identities or ‘households’ with women and girls lacking access to assets and opportunities (Griffin 2009; Bedford 2012; 2007). They also are perceived to be constrained in their economic agency by male violence (True 2012; World Bank 2013). Integrated into neo-liberal governmentality feminism has been co-opted: gender equality delivered through responsabilized selves is no longer costly, instead inequality is. Empowering women in this way promises solutions to all kinds of problems—from a more robust financial system and sustained economic growth to the end of poverty (World Bank 2012; United Nations 2012; Clinton 2010; Sen 1999).

Some scholars have gone so far to suggest that contemporary feminism provides legitimacy to liberalizing economies. Such “free market” or “global policy feminism” has lost its critical force and needs renewal from oppositional activism (Fraser 2009; Eisenstein 2007; Halley *et al* 2006). Others, however, question the portrayal of neoliberalism as an “evil essence” (Ferguson 2009: 318) that, imposed on various social situations, invariably creates negative

outcomes for women and vulnerable populations. Instead, they insist, that like the state itself (Pringle and Watson 1992), neoliberalism is highly malleable, interacting with historical givens and mutating in contested processes of translation. Accordingly, these authors call for empirical investigations to show the diverse forms that neoliberal interventions can take, but also to explore whether these interventions open spaces for progressive politics (Larner 2000; 2003). Processes of neoliberalization entail an adjustment in rules, norms, and discourses that may lead to a new embedding of the economy into a society where masculine domination is transformed (Ferguson 2009; Bergeron and Healy 2013; see also Prügl 2011).

Recognizing transnational public-private partnerships for women's economic empowerment as part of a neoliberalization of feminism with open outcomes, we first proceed to describe the contours of the four cases. What are these partnerships and what do they do? What motivates their engagement now and how do they fit into existing public and private relationships of power? In a second step we explore the legitimacy of these initiatives from a feminist perspective. Principles drawn from feminist methodology, policy evaluation and procedural democracy in global governance suggest the following relevant criteria for judging business partnerships in international governance (Coleman and Porter 2000; Bustelo and Verloo 2009; Ackerly and True 2008, 2010): First is the criterion of inclusiveness and mechanisms to deal with exclusions or biases in the programs enabled by the partnerships. If the partnerships are to promote gender equality and women's empowerment then how far and in what ways do they address the diversity of women and provide opportunities for their participation and representation? What are the mechanisms for reflecting on and revealed potential for gender and other biases in the program design and delivery? A second criterion is the degree of public transparency and accountability of the partnerships especially to those groups who are intentionally and unintentionally affected by their programs. Given the lack of a democratic constituency, international governance initiatives providing public goods are increasingly scrutinized for their external publicity and accountability (Keohane 2003; Grant and Keohane 2005). Governance partnerships can address their democratic deficits by developing appropriate mechanisms of public

accountability rather than needing to represent or include all impacted groups. This requirement is even more important from a feminist perspective attentive to unequal gender dynamics and the potential abuses and constraints of power in “private” spheres. The third criterion for assessing transnational public-private partnerships for gender equality and women’s empowerment is the mandate of reflexivity, of being attentive to the way a program exercises power including gendered power, affecting subject-participants sometimes in unintended, negative ways. Corporations clearly engage in their own risk analysis with respect to legal liabilities and returns on investment but from a feminist perspective we would want to know whether the partnerships are mindful of all the possible ways diverse groups of women will be impacted by their programs. Finally, we need to evaluate the partnerships for their operational effectiveness. This is at least as, if not more, important than the other three evaluation criteria since the purpose from a feminist standpoint is to change the situation of economic gender inequality and this is to a large extent shared by all four partnerships.

Assessing Transnational Public-Private Partnerships Governing Gender

The four initiatives reviewed here differ in the relative involvement of public and private partners. Our presentation below starts with two private-led initiatives and continues with two led by intergovernmental organizations. They deliver different types of public goods. The Goldman Sachs 10,000 Women Initiative provides a service, i.e. an educational curriculum while the other three initiatives engage in standard setting and benchmarking. All four seek to inform and convince, and they all do so through various transnational knowledge and public policy networks. Participation and the kind of regulation sought in all cases is voluntary, but soliciting active involvement rather than passive compliance as might be the case with some mandatory, “checkbox” approaches to gender mainstreaming for instance. In this sense, all initiatives engage in a neoliberal form of governmentality that looks for commitments for change, a responsabilization of individuals, corporations and governments.

Goldman Sachs 10,000 Women Global Initiative

The Goldman Sachs initiative is a partnership with business schools mainly from the US and Europe, some of them public institutions. Private organizations and philanthropic foundations are also involved as sponsors. The initiative aims to provide 10,000 “underserved” (read: deserving) women from developing countries, coined the “missing middle”, with practical business and management education akin to the MBA but at lower cost. The MBA-like education is largely provided in-country facilitated by the sharing of international business school curricula and the voluntary mentoring of Goldman Sachs staff (see Appendix A). Started in March 2008, the initiative grew as an idea within the Wall Street investment bank to increase the bank and its staff’s outreach into the global community. It is no coincidence that this program was initiated with the unravelling of the global financial crisis, in which Goldman Sachs was considered to be a major culprit (Financial Times 2009; Smith 2012). Goldman Sachs believes that the return on their US\$100 million investment in businesswomen from the Global South over five years will be more competitive, open and growing economies. They quote compelling data that increases in women’s labor market participation could lift incomes globally 14 per cent by 2020 and 20 per cent by 2030. Moreover, the 10,000 Women Initiative is the basis for a Harvard Business School case study assessing its impact (Marquis et al. 2010).

While the program is to generate more inclusive, “shared economic growth”, the number of places available in the program is limited; 10,000 Women is intended to be competitive and exclusive. Indeed 10,000 Women boasts an acceptance rate of 14 per cent, lower than that of the renowned Wharton School of Business in Pennsylvania (800 applicants for 80 positions in Brazil for example). The selection criteria are not as transparent as they are for entrance into regular business schools and “are tailored for each country” (Goldman Sachs 2010: 8); selection into the program generally takes place locally in each of the twenty countries that have so far joined the Initiative with a panel that consists of members from local business and a local business school, a representative of a US business school and a Goldman Sachs representative. Being risk-averse, the initiative has a built-in bias toward supporting and expanding the opportunities for women who are already running their own businesses rather than bringing women into business or encouraging companies

to employ more women. There is however, no self-reflection on this bias or on potential selection problems with the cohort.

The focus on women entrepreneurs is justified by the evidence of the economic multiplier effects they might generate; with a business education under her belt each of the 10,000 women may “pay it forward” by employing other women, and generating greater income to benefit their families and communities. As the slogan states: “10,000 women is not a program, it is a movement” (Goldman Sachs 2010: 25).

It is to be expected that an investment bank, such as Goldman Sachs would want a good return on its goal of realizing the economic gains from women’s increased participation in business. The Initiative therefore has partnered with the Bridgespan Group to develop a “performance monitoring instrument” that determines its effectiveness through quantitative measurement of changes to the sales and employment of the businesswomen ‘scholars’ after graduation (Goldman Sachs 200: p. 16). Rwanda is cited as a success case where sales increased 40 per cent, and 90 per cent of participants hired employees a year after the program (“Giving Women a Voice” 2010). Effectiveness of the program can also be assessed through the Washington, DC-based International Research Center on Women (IRCW 2011) independent evaluation of the 10,000 Women program in India. That evaluation found at least half of the graduate “scholars” doubled their business revenue and increased the number of employees from 6 to 10 on average 18 months after completion of the program. (There is no mention though of whether those employees were women or men or of the quality of the jobs created, as you would expect in a rigorous gender audit). Less tangible impacts are also noted, such as the access of each woman to the growing network and ongoing support of 10,000 Women. Being in the network presumably gives one access to people in power and with economic power including the power of Goldman Sachs although this is kept noticeably vague. But without the selection of women or the selection criteria being made explicit it is difficult to judge the effects of this power in terms of the exclusion of particular groups of women with respect to social class, ethnicity, education, nationality, sexuality etc.

Impressively 80 partners have signed up to support the 10,000 Women Initiative either as providers of business training, funders, or joined up networks in twenty countries. However, the collaboration is clearly skewed toward US organizations with approximately half of the academic institutions American (including seven of the top ten business schools) and more than half of the not-for profit partners US-based. Employees of Goldman Sachs and partner organizations are invited to volunteer their time in mentoring, giving lectures in the short courses to help educate the women, but there is no evidence of whether or not they can make suggestions to Goldman Sachs senior management on the delivery or intended outcomes of the program (Goldman Sachs 2010). The Goldman Sachs website does not publish 10,000 Women meeting minutes; it is intended mainly as a promotional site for Goldman Sachs Corporation and its partners rather than to improve publicity and therefore, the legitimacy of the governance initiative. Moreover, in terms of reflexivity, the independent evaluation by ICRW hardly notes any areas for improvement in the 10,000 Women program and does not sufficiently incorporate gendered analysis of the processes and outcomes of the program.

The WEF's Women Leaders and Gender Parity Program

The creation of the World Economic Forum's (WEF) Women Leaders and Gender Parity Program came in part as a result of civil society critiques of the Forum, which castigated it for its exclusionary practices (participation at the Davos meeting is by invitation only) and for its celebratory attitude towards globalization. One of the criticisms—popularized by feminist economist Lourdes Beneria, and ironically after her by Samuel Huntington—was that the meeting in Davos consisted mostly of middle-aged men from the US and Europe, the “Davos men” (Beneria 1999; Huntington 2004). The Forum reacted against these criticisms by coopting them and seeking to include more women; the Women Leaders and Gender Parity program was one result, established in 2001. In other words, the creation of the program was motivated in part by oppositional social forces from civil society, including feminists.

The program has three main purposes. First, it aims to increase the participation of women in Forum activities. Second, it seeks to produce reports,

which benchmark the status of women globally: Since 2005, the Global Gender Gap report annually tracks the status of women's employment, health, education, and political participation in countries around the world; beginning in 2010, the Forum has added a Corporate Gender Gap report which does the same for leading companies internationally both by country and by sector, and describes mechanisms in place to address gender inequalities in business. The third purpose of the program is to convene multi-stakeholder meetings on issues of gender equity. For this, the forum has created, since 2008, various groups: A global gender parity group consists of "100 highly influential and committed leaders—50 women and 50 men from business, politics, academia, media—who believe that companies and countries will economically benefit by addressing the gender gap and optimizing the flow of talent" (Women Leaders and Gender Parity). Smaller, regional gender parity groups have been established in Africa, the Middle East, Asia, and Latin America following a similar model. In addition, the program convenes women who attend the Forum to engage in a dialogue about issues of gender and diversity. It also has organized a group of experts, which includes a number of academics and advises the Forum on gender issues.

Exclusiveness is one of the trademarks of the World Economic Forum, which of course has raised questions about its legitimacy and is the core of civil society critiques. But it is precisely its exclusive character that makes the Forum attractive to world leaders, who consider it an opportunity to network and debate amongst themselves, away from the public limelight. The formation of the WEF Women Leaders and Gender Parity Program has not changed this logic, contravening democratic demands for inclusion, but also the feminist criterion of publicity (making "the personal" the subject of transparent political debate). As is the case with all WEF activities, participation in the gender parity groups—both the global group and the regional groups—is by invitation only and membership rosters of these groups are not publicly available. According to the officer in charge of the program, the global group in 2011 consisted of 80 percent members from the business community (Zahidi 2011). Media reports and short notices in WEF materials indicate that the regional groups apparently include a large number of representatives of the public sector, but a definitive assessment

cannot be made.² There also is no public record of what is being discussed in these groups and of how their message spreads beyond the circle of the group. According to the officer in charge of the groups at the WEF, the global group in the initial one and a half years focused on perfecting the methodology for measuring the gender gap and on educating members on the business case for gender equality. Since then the effort has shifted towards pulling together country success stories; the goal now is to develop a platform to share these stories across countries (Zahidi 2011).

The Forum publishes membership in one of its gender groups, namely the Global Agenda Council on Women's Empowerment, which serves as a source of scientific evidence for closing the gender gap. According to the WEF website its mission consists in "providing new insights and synthesizing existing knowledge to develop innovative solutions for closing the economic gender gap globally" (Global Agenda Council 2012). The Council includes about twenty, all female members from business, academia, the media, and civil society organizations. In 2008 and 2009 about half of these came from the US, but the 2013 Council has diversified considerably. In 2008, academics accounted for three fourth of the members, in 2009 for half, and in 2013 for less than a quarter.³ Academics were heavily concentrated in business schools, economics and psychology departments. Of note is that there is no representation of academics in the humanities or women's/gender studies.

Overall, the WEF collects elite women who have been successful in business, public life, academia, the media, or civil society. Within academia, those

² The 2008 report of the Africa Forum announced the first meeting of the African Gender Parity Group and on its last page lists some of the most prominent members: the Deputy President and a minister of South Africa, the Governor of the Bank of Botswana, the Chairman of the Board of the Development Bank of Southern Africa, the heads of a South African bank and a global media corporation, the CEOs of three companies (Accenture, ArcelorMittal, and PG Industries, Zimbabwe), the head of the Nigerian stock exchange, and the president of an association supporting female entrepreneurs in Cameroon (World Economic Forum on Africa 2008, 31).

The Middle East Regional Parity Group was launched in 2008, and the media reported among its members the CEOs of two companies (Rachid Mashreq Group, Egypt and Rubicon, Jordan), the heads of the national bank of Kuwait and of the Arab League, the Egyptian minister of finance, and the head of the negotiations department of the PLO (AMEInfo.com 2010). The people mentioned are only the most visible of the 50 members – half men and women – that make up all regional groups. No information could be gleaned on the Asian and Latin American regional parity groups.

³ See lists of members are in Appendix B.

women working in fields predominate that are traditionally more practical and favor problem-solving types of scholarship, such as business and management, psychology, and economics. This skewed emphasis is deliberate since the Forum hand-selects individuals it deems fit for participating in the conversations. Despite Forum efforts to include people outside the business community in its deliberations, they have constituted a minority. The officer in charge of the gender program speculated that some of the members in the WEF groups may consider themselves feminist in their personal capacities, but she doubted that any of the organizations represented in the groups would consider themselves feminist movement organizations (Zahidi 2011). It appears that the gender parity groups are relatively uniform in background and most likely in the kinds of understandings of the role of women in business. There is little evidence of reflexivity over the fact that the Forum collects the powerful and the effects this may produce not least on the policies discussed to economically empower diverse groups of women. While the Forum is aware of its own position of power in a world polity, it assumes no differences among women and is confident that elite women can speak for all women.

The program has had some success in increasing the number of women participating in the Davos Forum – from 8 percent in 2002 to 15 percent in 2005 (Pigman 2007: 132), but has largely remained stuck there (Zahidi 2011; Elias 2013). This might appear meagre, yet it is higher than the average representation of women on the executive boards of corporations, which averaged 11 percent globally in 2012 (Governance Metrics International 2013). At the 2011 Forum, the organization implemented a quota: the Forum’s “strategic partners,” i.e. those in a higher echelon of membership who also participate in setting the themes for the annual meeting, were required to bring at least one woman in every group of five senior executives sent to Davos (Moya 2011). About 80 percent of strategic partners showed up in Davos in mixed delegations with some noticeably recalcitrant such as Deutsche Bank (Zahidi 2011; CNBC January 17, 2011), but this had little effect on the overall gender composition of the Forum, with women’s participation nudging up just one percentage point. And while the Forum leaders may have embraced quotas, the

topic was highly contentious among Forum participants engaging in debates on the topic (see The Gender Agenda).

Effectiveness with regard to the program's other goal, i.e. to help close gender gaps, is much more difficult to gauge. The Forum's annual Global Gender Gap reports are highly popular and often preferred over competing indices because they make visible gaps between what is and what could be rather than just measuring performance compared to other countries. The new corporate Global Gender Gap report is a novelty that can be used to hold businesses accountable. By setting a new standard for benchmarking on gender issues, the program can be judged highly effective. What kinds of changes this has produced in actual state practices and public policies to support gender equality in the economy and society is difficult to assess. The program officer cites considerable anecdotal evidence of governments and firms utilizing the reports, but the program has not conducted its own evaluation (Zahidi 2011).

EU Programme on Gender-Balance in Decision-Making

The European Union's (EU) interest in the role of women in business leadership is embedded within its larger agenda of increasing the role of women in decision-making. The EU's programme reaches back into the 1990s, and initially focused primarily on women in the public sector. Economic decision-making entered the agenda with the Roadmap for gender equality that started in 2006 and continues in the EU's strategy for gender equality for 2010-15.

The Programme consists of two initiatives: a database and a network of women in decision-making. The database collects information on women in politics, public administration, the judiciary, the social partners and NGOs, in addition to women in business and finance.⁴ The network of women in decision-making, established in June 2008, has 15 members from umbrella organizations that represent other more specialized European and international networks. Businesswomen are represented in the network through their professional organizations and not through business firms or employers (see Appendix C).

⁴ See European Commission webpage at http://ec.europa.eu/justice/gender-equality/gender-decision-making/database/index_en.htm. Accessed 31 October 2012.

A short survey sent to members of the network shortly after its establishment showed that they “found the network very useful” (Ribeiro 2010). It helped them make contacts and network with other European organizations interested in women in economic decision-making. It also helped them raise awareness on the issue and exchange good practice. Finally it provided them with information on EU initiatives on gender equality, in particular on women in decision-making, and allowed them to disseminate this information to their membership (Ribeiro 2011). However, the Commission official in charge of the network surmised that some of the member networks have limited political influence in EU countries, which may hamper the effectiveness of the network. Indeed, in 2011 the program was moved from the Directorate General (DG) Employment and Social Inclusion to DG Justice under the leadership of Commissioner Viviane Redding in line with the increasing focus on government regulation of businesses’ gender equality performance (see ----2013). Redding’s attempt to legislate mandatory quotas for corporate management and executive boards on a Europe-wide level generated massive resistance not only among companies and member states, but Redding also failed to gain the support of fellow Commissioners. Even though quotas were on the agenda of the network, apparently it was not able to generate the political momentum or consensus needed to support Redding’s agenda and the purpose of accelerating social change in the business world.

In contrast, the database, in the spirit of knowledge sharing and nudging toward rather than mandating social change, seems to be a success. According to the official in charge, it is quite difficult to obtain comparable data on women in some categories of leadership and the database is used widely (Ribeiro 2010). EU member states, international organizations, civil society, the European Parliament and academics all have used the database, as have companies such as McKinsey for whom it supports their work on women’s leadership. Overall, the feedback is that these users are happy with the database.

How legitimate is the EU Programme? According to the Commission official in charge, network members do not necessarily consider themselves feminists. “Many members are representatives from networks organized at European level promoting women in businesses and interested in this specific

issue” (Ribeiro 2011). The network represents a particular kind of liberal feminism that seeks to open the full range of opportunities in business and the economy to women. Publications associated with network activities on the Commission’s website focus on empowering individuals through mentoring, networking and role models, on quotas for women in boardrooms and on the gender pay gap in decision-making positions. Transcripts or minutes of network meetings unfortunately are not published; thus, the network is relatively non-transparent.

Network membership provides a glimpse on inclusiveness. Although the purpose of the network is to advance leadership both in the economic and political sectors, membership is heavily weighted towards business with more than half of members representing organizations dedicated to furthering women in business or entrepreneurship (for a full listing of members see appendix C). Yet, the network also allows room for union and socialist organizations in addition to public sector representatives and general feminist organizations. It thus appears to draw its net fairly widely, especially when compared with the two business-led initiatives discussed earlier.

The UN’s Global Compact-UNIFEM Women’s Empowerment Principles

The Women’s Empowerment Principles (WEPs) form part of the UN Global Compact with business and civil society, which is a corporate social responsibility program promoting human rights and sustainable development (see www.weprinciples.org, accessed July 18, 2013). Based on the Calvert women’s principles, the WEPs are a global corporate code of conduct on women’s human rights developed through an international multi-stakeholder consultation process in March 2009 and launched in March 2010. They consciously seek to harness the powerful role of corporations to empower women globally. The initiative to draft the principles assumes that employment by corporations, even with the right equal opportunity and work/life balance policies, is inherently empowering leaving aside the question of decent work and the devaluing of work traditionally carried out by women in feminized sectors of the economy.

By contrast with the World Economic Forum, European Union and Goldman Sachs initiatives, the focus of the WEPs is on corporate responsibility to address the rights of *all women across the board* and not just as entrepreneurs or at the boardroom table. Seemingly inclusive of more categories of women, the WEPs highlight the situation of women employees across sectors of the economy and occupational hierarchies. By contrast, the three initiatives discussed previously tend to stress the benefits of increased women's employment in the abstract while concentrating on the empowerment of a select group of women: typically women entrepreneurs and leaders. Similarly though, the WEPs involve high-level commitment from global CEOs whose personal signatures and statements can be found on the UN website, lauding the economic gains to be had from empowering women.

There are seven women's empowerment principles, each associated with indicators to monitor their impact and fleshed out with specific kinds of programmatic action and best practice examples. CEOs commit to promoting women's empowerment through these general principles. The principles advocate 1) leadership for gender equality, 2) equal opportunity, inclusion, and non-discrimination, 3) health, safety and freedom from violence, 4) education and training, 5) empowering enterprise development, supply chain and marketing practices, 6) community leadership and engagement, and lastly, 7) transparency, measurement, and reporting.⁵ The seven principles emphasize that equality lies in increasing women's leadership (equal outcomes), introducing work/life balance policies in employment, and ensuring women are included as equals (equal treatment) at work. For instance, a key element drawn from principle 2 suggests companies "proactively recruit and appoint women to managerial and executive positions and to the corporate board of directors" in order to promote workplace practices and policies free from gender discrimination.⁶ The discussion of principle 2 goes so far to recommend 30 per cent or greater proportional inclusion of women in decision-making and governance in all areas of the business presumably based on the "critical mass"

⁵ For a full formulation of the WEPs see Appendix D.

approach to women's representation (Bratton 2005) and the now popular "30% clubs" in the US and the UK that advocate for gender balance on corporate boards: "The 30 per cent threshold does not ensure that women hold as many positions of power as men, but is a step in this direction" (see UN Global Compact 2010).

It is notable given our feminist evaluation criteria that transparency is itself a core WEP: Principle seven ensures the publicity in the implementation of the Women's Empowerment Principles. Companies need to do more than promote the principles and their attendant initiatives online; they must "make public the company policies and implementation plan for promoting gender equality; establish benchmarks that quantify inclusion of women at all levels; measure and report on progress, both internally and externally, using data disaggregated by sex" (UN Global Compact 2010a: 3). The United Nations keeps track of how businesses are doing on the initiatives. For instance, it has an index measuring implementation updated as of June 2013. This is a working document that contains examples of "best practice" initiatives including those that pre-date the 2010 Women's Empowerment Principles but show how key multinational businesses in energy, finance, services/tourism, and manufacturing sectors have implemented processes aligning with the principles (UN Global Compact 2010b). The effects of the empowerment principles are demonstrated even before they have been formally signed onto and implemented since companies want to ensure that they can fully comply with them. However, the working document of "best practice" implementation of the principles is of limited use since these practices have not been audited by the UN or independently. In effect, they serve merely to raise awareness of the many ways in which business can promote gender equality at work, in the market and community (UN Global Compact 2010b). Another activity intended to nudge corporations to sign onto the WEPs are the inaugural WEP Leadership Awards begun in 2013 to recognise and celebrate corporate achievements in implementing the WEPs. These awards fall into five categories: "Benchmarking for change", "business case action for change", "community engagement", "cultural change for empowerment" and "7 principles" for coordinated action across all WEPs. In 2013, of the corporations that won these awards, all the Chief Executives recognised along with their

organisation were men (see www.weprinciples.org/Site/WepsLeadershipAwards/ accessed July 18, 2013).

Although transparency is achieved by the requirement that companies measure and report on progress toward implementing the Women's Empowerment Principles, actual public involvement and accountability need not be integral to this reporting. Principle 6 covers community involvement and engagement but the implementation of this principle is left up to individual businesses. It may involve businesses forming partnerships with women-owned enterprises and/or community organizations.⁷ Companies may pick and choose from a grab bag of approaches to public engagement. They may:

“[L]ead by example in the community – showcasing company commitment to gender equality and women's empowerment; leverage their influence, alone or in partnership to advocate for gender equality and collaborate with business partners, suppliers, and community leaders to promote inclusion; work with community stakeholders, officials and others to eliminate discrimination and exploitation and open opportunities for women and girls; promote and recognize women's leadership in, and contributions to, their communities and ensure sufficient representation of women in any community consultation; use philanthropy and grants programs to support company commitment to inclusion, equality, and human rights.”⁸

All these approaches suggest the potential for a two-way street of engagement wherein businesses influence community by advocating gender equality and communities are able to shape business engagement priorities and corporate social responsibility activities. Further investigation of partnership agreements would be needed to determine how much these engagements allow communities or women-owned enterprises to have a voice or participatory role.

The Women's Empowerment Principles reflect on some if not all the workings or effects of power. Nowhere are the causes of women's

⁷ See principle 5, first bullet point. UN Global Compact/UNIFEM (2010a:3).

⁸ This lists the bullet points present under principle 6 'Community Leadership and Engagement' UN Global Compact/UNIFEM (2010a: 3).

disempowerment or lack of power discussed. Nor does the WEP initiative defend the efficacy of its primarily voluntarist approach to corporate power and social responsibility compared with governmental or regulatory approaches that seek to mitigate corporate power. However, the WEPs are sensitive to increasing women's economic decision-making power through best practice initiatives such as making board members responsible for championing the importance of women's participation, designing recruitment strategies to reach more women, checking gender balance on boards and interview panels, undertaking an audit on the gender policies of suppliers and determining a baseline number of women-owned enterprises as suppliers (UN Global Compact 2010a: 6-7). In addition, the WEPs promote the recognition of women in power (for example, focusing on female employees' accomplishments and women's IT achievements (UN Global Compact 2010a: 4-5)), and deploying financial power to change society such as fundraising for ending domestic violence internationally, awarding grants to community-based organizations that empower women and assisting women-owned-enterprises to help develop their capacity to become quality suppliers (UN Global Compact 2010a: 5). As with community engagement, the predominant assumption about power is that corporations have it and can deploy it for socially good ends including women's economic empowerment rather than any bottom-up notion of power as the capacity for collective action involving women as active participants in change.

Conclusions and Directions for Research

Our purpose in this paper has been to locate transnational public-private partnerships in existing literatures and to provide a conceptual understanding of them from a feminist political economy perspective that is informed by democratic and feminist ethical criteria for evaluating the processes as well as the effects of these partnerships. Our case studies illustrate different hybrid forms that can be separated into public- and private-led partnerships. All four target a change in conduct either on the part of governments (as in the case of the WEF), businesses (as in the WEPs, the EU, and partially the WEF) or women (as in 10,000 Women). They do so through different means, ranging from

awareness raising or agenda setting to benchmarking and capacity building. And they foreground different purposes.

Both the WEF and the EU program aim to create awareness about the collective economic benefits from gender equality by providing an evidence base of statistics and enabling benchmarking explicitly targeting states and more recently, corporations. Further agenda-setting initiatives by governments especially to address gender inequalities are intended to follow from this global ranking exercise (compare Towns 2010). The Women's Empowerment Principles (WEPs) are an example of explicit standard setting promoted by governments but aimed exclusively at business firms, formulating principles of conduct and working towards voluntary adoption and tailored implementation of these principles. In contrast, the work of Goldman Sachs focuses on capacity building and implementation of a norm that is implicitly considered beyond debate, i.e. that it is desirable to empower women to run their own businesses. Together with our other private-led partnership, the World Economic Forum's Gender Program, the Goldman Sachs 10,000 women initiative is based on the theory that promoting women's entrepreneurship especially in developing countries will increase global growth.

Motivations to engage in these partnerships vary. Civil society critiques apparently motivated the WEF to explore its own extreme gender imbalance at the annual Davos meetings. Public relations materials of Goldman Sachs suggest an interest in creating more open and competitive societies with new sources of growth. The timing of the 10,000 Women Initiative also intimates more immediate reasons that motivated the company's involvement, including possibly an anti-corporate climate heightened by the 2007/8 global financial crisis. We consider it a highly interesting line of further inquiry to trace the processes by which individual companies and international organizations come to adopt gender equality initiatives. In the case of the private sector, are these motivated purely by the global normative environment and a desire to lift the public image of the company? How do external partnership programs relate to the ways in which companies deal with gender inequality internally? How do companies reconcile the potentially disempowering effects of their regular business practices (such as Goldman's role in the financial crisis of 2007/8,

which was highly-gendered in its impacts⁹) with the image of a women-friendly, socially responsible global corporation that they want to create? In the case of the national and international public sector, what drives the decision to approach businesses? The embeddedness of government in business networks? The lack of public funding and climate of budget austerity? The promise of greater effectiveness with business as a partner? Neoliberal ideology that proposes business should lead social change and states should play a minimal role in structuring the economy?

We have suggested that the partnerships do not simply solve a collective action problem or fill a governance gap as rationalists might suggest, but are part of a transnational, neoliberal transformation of governance and embedded in political struggles. The many dimensions of these struggles could be a useful line of empirical inquiry. Which social forces, including which feminist groups, assert themselves in the formation of these partnerships? In which ways are these partnerships embedded in contemporary hegemonies? What new technologies of power do they make available for governing gender? Our case studies point to the salience of certain types of academic knowledge in the WEF and Goldman Sachs. The corollary wisdom frames gender equality as good for business and economic growth at Goldman Sachs and in the EU network, and vice-versa principled business and economic activity as good for gender equality and women's empowerment in the UN WEPs. This leads us to propose that the political economy of neo-liberal restructuring that has been advanced since the 1980s provides the conditions of possibility for these partnerships—from a celebration of individual initiative and entrepreneurship to a mode of regulation via nudging incentives and normative standards rather than enforcement. While mandatory state regulation has been effective in some areas, informal “nudge” approaches, which force reflection on the extent of gender inequality and diversity but allow for different approaches to addressing these, are increasingly

⁹ See special issue on the economic crisis of *Gender and Development* 18, 2 (July 2010). Roberts (2012) questions Goldman's credibility in the matter of women's empowerment—promoting on the one hand women entrepreneurs while having played an infamous role in popularizing collateralized debt obligations that initiated the subprime mortgage crisis in the US and spiraled into a financial crisis. Poor women were disproportionately targeted for these financial products and many lost their homes during the crisis.

driving change within corporations and states (Thaler and Sunstein 2008). Do these neoliberal technologies preclude progressive agendas or can they also become vehicles for feminist movement goals? Could the idea that gender equality is a pre-condition for economic success and wellbeing provide an entry for a Polanyian social re-embedding of markets?

How legitimate are the partnerships? We have outlined four feminist criteria along which to evaluate these governance initiatives: inclusiveness, publicity/transparency, reflexivity and effectiveness. The initiatives measure up against these criteria in quite different ways, with differences pronounced between public and private-led programs. Public-led initiatives are more likely to value inclusion—as in the EU network’s inclusion of women in business in addition to feminist organizations and those from other sectors; and as in the UN’s Women’s Empowerment Principles’ consideration of a broad range of women in different locations of the labor market and its openness to membership by any and all businesses. Private-led initiatives seem to be less inclusive. The World Economic Forum operates on the basis of exclusiveness; similarly the Goldman Sachs program celebrates its high degree of selectivity of businesswomen. A corollary of the character of these programs is that they tend to avoid transparency while carefully guarding information that reaches the public: publicity becomes a matter of managing the global media and public relations, not a principle of democracy enabling informed debate and accountability to those who are impacted by its programs.

However, it appears that exclusivity does not preclude effectiveness—at least if measured by the goals the programs set themselves. On the contrary, both, the WEF program and the Goldman Sachs program have been highly effective—as judged by the resonance of the WEF’s gender gap reports and as judged by Goldman Sachs’ evaluations in partnership with the Harvard Business School, which employs 10,000 Women as a published case study in its Professional MBA programs (Marquis et al. 2010), and with the International Center for Research on Women (2011). Effectiveness is somewhat more difficult to assess in the cases of the UN Women’s Empowerment Principles and the EU network, both of which seek to raise awareness and enable further agenda-setting. For the EU network in particular, it is difficult to assess what the effects

have been of its work. In tangible terms, it has received a significant setback with the rejection of a EU-wide policy on company quotas (*The Guardian*, 23 October 2012). The outcomes of the Women's Empowerment Principles might be somewhat easier to measure given the annual conferences of WEP member corporations hosted by the UN on International Women's Day; but to our knowledge there are no empirical studies that have sought to do so as yet. A research project along these lines could generate valuable insight.

Not surprisingly, we found little evidence in the partnerships of reflexivity, of explicit thinking about how one's own power position affects outcomes for gender relations and diverse groups of women in particular. There is no reflection on who is being excluded from these efforts and what issues are being silenced. For example, with the exception of the Women's Empowerment Principles the conduct of businesses towards women employees outside the leadership ranks does not seem to be a topic of discussion. Silenced as well are issues of reproductive labor that have been a central focus of analysis for feminist political economists, from the sharing of work in households to the treatment of maids and nannies (Elias 2010; Rai and Hoskyns 2007). The fact that most of the actors involved in the partnerships do not self-identify as feminists facilitates a silencing of these other issues that may be crucial to the empowerment of a broad tranche of women in developed and developing countries.

In a related manner, there is little reflection in these programs on their theoretical premises and causal assumptions, and thus considerable room for interventions drawing on feminist constructivist and political economy scholarship: How does the inclusion of women in leadership improve the status of women overall? What is the relationship between descriptive representation, i.e. women's presence in businesses, and a substantive representation, i.e. a representation of women's group interests, such as interests in flexible work to accommodate women's unpaid family responsibilities or social benefits such as healthcare and childcare that extend to women individually as well as their families? Moreover, theoretically informed feminist inquiry should probe issues of accountability in these partnerships. Whose cause do they advance? Who speaks for women in these programs? To whom do the partners answer? At

present only one of the four initiatives—the UN Women’s Empowerment Principles—is moving toward mandatory public reporting on progress and outcomes although even that requirement falls short of an independent audit which is common in environmental and human rights governance initiatives (see Park 2010).

The new attention to gender equality in business and global economic governance is both an expression of and a key process in the transformation of states and corporations in the context of global competition and restructuring. It also reflects the mainstreaming of feminism, the taming of oppositional social movement ideas to become compatible with capitalist logics and operative in support of systemic projects. It is part and parcel of a new neo-liberal reality that celebrates voluntary governance and the entrepreneurial individual while making room for gendered selves. Our assessment of this reality in light of various feminist principles is decidedly ambiguous, revealing a dearth of reflexivity, exclusionary and secretive tendencies in some initiatives, while also showing surprising effectiveness in others. Transnational public-private partnerships in support of gender equality and women’s empowerment bring together the legacies of neo-liberalism and feminism, bearing different fruit in different contexts, and enabling co-optations as much as new openings. They also constitute a terrain ripe for scholarly engagement along the lines suggested and beyond.

Works Cited

- Ackerly, Brooke and Jacqui True, 2010. *Doing Feminist Research in Political and Social Sciences*. New York: Palgrave, pp. 321.
- Ackerly, Brooke and Jacqui True. 2008. "Reflexivity in Practice: Power and Ethics in Feminist Research on International Relations". *International Studies Review* 10: 581-600
- Aganthelelou, Anna and L.H.M. Ling. 2004. Power, Borders, Security, Wealth: Lessons of Violence and Desire from September 11. *International Studies Quarterly* 48, 3: 517-538.
- AMEInfo.com. 2008. Middle East Gender Equality Gets a Boost with New Gender Parity Group, May 19, <http://www.ameinfo.com/157325.html>, accessed November 18, 2010.
- Andonova, Liliana B. 2010. Public-Private Partnerships for the Earth: Politics and Patterns of Hybrid Authority in the Multilateral System. *Global Environmental Politics* 10, 2 (May): 25-53.
- Andonova, Liliana B. 2006. Globalization, Agency and Institutional Innovation: The Rise and Fall of Public-Private Partnerships in Global Governance. Goldfar Center Working Paper: 2006-004. Waterville, ME: Goldfarb Center.
- Andonova, Liliana B., Michele M. Betsill and Harriet Bulkeley. 2009. Transnational Climate Governance. *Global Environmental Politics* 9, 2 (May): 52-73.
- Anglo American, "Shareholders Meetings: AGM 2008 - Chief Executive Speech," <http://www.angloamerican.com/aal/investors/meetings/agm2008/ceo2008/?version=1> (accessed November 17, 2010).
- Anglo Platinum, "Employment Equity - Diversity and Opportunity" http://www.angloplatinum.com/careers/careers_sub/employment_equity.asp (accessed November 17, 2010).
- Bakker, Isabella and Stephen Gill eds. 2003. *Power, Production and Social Reproduction*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

- Bedford, Kate. 2012. Gender WDR: Limits, Gaps, and Fudges. Bretton Woods Project at <http://brettonwoodsproject.org/art.shtml?x=569646>. Accessed June 18, 2013.
- Bedford, Kate. 2007. The Imperative of Male Inclusion: How Institutional Context Influences World Bank Gender Policy. *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 9, 3 (September): 289-311.
- Beneria, Lourdes. 1999. "Globalization, Gender and the Davos Man." *Feminist Economics* 5, 3: 61-83.
- Bergeron, Suzanne and Stephen Healy. 2013. Beyond the Business Case: A Community Economics Approach to Gender, Development and Social Economy. Draft paper prepared for the *UNRISD Conference: Potential and Limits of Social and Solidarity Economy*. 6-8 May 2013, Geneva.
- Bexell, Magdalena. 2012. UN – Business Partnerships for Women’s Empowerment. *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 14, 3 (September): 389-407.
- Bratton, Kathleen A. 2005. Critical Mass Theory Revisited: The Behavior and Success of Token Women in State Legislatures. *Politics and Gender* 1, 1: 97-125.
- Bull, Benedicte, and Desmond McNeill. *Development Issues in Global Governance: Public Private Partnerships and Market Multilateralism*. London: Routledge. 2007.
- BPW International, the International Federation of Business and Professional Women, "Women’s Empowerment Principles (WEPs)" <http://www.bpw-international.org/latest-news/from-the-executive/president/881-womens-empowerment-principles-weps-> (accessed November 17, 2010).
- BPW, "Equality Means Business Bulletin", http://www.bpw-international.org/Downloads_2010/wep_bulletin_2010_10_27%5B1%5D.pdf available from <http://www.bpw-international.org/latest-news/from-the-executive/president/881-womens-empowerment-principles-weps-> if you click 'view the full bulletin' (accessed November 17, 2010).

- Bustelo, Maria and Mieke Verloo. 2009. "Grounding Policy Evaluation on an Understanding of Politics as Discursive". In *The Discursive Politics of Gender Equality: Stretching, Bending and Policymaking* eds. Petra Meier, Emanuela Lombardo and Mieke Verloo. New York: Routledge.
- Caglar, Gülay. 2009. *Engendering der Makroökonomie und Handelspolitik: Potenziale transnationaler Wissensnetzwerke* Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Clinton, Hilary. 2010. "Development in the 21st Century." *Foreign Policy*, January.
- Coleman, W.D. and T. Porter. 2000. International Institutions, Globalization and Democracy: Assessing the Challenges. *Global Society: Journal of Interdisciplinary International Relations* 14, 3: 377-98.
- Cox, Robert W. 1981. Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory. *Millennium—Journal of International Studies* 10, 2: 126-155.
- Economist, The. 2006. "A Guide to Womenomics: Forget China, India and the Internet, Economic Growth is Driven by Women," *The Economist*, April 12.
- Elgstrom, Ole. 2000. 2000. Norm negotiations: the construction of new norms regarding *gender* and *development* in EU foreign aid policy. *Journal of European Public Policy* 7, 3: 457-476.
- Elias, Juanita. 2010. Making Migrant Domestic Work Visible: The Rights Based Approach to Migration and the "Challenges of Social Reproduction". *Review of International Political Economy* 17, 5: 840-859.
- Elias, Juanita. 2013. Davos Woman to the Rescue of Global Capitalism: Postfeminist Politics and Competitiveness Promotion at the World Economic Forum. *International Political Sociology* 7, 2 (June).
- Ferguson, James. 2009. The Uses of Neoliberalism. *Antipode* 41, S1: 166-184.
- "Giving women a voice and a vision." *Financial Times*, March 8, 2010.
- Financial Times, The*. 2009. "Goldman Sachs Reputation Tarnished." 2 August.
- Finnemore, Martha and Kathryn Sikkink. 1998. International Norm Dynamics and Political Change. *International Organization* 52, 4: 887-917.

- Fransen, Luc and Brian Burgoon. 2012. A market for worker rights: Explaining business support for international private labour regulation. *Review of International Political Economy* 19, 2: 236-266.
- Global Agenda Council on Women's Empowerment 2012. Website of the World Economic Forum at <http://www.weforum.org/content/global-agenda-council-womens-empowerment-2012#IssueOverview>. Accessed January 18, 2013.
- Goldman Sachs. 2010. *10,000 Women: Education. Empowerment. Economic Opportunity*. Brochure. New York.
<http://www.goldmansachs.com/citizenship/10000women/10000-women-immersive/10000-women-brochure.pdf> accessed June 19, 2012.
- Gladman, Kimberly, and Michelle Lamb. 2013. *Governance Metrics International Ratings, 2012 Women on Boards Survey*. www.gmi3D.com (accessed June 11, 2013).
- Grant, R. W. and Keohane, R. O. 2005 Accountability and abuses of power in world politics. *American Political Science Review* 99: 29–44.
- Griffin, Penny. 2009. *Gendering the World Bank: Neoliberalism and the Gendered Foundations of Global Governance*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Griffin, P, 2013, 'Gendering Global Finance: Crisis, Masculinity and Responsibility', *Men and Masculinities*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 9 - 34
- Halley, Janet. 2006. *Split Decisions: How and Why to Take a Break from Feminism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Halley, Janet, Prabha Kotiswaran, Hila Shamir, and Chantal Thomas. 2006. "From the International to the Local in Feminist Legal Responses to Rape, Prostitution/Sex Work, and Sex Trafficking: Four Studies in Contemporary Governance Feminism." *Harvard Journal of Law & Gender* 29: 335–423.
- Hausmann, Richard, Laura Tyson and Saadia Zahidi. 2010. *Global Gender Gap Report*. World Economic Forum, Geneva, December.
- Hoskyns, Catherine. 2008. "Governing the European Union: Gender and Macroeconomics. In Shirin Rai and Georgina Waylen eds. *Global Governance: Feminist Perspectives*. New York: Palgrave, pp. 108-127.

- Hoskyns, Catherine and Shirin Rai. 2007. Recasting the Global Political Economy: Counting Women's Unpaid Work. *New Political Economy* 12, 3: 297-317.
- Huntington, Samuel. 2004. Dead Souls: The Denationalization of the American Elite. *The National Interest* (Spring).
- International Labor Organisation, "Resource Guide – Gender Equality in the World of Work," <http://www.ilo.org/public/english/support/lib/resource/subject/gender.htm>, (accessed November 17, 2010).
- International Centre for Research on Women. 2011. *Capitalizing Growth in the Women-Run Small and Medium Enterprises Sector (SMEs): Evaluating the Goldman Sachs 10,000 Women Initiative [in India]*. New York: ICRW.
- Joachim, Jutta M. 2007. *Agenda Setting, the UN, and NGOs: Gender Violence and Reproductive Rights*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Keck, Margaret and Kathryn Sikkink. 1998. *Activists Beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics*. Ithaca NY: Cornell University Press.
- Keohane, Robert O. 2003 Global governance and democratic accountability, pp. 130-59, in *Taming Globalization: Frontiers of Governance* eds. D. Held and D. Archibugi, London: Polity.
- Kinsella, Helen M. 2005. Securing the civilian: sex and gender in the laws of war, pp. 249-272 in *Power in Global Governance* eds. M. Barnett and R. Duvall. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Krook, Mona Lena and Jacqui True. 2012. Rethinking the Life Cycles of International Norms: The United Nations and the Global Promotion of Gender Equality. *European Journal of International Relations* 18, 1: 100-124.
- Larner, Wendy. 2000. Neo-liberalism: Policy, Ideology, Governmentality. *Studies in Political Economy* 63 (Autumn): 5-25.
- Levitt, Peggy, Sally Merry, Rosa Alayza and Mercedes Crisóstomo Meza. 2013. Doing Vernacularization: The Encounter between Global and Local Ideas about Women's Rights in Peru. In *Feminist Strategies in International*

- Governance*, eds. Gülay Caglar, Elisabeth Prügl and Susanne Zwingel.
London: Routledge
- Locher, Birgit and Elisabeth Prügl. 2001. Feminism and Constructivism: Worlds Apart or Sharing the Middle Ground? *International Studies Quarterly* 45, 1 (March): 111-129.
- Locke, Richard M. and Monica Lomis. 2010. The promise and perils of private voluntary regulation: Labor standards and work organization in two Mexican garment factories. *Review of International Political Economy* 17, 1: 45-74.
- Marquis, Christopher, V. Kasturi Rangan, Catherine Ross. *Goldman Sachs: The 10,000 Women Initiative: Case 509-042*. Harvard Business School Publishing.
- Merry, Sally Engle. Measuring the World: Indicators, Human Rights, and Global Governance. *Current Anthropology* 52, S3: 83-95.
- Mintrom, Michael and Phillipa Norman. 2009. Policy Entrepreneurship and Policy Change. *Policy Studies Journal* 37: 649-667
- Moya, Elena. 2011. Davos Imposes Gender Quota. *guardian.co.uk*, Wednesday, 12 January 2011.
- Park, Susan. 2010. *World Bank Group interactions with Environmentalists: Changing International Organisation Identities*. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press.
- Pattberg, Philipp, Frank Biermann, Sander Chan, and Aysem Merg, eds. 2012. *Public-Private Partnerships for Sustainable Development: Emergence, Impacts, and Legitimacy*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Pigman, Geoffrey Allen. 2007. *The World Economic Forum: A Multi-stakeholder Approach to Global Governance*. London: Routledge.
- Porter, Doug and David Craig. 2004. The third way and the third world: poverty reduction and social inclusion in the rise of 'inclusive' liberalism. *Review of International Political Economy* 11, 2: 387-423.

- Press Release – “Chief executives worldwide support women’s empowerment principles” available at http://www.unglobalcompact.org/docs/issues_doc/human_rights/WEPs/WEP_CEO_Statement_Release_21June.pdf (accessed November 16, 2010).
- Pringle, Rosemary and Sophie Watson. 1992. “Women's Interests' and the Post-Structuralist State.” In *Destabilizing Theory: Contemporary Feminist Debates* ed. Michele Barrett and Anne Phillips. Stanford: Stanford University Press, pp. 53-73.
- “Promotions of Equality,” <https://portal.bbk.es/bbkportal/memoriabbk2009/en/obra/promo.html> (accessed November 17, 2010).
- Rai, Shirin. 2004. Gendering Global Governance. *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 6, 4: 579-601.
- Reese, Audrey. 2012. Feminist Knowledge and Emerging Governmentality in UN Peacekeeping. *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 14, 3 (September): 348-369.
- Roberts, Adrienne. 2012. Financial Crisis, Financial Firms ... And Financial Feminism? The Rise of “Transnational Business Feminism and the Necessity of Marxist-Feminist IPE. *Socialist Studies/Études socialistes* 8, 2 (Autumn): 85-108.
- Reich, Michael R. 2002. *Public-Private Partnerships for Public Health*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Center for Population and Development Studies.
- Ribeiro, Fatima. Email exchange with Elisabeth Prügl, 6 January 2011.
- Sabat, Rita. 2013. Translating International Norms: Filters to Combating Violence against Women in Lebanon. In *Feminist Strategies in International Governance*, eds. Gülay Caglar, Elisabeth Prügl and Susanne Zwingel. London: Routledge.
- Sen, Amartya. 1999. *Development as Freedom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Schäferhoff, Marco, Sabine Campe, and Christopher Kaan. 2009. Transnational Public-Private Partnerships in International Relations: Making Sense of

- Concepts, Research Frameworks, and Results. *International Studies Review* 11: 451-474.
- Smith, Greg. 2012. "Why I am Leaving Goldman Sachs." Op-ed Opinion. *The New York Times*, March 14.
- Stevenson, Max O. 1991. Whither the Public-Private Partnership: A Critical Overview. *Urban Affairs Review* 27, 1: 109-127.
- Stone, Diane. 2010. Knowledge and Policy Networks in Global Governance. In *Gender Knowledge and Knowledge Networks in International Political Economy*, eds. Brigitte Young and Christoph Scherrer, pp. 36-54. Baden-Baden: Nomos.
- The Business of Empowering Women*. 2010. London: McKinsey & Company.
- Thaler, Richard H.; Sunstein, Cass R. 2008. *Nudge: Improving Decisions about Health, Wealth, and Happiness*. New Haven: [Yale University Press](http://www.yale.edu/yupress/).
- The Gender Agenda: Putting Parity into Practice. Videorecording of Davos Annual Meeting 2010-CNBC event. WEF website at <http://www.weforum.org/women-leaders-and-gender-parity>. Accessed January 6, 2011.
- Thematic Financing. N. d. Webpage of the United Nations Office for Partnerships at http://www.un.org/partnerships/financial_contributions.html. Accessed January 24, 2013.
- Tickner, J. Ann. 2005. What Is Your Research Program? Some Feminist Answers to International Relations Methodological Questions. *International Studies Quarterly* 49: 1-21.
- Towns, Ann. E. 2010. *Women and States: Norms and Hierarchies in International Society*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- United Nations, "What Leaders are Saying in Support of the Women's Empowerment Principles." PDF available from http://www.unifem.org/attachments/partnerships/womens_empowerment_principles/CEO_Quotes_What_Leaders_Are_Saying_June2010.pdf
- United Nations Development Programme. 2012. *Powerful Synergies: Gender Equality, Economic Development and Environmental Sustainability*. New York: United Nations.

- United Nations Global Compact/UNIFEM. 2010a. Women's Empowerment Principles: Equality Means Business brochure.
http://www.unglobalcompact.org/Issues/human_rights/equality_means_business.html (accessed November 21, 2012).
- United Nations Global Compact, 2010b. "Companies Leading the Way: Putting the Principles into Practices." Available from
http://www.unglobalcompact.org/docs/issues_doc/human_rights/Resources/Companies_Leading_the_Way.pdf (accessed November 16, 2010).
- United Nations Global Compact, Women's Empowerment Principles, "CEO Statement of Support and List of Signatories."
http://www.unglobalcompact.org/docs/issues_doc/human_rights/WEPs_CEO_Statement_of_Support_Signatories.pdf PDF available for download from
http://www.unglobalcompact.org/Issues/human_rights/equality_means_business.html (accessed November 17, 2010).
- Van der Vleuten, Anna and Mieke Verloo. 2012. Ranking and benchmarking. The political logic of new regulatory instruments in the fields of gender equality and anti-corruption. *Policy & Politics*, 40(1), 73-88.
- Women Leaders and Gender Parity. Website of the World Economic Forum at <http://www.weforum.org/women-leaders-and-gender-parity>. Accessed January 18, 2013.
- Whitworth, Sandra. 1994. *Feminism and International Relations: Towards a Political Economy of Gender in Interstate and Non-Governmental Institutions*. Basingstoke: The Macmillan Press.
- World Bank. 2012. *World Development Report: Gender Equality and Development*. Washington DC: World Bank.
- World Bank, The. 2006 . Gender Equality as Smart Economics: A World Bank Group Gender Action Plan (Fiscal Years 2007-2010). Washington DC, September.

- World Bank, The. 2013. *On Norms and Agency: Conversations about Gender Equality with Women and Men in 20 Countries*. Washington DC: World Bank.
- World Economic Forum on Africa: Capitalizing on Opportunity*. 2008. Report. Geneva: World Economic Forum.
- Zahidi, Saadia. 2011. Phone Interview with Elisabeth Prügl. Geneva, February 24.
- Zwingel, Susanne. 2013. Translating International Women's Rights Norms: CEDAW in Context. In *Feminist Strategies in International Governance*, eds. Gülay Caglar, Elisabeth Prügl and Susanne Zwingel. London: Routledge.
- Zwingel, Susanne. 2012. How Do Norms Travel? Theorizing International Women's Rights in Transnational Perspectives. *International Studies Quarterly* 56: 115-129.

Appendix A: Goldman Sachs 10,000 Women initiative partnerships¹⁰

Academic Partners

American University of Afghanistan
American University of Beirut
American University in Cairo
Asian University for Women
Babson College
Brown University
Columbia Business School
Cuttington University
Fundação Dom Cabral
Fundação Getulio Vargas Escola de
Administração de Empresas de Sao Paulo
Georgetown University/US Afghan
Women's Council
Harvard Business School
HEC Paris
IAG Business School – PUC-Rio
IE Business School
IESE Business School
Indian School of Business
INSEAD
Keio University Graduate School of Media
Design
London Business School
Mills College
Özyeğin University Center for
Entrepreneurship

Nonprofit Partners and Advisors

Acumen Fund
Africa America Institute
AMIDEAST
Ashoka
Aspen Institute - ANDE
Camfed International
CARE
Case Foundation
Center for Creative Leadership
Center for Global Development
CHF International
Endeavor
Global Business School Network
Global Health Corps
Grameen Foundation
Hispanic Scholarship Fund
Institute of International Education
Inter-American Development Bank
International Center for Research on
Women
LASPAU: Academic and Professional
Programs for the Americas
Mibanco
National Entrepreneurship Network
Opportunity International
Overseas Private Investment Corporation

¹⁰ Goldman Sachs, "10,000 Women: About: Partners,"
<http://www2.goldmansachs.com/citizenship/10000women/about/partners/partner-list.html>
(accessed November 6, 2010).

Pan-African University	Room to Read
Saïd Business School, University of Oxford	TechnoServe
School of Finance and Banking	United Negro College Fund
Stanford Graduate School of Business	Vital Voices Global Partnership
Strathmore University	Women For Women International
Tecnológico de Monterrey	Women's World Banking
Thunderbird School of Global Management	World Bank
Tsinghua SEM	
Universidad del Pacifico	
Universidad del Valle de Guatemala	
Universidad Tecnológica de Panama	
United States International University	
University of Asia and the Pacific	
University of Cambridge, represented by Judge Business School and the Cambridge Assessment Group	
University of Cape Town Graduate School of Business	
University of Dar es Salaam	
University of Johannesburg	
William Davidson Institute at the University of Michigan	
The Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania	
Yale University, Global Health Leadership Institute	
Zhejiang University Global Entrepreneurship Research Centre, School of Management	

Appendix B: WEF Global Agenda Council on Women's Empowerment

Membership

(from

<http://www.schwabfound.org/en/Communities/GlobalAgendaCouncils/MembersProfilesSearch/index.htm?isSearch=true&Year=&Council=&Cluster=&Role=&Stakeholder=&Gender=&Country=&Region=&Keywords=gender+gap>. Accessed November 18, 2010.)

2008 Members

Ann Cotton, UK

Anne Fausto-Sterling

Esther Duflo, France

Helen Fisher, USA

Herminia Ibarra, USA

Ilene H. Lang, USA

Iris Bohnet, Switzerland

J. Frank Brown, USA

Joanne Lipman, USA

JoAnne Yates USA

Kuniko Inoguchi, Japan

Laura D'Andrea Tyson, USA. Chair

Laura Liswood, USA,

Lauren Resnick

Lynda Gratton

Marilyn Carlson Nelson, USA

May Al Dabbagh, Saudi Arabia

Pippa Norris, UK

Rosabeth Moss Kanter, USA

Roshaneh Zafar, Pakistan

Sylvia Ann Hewlett, USA

Uri Gneezy, Israel

Wu Qing, People's Republic of China

2009 Members

Chanda Kochhar, India, vice-chair
Elisabeth Marx, Germany
Esther Duflo, France
Gisele Yitamben, Cameroon
Helen Fisher, USA
Herminia Ibarra, USA
Ilene H. Lang, USA
Iris Bohnet, Switzerland
Jane D. McAuliffe, USA
Joanne Lipman, USA
JoAnne Yates USA
Laura D'Andrea Tyson, USA, chair
Laura Liswood, USA,
Lauren Resnick
May Al Dabbagh, Saudi Arabia
Pat Mitchell, USA
Roshaneh Zafar, Pakistan
Sylvia Ann Hewlett, USA
Tumi Makgabo, South Africa
Wu Qing, People's Republic of China

2012 Members

(from <http://www.weforum.org/content/global-agenda-council-womens-empowerment-2012>; Accessed January 18, 2013)

Laura D'Andrea Tyson, Haas School of Business
Laura Liswood, Council of Women World Leaders
Herminia Ibarra, INSEAD
Monika Queisser, OECD
Martina Viarengo, Graduate Institute, Geneva

Ana Duarte-McCarthy, Citi

Beth A. Brooke, Ernst & Young

Ilene H. Lang, Catalyst

Iris Bohnet, Harvard Kennedy School of Government

Yukako Uchinaga, Benesse Holdings

Angelica Fuentes, Omnilife

Carlos Danel, Compartamos

Fatima Obaid Al Jaber, Al Jaber Group, UAE

Demet Ikiler, GroupM, Turkey

Askin Asan, Ministry of Family and Social Policies of Turkey

Sakie T. Fukushima, G&S Global Advisors

Ferit F. Sahenk, Dogus Group,

Appendix C: EU Network of Women in Decision-Making, Members

(from http://ec.europa.eu/justice/gender-equality/gender-decision-making/index_en.htm. Accessed October 31, 2012)

Classifications added

Marijo Bos, President, European Professional Women's Network

Business

Jocelyne Bougeard, President, Committee of Women Elected Representatives of Local and Regional Authorities (Council of European Municipalities and Regions)

Public sector

Gabriella Canonica, 1st Vice President, BPW (Business and Professional Women)

– International

General Feminist

Helena de Felipe Lehtonen, President, Association of Organisations of Mediterranean Businesswomen

Business

Sophia Economacos, President, Eurochambres Women's Network

Business

Julia Harrison, Member, Women's Forum for the Economy and the Society

Business

Marianne Karlberg, Co-ordinator, European Network to Promote Women's Entrepreneurship

Entrepreneurship

Leena Linnainmaa, Member, European Women Lawyers Association

Legal

Sonja Lokar, Coordinator for the South East Europe Office, CEE Network for Gender Issues

Socialist

Brigitte Mühlenbruch, President, European Platform of Women Scientists

Academia

Irene Natividad, President; Maud Pagel/Member, Global Summit of Women

General Feminist/Business

Bola Olabisi, Director, European Women Inventors and Innovators Network

Entrepreneurship

Tina Reisenbichler, President, European Women's Management Development International Network

Business

Myriam Schervernels, Femanet – Eurocadres

Union

Brigitte Triems, President, European Women's Lobby

General Feminist

Appendix D: The Women's Empowerment Principles

1. Establish high-level corporate leadership for gender equality.
2. Treat all women and men fairly at work – respect and support human rights and nondiscrimination.
3. Ensure the health, safety and well-being of all women and men workers.
4. Promote education, training and professional development for women.
5. Implement enterprise development, supply chain and marketing practices that empower women.
6. Promote equality through community initiatives and advocacy.
7. Measure and publicly report on progress to achieve gender equality.