DLP
DEVELOPMENTAL LEADERSHIP PROGRAM

Gender & Power

Diana Koester
May 2015

DLP Concept Brief   04

'Gender' is one of the most persistent causes, consequences and manifestations of power relations. Understanding gender can therefore significantly enhance our understanding of power and vice versa.

Yet donors have largely neglected 'gender' in their efforts to understand power relations in partner countries. In particular they are often blind to the ways in which power and politics in the 'private' sphere shape power relations at all levels of society; the ways in which gender hierarchies mark wider economic, political and social structures and institutions; and the opportunities for peace and prosperity emanating from feminized sources of power. By addressing these blindspots, a focus on gender can significantly enhance donors' insights into power dynamics and their ability to 'think and work politically' overall.

At the same time, focusing on power can improve donor support to gender equality by pointing to the need for more politically-informed approaches. This would involve, among other things, developing a deeper understanding of the local context, engaging a wider range of powerful actors, providing better support for women's mobilization and, importantly, taking a closer look at gendered power relations within donor organizations themselves.

This concept brief offers a concise introduction to the links between gender and power. It is designed for those who are new to these ideas and it addresses three main questions: What is power and how can a gender perspective help us understand it? What is gender and how can a power perspective help us understand it? What policy and operational messages follow from a focus on gender and power?

Scholars and practitioners have increasingly recognized that development is fundamentally a political process. This means that technical solutions will not suffice to meet development challenges: successful support requires 'thinking and working politically' (TWP). While understandings of what exactly this entails have varied, there is wide agreement that 'power' lies at the heart of the approach: development practitioners need to understand who holds power and how it is exercised so as to help build new alliances for peace and prosperity.

To this end donors have developed a series of analytical tools designed to reveal "the distribution of power and wealth between different groups and individuals and the processes that create, sustain and transform these relationships over time."[1] Various groups and publications have since discussed how the results and the wider TWP approach can be translated into practice.

However, these debates have been largely blind to one of the most central and pervasive systems of power worldwide: gender. This concept brief argues that this omission has serious and detrimental consequences for the effectiveness of development work. Understanding the links between gender and power is a precondition for addressing it.

The following sections develop this argument by briefly reviewing mainstream discussions on the nature of power and the insights a gender perspective contributes to these debates. The concluding section highlights two practical implications: the need for both a more gender-conscious approach to thinking and working politically and a more politically-informed approach to supporting gender equality.

How can 'gender' help us understand 'power' and vice versa?

1. A brief overview of mainstream debates on power

While there is wide agreement that 'power' lies at the heart of the social sciences, scholars have long debated how this concept should be understood. There are several points of disagreement:

Power-over and power-to. While some understand power as getting someone else to do what you want them to do ('power-over'),[2] others see it as the ability to attain an end or a series of ends (power-to).

Actors and structures. While some view power as actions or capacities of specific actors, others see it as lying in wider historical, political, economic and social forces. After all these often *constrain* people's opportunities for action.[3] They may also *constitute* individuals by shaping how we understand ourselves and the world we live in (see further below). In this view, "The individual (…) is not the vis-à-vis of power; it is, I believe, one of its prime effects."[4]

Visible, hidden and 'invisible' power. While some have focused on directly observable power relations negotiated through formal institutions and official decision-making, others have highlighted the 'hidden' ways in which some powerful actors shape these formal processes by controlling who participates in decision-making and which items are up for discussion. Yet some have argued that the "supreme and most insidious exercise of power"[5] operates in even less visible ways: by shaping people's sense of themselves and their world, thus keeping issues not only off the agenda but off people's minds.

Why the diversity of definitions? Scholars have studied 'power' in a wide range of disciplines, each with its own interests, methodologies and assumptions about the nature of reality. Not surprisingly, these different starting points lead to very different perspectives on power.

What is more, 'power' in all of its definitions has strong normative implications: whether or not certain processes are assigned this label impacts whether they are perceived as oppressive or benign, as passive or as forces for change. In this way "how we think about power may serve to reproduce and reinforce power structures and relations, or alternatively it may challenge and subvert them."[6] Therefore the variety of perspectives is also a function of observers' varied political commitments.

How do we choose which one(s) to employ? A useful way forward may be to understand 'power', with Haugaard, as a 'family resemblance' concept: like members of a family, the varied definitions overlap in many characteristics without a single essence being common to all. Different members shed light on a different, significant aspect of power. Accepting this plurality does not mean that 'anything goes'. We can distinguish between better and worse usages in relation to the problem at hand: "the better definition is the one that accomplishes the task the theorists set for themselves."[7]

Normative implications are a second criterion to keep in mind when selecting a definition. Which relations does a particular understanding of power problematize and which does it remove from view? Whose experiences are primarily reflected and whose might be marginalized?

The following section will show that both strategies are incomplete without considering the links between gender and power.

2. Gender as a system of power

Gender shapes power relations at all levels of society. In fact, the set of roles, behaviours and attitudes that societies define as appropriate for men and women ('gender') may well be the most persistent cause, consequence and mechanism of power relations from the intimate sphere of the household to the highest levels of political decision-making.

Feminist literatures highlight these links and can therefore significantly enhance our understanding of both power and gender. These works use the concept 'gender' in different ways, each of which opens up a different perspective on power (see Box 1).[8] Yet it is important to keep in mind that most of these are developed from Northern perspectives and may therefore provide only a starting point for understanding gender and power in other contexts.

This section summarizes some of the key takeaways for scholars and practitioners. Wherever possible it provides examples from a small number of existing political economy and power analyses that have highlighted these dynamics.

Box 1: Different usages of the concept 'gender' and the perspectives on power these open up

Usage of the concept 'gender'	Perspective on power
Differentiating individuals into 'men' and 'women' while retaining other mainstream categories of analysis.	One of the most persistent patterns in the distribution of power are immense inequalities between men and women
Problematizing gender roles as such, that is, the ways in which societies define appropriate masculine and feminine behaviour.	Gender roles *are* power relations. Gender is not only a cause but also a consequence, instrument and embodiment of power-over.
Studying gender as one of several systems that divide power, including those based on class and ethnicity.	Gender interacts with other hierarchical power relationships. Focusing on only one of these divisions reduces each group to the views of their most powerful members and therefore reinforces power relations.
Analyzing gender as a characteristic of wider social structures and institutions.	Wider structures and institutions shape the distribution of power by reinforcing and relying on gender roles.
Studying women on their own terms and challenging categories of analysis established by the male-dominated social sciences.	The private sphere is an arena of power and politics and shapes power relations at all levels of society. Our understandings of power may themselves be the result of men's power over women. We may be neglecting women's specific forms and sources of power.

One of the most persistent patterns in the distribution of power-over and power-to are huge inequalities between men and women. This becomes apparent as soon as gender is considered by simply differentiating individuals into 'men' and 'women'. For example, one of the most consistent features of political decision-making is women's lack of influence. This is in turn often the result of what feminist scholars have problematized as perhaps the most pervasive, institutionalized and detrimental power-over relationship in our world: the domination of women by men.[9] These patterns of power can have important consequences for development outcomes. An example from a PEA of mining in Malawi illustrates this (see Box 2).

Box 2: Gender power relations and mining in Malawi

A 2012/2013 PEA of mining in Malawi found that women's specific priorities were systematically neglected in relevant decision-making. This was due to the power of male traditional elders over other individuals in the community, particularly women. For example, investors asked a community affected by mining whether they would prefer to receive cash compensation for relocation or to have houses built for them. Women said they would rather have houses, fearing that men would receive the cash and misuse it on unrelated acquisitions like buying cell phones, bicycles, spending on other women etc. However, when a woman got up to voice this viewpoint during a meeting, traditional authorities immediately commanded her to sit down and declared that "no woman would speak in front of men as women had no cultural standing to give an opinion on the matter" (Tilitonse 2013: 20).

Source: Tilitonse. (2013). Political economy analysis of mining in Malawi. Lilongwe: Tilitonse.

Gender roles *are* power relations. Gender is not only a cause but also a consequence, instrument and embodiment of power-over relations. It is a key mechanism through which power not only constrains but *constitutes* individuals and is perhaps the most persistent form of 'invisible power' in our world.

This can be seen by problematizing the ways in which societies define appropriate masculine and feminine behaviour. In many contexts, what it *means* to be a woman is to be powerless; it is considered 'feminine' to be quiet, accommodating, and obedient. By contrast it is considered 'manly' to exercise power-over, that is, to get others to do what you want them to do. In this way, "women/men is a distinction not just of difference, but of power and powerlessness…Power/powerlessness is the sex difference."[10]

As a result of these associations, gender roles can reify men's power over women. Men and women consequently often consider women's lack of power 'natural' and appropriate. This, for example, significantly reduces women's access to decision-making as they may lack the self-confidence or be actively prevented from speaking up in public meetings (see Box 2). Recognizing these dynamics, work on women's empowerment has stressed women's sense of self-worth and self-knowledge (power-within) as a critical aspect of the process for change.

The association of power differentials with gender roles also helps explain why expressions of power are often highly gendered, as seen for example in a Drivers of Change (DOC) analysis in Malawi (Box 3).

Box 3: Gender roles as power relations in Malawi

The association of power with masculinity and domination of women can help explain why public power is often expressed in highly gendered ways. In Malawi a Drivers of Change analysis thus found that dominant leaders have traditionally drawn on expressions of women's subordination to underpin their 'big man' status, expecting women to perform songs and dances to the personal aggrandisement of the president and to provide sexual 'favours' to party leaders and functionaries. In this way, they established "the mobilisation of women in subordinate and exploitative roles as an enduring feature of Malawi's political system" (Booth et al 2006: 18).

Source: Booth, D., Cammack, D., Harrigan, J., Kanyongolo, E., Mataure, M., & Ngwira, N. (2006) Drivers of Change and Development, London: ODI.

The private sphere is an arena of power and politics. Mainstream scholars tend to view the family and household as removed from 'public' concerns of power and politics – and thus irrelevant to their debates. Feminist scholars have revealed that this public/private divide leads to significant blindspots in our understanding of power. Unlike men's power over other men, men's power over women has often been accomplished "in intimate contexts, as everyday life."[11] These power struggles in the 'private' sphere often interact with 'public' power dynamics (see Box 4).

Box 4: Politics of the private sphere in Ethiopia, Sri Lanka and Bangladesh

Power relations in the 'public' and 'private' spheres often interact in complex ways to shape development outcomes. In Ethiopia, for example, a power analysis highlighted that "political power structures are learnt, or embodied, through family power relations from a young age: men are superior to women, elders to younger" (Nordlund: 2014). This results in a rigidly hierarchical culture, which is a key constraint on democratic governance.

In Sri Lanka and Bangladesh, power analyses showed how wider economic trends have increased female employment and access to resources. This has often challenged power relations between men and women in households, leading to conflicts in families and, paradoxically, a wider resurgence of social control over women.

Sources: Nordlund, P. (2014) 'PEA, Power Analysis and Gender: Experiences from Working with Sida's Power Analysis Guide'. Presentation to OECD-DAC Workshop on Gender and Statebuilding; Vaughan, S. and K. Tronvoll (2003) The Culture of Power in Contemporary Ethiopian Political Life. Sida Studies No. 10; Orjuela, C. (ed), S. Bastian, S. Kottegoda and J. Uyangoda (2010) Power and politics in the shadow of Sri Lanka's armed conflict. Sida Studies No. 25; Lewis, D. and A. Hossain (2008) Understanding the local power structure in rural Bangladesh, Sida Studies No. 22.

Gender interacts with other hierarchical power relationships. Feminist scholars of colour and from developing countries in particular have argued that gender must be studied as one of several systems that divide power, including those based on ethnicity and class. These often interact in shaping the distribution of power in society ('intersectionality'). Focusing on only one of these divisions reduces each group to the views of their most powerful members and so reinforces hierarchical power relations. Offering several approaches for addressing such complexity, "feminists are perhaps alone in the academy in the extent to which they have embraced intersectionality… as itself a central category of analysis."[12] Box 5 provides examples of insights this lens revealed in a power analysis in Sri Lanka.

Box 5: Intersectionality in Sri Lanka

A power analysis in Sri Lanka highlighted complex interactions between various hierarchical power relationships. Such 'interesectionality' often reduced the visibility of gender power relations and hence the opportunities for tackling these. For example, wider nationalist and ethnic struggles served to silence other power struggles and identities, including those based on gender: "The struggle against the enemy (the Sri Lankan state) called for Tamil unity which concealed the power differences and conflicts between Tamils of different class, caste, gender and geographical background. Anyone voicing criticism against the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE) was branded as 'traitor' and risked death" (Orjuela et al 2010: 16). International actors may have reproduced such hierarchies to some extent, with the study noting that "The debate about power, both within Sri Lanka and among international actors, has tended to be gender-blind, caste-blind and class-blind, as nationalist struggles and ethnic divisions have overshadowed other important power struggles and identities" (Orjuela et al 2010: 25).

Source: Orjuela, C. (ed) S. Bastian, S. Kottegoda and J. Uyangoda (2010) Power and politics in the shadow of Sri Lanka's armed conflict Sida Studies No 25

Wider structures and institutions shape the distribution of power by reinforcing and relying on gender roles. Scholars have gained further insights into power by analyzing gender as a characteristic of wider social structures and institutions. These were often built by privileged men for privileged men. As a result they are often tailored to men's life experiences, rely on unequal power relations between men and women, and idealize characteristics associated with masculine behaviour. As a result, wider structures and formal and informal institutions can in diverse ways perpetuate both men's power over women and the dominance of those men who conform with masculine ideals over others. As Box 6 highlights, this can apply for example to 'political settlements.'[13]

Box 6: Gendered institutions in Burundi

As political settlements tend to reflect bargains between male elites they are often tied to, or even reliant on, patterns of gender inequality, such as women's exclusion from key resources. In Burundi for example, male elites have consistently blocked legislation to grant women inheritance rights. This was in large part because dividing up land between sons and daughters would significantly alter land distribution patterns and hence threaten practices of land distribution for patronage. In this way, women's inheritance rights threatened a political settlement based on exclusionary land ownership.

Source: Castillejo, C. (2011). Building a State that Works for Women. Madrid: FRIDE.

Our understandings of power may themselves be the result of men's power over women. This is because power has been conceptualized by and hence from the perspective of privileged men. Feminist scholars have argued that our concepts are therefore derived from a masculine life experience "conceived as (and fact) inhabited by a number of fundamentally hostile others whom one comes to know by means of opposition (even death struggle) and yet with whom one must construct a social relation in order to survive."[14] This leads to the concept of power as power-over.

We may be neglecting women's specific forms and sources of power. Some feminist scholars suggest that women's roles as carers and mothers lead in an opposite direction from the hostile world of masculine experience. Rather than in opposition, women construct themselves in relation and continuity to others. Rather than to dominate, the purpose of women's activity is often to build capacity in others. This suggests an alternative conception of power as a specific kind of power-to: "the capacity to transform and empower oneself and others".[15] While this concept may risk homogenizing and essentializing women[16] it can shed light on forces for change that may otherwise be neglected. Box 7 highlights some examples of what these may look like in practice.

While different areas of feminist scholarship offer differing perspectives on how gender shapes power and vice versa, a shared conclusion is that gender is fundamentally a question of power.

Box 7: 'Feminine' power in Ethiopia and Nepal

Some donor analyses have pointed to forms that specifically feminine power might take in practice. In Ethiopia, for example, a power analysis pointed to women as key players in (re)producing political culture given their critical role in socializing new generations. In Nepal research highlighted that healthcare usage and outcomes improve for children as they improve for women. In this way it documented women's power to enhance the health and productivity of future generations.

Sources: Vaughan, S. and K. Tronvoll (2003) The Culture of Power in Contemporary Ethiopian Political Life. Sida Studies No 10;
Bennett, L. (2005) Unequal Citizens: Gender, Caste and Ethnic Exclusion in Nepal Kathmandu: The World Bank / DFID.

What policy and operational messages follow from a focus on gender and power?

1. Without thinking about gender, we're not politically smart

Feminist perspectives on power reveal that debates on 'thinking and working politically' (TWP) and political economy analysis (PEA) have missed one of the most significant systems shaping power relations worldwide: gender. If gender is at all considered in PEA, the term is usually understood as synonymous with 'women' and the discussion confined to some observations about women's unequal representation in formal institutions or legal discrimination against them (see Box 8).

Box 8: GSDRC report on gender in Political Economy Analysis

Following a request by a DFID country office, the GSDRC recently reviewed how gender is integrated into donor political economy analysis. ''This review of PEA frameworks showed that few contained the terms 'gender' or 'women'. Where there was mention, it was mostly around the numbers of women included in formal processes such as elections and in parliament, missing a more nuanced analysis of gender relations.

The few PEA studies that do incorporate gender focus on the following:

- The role of gender in society: e.g. gender equality in formal and customary law, women's property and business ownership.
- Women in positions of power and influence: e.g. how many women sit in parliament, how many are business or civil society leaders.
- Representation and influence of women's groups: e.g. whether lobbying groups exist for women's rights and their success.''

Source: Browne, E. (2014) Gender in Political Economy Analysis, Helpdesk Research Report 1071. GSDRC, University of Birmingham.

This at best superficial consideration of gender means that PEA and the TWP agenda are blind to key components of the workings of power: the ways in which power and politics in the 'private' sphere shape and are influenced by power relations at all levels of society; the ways in which wider economic, political and social structures rely on and reproduce gender power relations; and the opportunities for peace and prosperity emanating from feminized sources of power.

These gendered blindspots have real and detrimental consequences for development work. As the example from Sri Lanka in Box 9 shows, understanding the links between gendered power relations in households, the economy and conflict can be a precondition not only for effective engagement but also for doing no harm.

Box 9: Gendered power struggles in Sri Lanka and implications for NGO engagement

In 2006 a campaign was launched in two districts of Sri Lanka against women employees of NGOs accusing them of sexual misconduct and threatening those who refused to stop work with death. Organizations that continued to employ them received bomb threats and female employees' families were similarly harassed. In this way NGO engagement was not only handicapped – it was doing harm.

A Sida power analysis highlights that understanding how gender was shaping, and being shaped by, local power relations could have helped anticipate this situation. It places these developments in the context of wider trends that had already led to significant shifts in gender power relations before numerous NGOs arrived in the region after the Tsunami. Polarization of society along ethnic lines had been played out on women's bodies, with both the LTTE and Sinhalese society making demands on women to wear national dress and uphold the national culture. At the same time, wider economic trends had increased women's access to income, challenging gender power relations in households. Against the backdrop of these gendered power struggles, the arrival of international NGOs exercised a highly gendered impact on the local labour market by offering high-income employment to women. In this way, these organizations exacerbated pre-existing tensions.

Source: Orjuela, C. (ed), S. Bastian, S. Kottegoda and J. Uyangoda (2010) Power and politics in the shadow of Sri Lanka's armed conflict, Sida Studies No. 25.

However, current conceptions of power in the 'thinking and working politically' debate would miss these connections – and are therefore inadequate for achieving the task that proponents of this approach have set for themselves: informing effective development. In other words, the TWP approach fails Haugaard's test for what is an appropriate definition of power. The good news is that a rich feminist literature on power is available and can provide a useful starting point for addressing this gap.

At least one donor has already recognized that ''the gender dimension of our analyses remains to be developed''[17] and has made efforts to translate feminist insights into power into their power analyses (see Box 10).

Box 10: Sida's (2013) Practical Guide to Power Analysis: An overview of gender-related questions

Sida's guide to power analysis provides an extensive menu of issues that power analysis might tackle. This includes several explicitly gender-related questions:

How do gender norms reinforce power relations?

- How does gender intersect with the distribution of formal and informal power in society in terms of the public sphere (political institutions, social institutions, rule of law, the market and economy) and the private sphere (domestic life and family, intimate relations)?
- What can be said about both the situation of women in general and about particular groups of women (such as women who do not cohabit with men, whether single mothers, widows, non-married women) as well as about particular groups of men who may be disadvantaged by dominant ideas of masculinity?
- Is legislation gender neutral, or do particular laws reinforce and sustain subordinate or discriminated gender roles?

Source: Pettit, J. (2013) Power Analysis: A Practical Guide. Stockholm: Sida.

2. If we're politically smart, we'll provide better support to gender equality

Understanding the links between gender and power can also enhance efforts to support gender equality. It reveals that gender and gender inequalities are a cause, consequence and component of power relations at all levels of society. In other words, gender inequalities are deeply political. This means that if they are to be addressed successfully, they must be addressed as such. A focus on gender and power points to the need not only for more gender-sensitive approaches to thinking and working politically but also for more politically-informed approaches to supporting gender equality. This would involve, among other things:

Developing a deeper understanding of the local context and in particular of the ways in which gender inequalities are tied to wider power structures, such as political settlements (see Box 6). A newly released framework for understanding the gender dynamics of political settlements may prove useful in this context.[18]

Focusing on the critical role of a wider range of powerful actors, including customary institutions and political parties. Highlighting that "women/men is a distinction not just of difference, but of power and powerlessness",[19] feminist perspectives draw particular attention to how women's (subordinate) roles are defined in relation to men's (dominant) roles. In practice this means that making space for the realization of women's rights also requires changes in masculine roles and claims to power. Engaging men will therefore help make interventions effective.[20] As Box 4 illustrates regarding women's economic empowerment, it is also a precondition for doing no harm.

Better support for women's mobilization. Civil society activism has provided "new democratic spaces"[21] where women can take leadership, advocate their rights and develop leadership skills with less obstruction from the gendered power relations that often mark formal institutions (see Box 5). Donor support to women's mobilization is therefore critical.

However, donors currently disproportionately focus on English-speaking, educated, capital-based elites, therefore reducing 'women's interests' to those of their most powerful group members. As feminist perspectives on intersectionality would anticipate, this can silence voices of women from different class, ethnic or religious backgrounds and reinforce power relations. Donors should do more to take into account these intersections and build effective coalitions across divisions. They may also need to take some risks by searching for partners beyond the usual elite, capital-based suspects.

A closer look at gendered power relations within donor country organizations. These organizations can bring their own gendered institutional cultures to development work. Partly as a result, top management of international bodies engaging in developing countries do not tend to prioritize gender, and their staff lack incentives for taking it into account. Gender advisors in donor agencies tend to work in silos rather than in cooperation with governance- or conflict-focused colleagues. They also tend to be asked to add a gender lens to analysis and plans that have already been developed, rather than to be included from the start.

Working on this gender-specific composition and culture will enable donors to provide more effective support. Importantly, this includes considering how the concepts of power they bring to development may themselves "reproduce and reinforce power structures and power relations"[22] by removing gender from the analysis.

Further reading

Browne, E. (2014) Gender in Political Economy Analysis, Helpdesk Research Report 1071. Birmingham: GSDRC, University of Birmingham

Castillejo, C. (2011). Building a State that Works for Women, Madrid: FRIDE.

ESID (2014). Researching the politics of gender: A new conceptual and methodological approach, ESID Briefing Paper No. 7 / Research Framing Paper No. 1., Effective States and Inclusive Development Research Centre, University of Manchester.

Pettit, J. (2013). Power Analysis: A Practical Guide, Stockholm: Sida.

Koester, D. (2014) Statebuilding, Gender Equality and Women's Rights, in All Human Rights for All: Vienna Guidebook on Peaceful and Inclusive Societies, NWV Neuer Wissenschaftlicher Verlag, edited by Manfred Nowak and Ursula Werther-Pietsch.

Krook, M. L. and Mackay, F. (eds) (2011) Gender Politics and Institutions: Towards a Feminist Institutionalism, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. In particular the Chapter on "Power, politics, domination and oppression" by Moya Lloyd.

OECD (2013), Gender and Statebuilding in Fragile and Conflict-Affected States, Paris: OECD Publishing.

Waylen, G., Celis, K., Kantola, J., and Weldon, S. L. (eds) (2013). The Oxford Handbook of Gender and Politics. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Endnotes

1. OECD-DAC

2. Robert Dahl for example influentially argued that "A has power over B to the extent that he can get B to do something that B would not otherwise do." As an example of this "intuitive idea" of power Dahl describes a police officer standing at an intersection and successfully ordering traffic to go left and right rather than ahead. Robert A. Dahl (1957) "The Concept of Power", *Behavioural Science*, Vol. 2 No 3, p. 203. For the distinction between power-over and power-to and further elaboration see for example: Haugaard (2010) "Power: A 'family resemblance' concept. *European Journal of Cultural Studies, 13* (4), 419-438.
Allen (1998) "Rethinking Power", *Hypatia*, Vol 13, No 1, pp. 21-40

3. The powers of Dahl's police officer, for example, "are not actually inherent to him/her. They are a reflection of a particular *system of power* in which such things as "police officers" exist, which, in macrohistorical and anthropological terms, is relatively unique." As such *systemic power* continues to operate on individuals it can be seen as an extension of, rather than an alternative to, individualist models, accounting for variation in power of particular actors. See also Saar, M. (2010) "Power and critique", *Journal of Power*, Vol 3, No 1, 7-20.

4. Foucault, "Two Lectures" in Colin Gordon (ed) (1980) *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interview and Other Writings, 1972-1977, Michel Foucault*. New York: Pantheon Books

5. Lukes, S. (2005) *Power: A Radical View*, 2nd expanded edition. London: Macmillan

6. Lukes (2005)

7. Haugaard (2010). 419-438.

8. A forthcoming DLP Concept Brief on "the intersection of gender, sexuality and inquality" highlights limits in restricting our understanding of gender as men and women only. We have kept this simple binary here as it reflects most development programmes.

9. By referring to domination, feminist scholars emphasize that this power-over relationship is particularly pervasive, highly institutionalized and works to women's disadvantage. See for example discussions of the term 'domination' in Haugaard (2010) and Allen (1998).

10. MacKinnon, C. (1987) *Feminism Unmodified: Discourses on Life and Law*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press

11. MacKinnon (1987)

12. McCall, L. (2005) "The Complexity of Intersectionality", *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, Vol. 20, No. 3

13. For a concise introduction to the concept see Edward Laws and Adrian Leftwich (2014) Politial settlements. DLP Concept Brief No 1. Birmingham: DLP. See also ESID (2014). Researching the politics of gender: A new conceptual and methodological approach. ESID Briefing Paper No. 7 / Research Framing Paper No. 1., ESID, University of Manchester.

14. Hartsock, N. M. (1983) *Money, sex and power: towards a feminist historical materialism*, New York, London: Longman

15. Allen (1998)

16. It also neglects the empirical fact that some women in some contexts can and do exercise power over others, including over men.

17. Bjuremalm, H. (2006) *Power Analysis – Experiences and Challenges*. Stockholm: Sida

18. ESID (2014)

19. MacKinnon (1987)

20. Sweetman, C. (2013), "Introduction: Working with Men on Gender Equality", Gender & Development, Vol. 21, No. 1, pp. 1-13.

21. Cornwall, A. and Goetz, A-M. (2005) "Democratising Democracy: Feminist Perspectives". *Democratization*, Vol.12, No.5, pp.783–800

22. Lukes (2005)

Diana Koester is an Associate Member, Governance for Development and Peace (G4DP) Global Policy and Partnerships Division, OECD-DCD. She is also a DPhil Candidate, Department of Politics and International Relations University of Oxford.

The Developmental Leadership Program (DLP) is an international research initiative based at the University of Birmingham, and working in partnership with University College London (UCL) and La Trobe University in Melbourne. DLP's independent program of research is supported by the Australian aid program.

The Developmental Leadership Program
International Development Department
School of Government and Society
College of Social Sciences
University of Birmingham
Birmingham B15 2TT, UK
info@dlprog.org

www.dlprog.org