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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 institutionalized 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 and find 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.
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The World Bank considers gender equality to be ‘smart economics’ (World Bank 2006); 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 pay-offs 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 term the ‘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 actors 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 towards 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, labor 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 per cent of all funding contributed (UN Office for Partnerships, n.d.). In a similar vein, a 2009 McKinsey survey showed that only 19 per cent of companies contacted were ‘doing anything specifically focused on women, either directly or indirectly’ (McKinsey, 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 (EU), and the United Nations (UN), while in the private sector the World Economic Forum (WEF) 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). 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 WEF’s Women Leaders and Gender Parity Program; (3) the EU’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 policymakers. The WEF is a non-profit institution that invites key stakeholders and leaders mostly from private 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 UN and the EU – 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, Betsill and Bulkeley, 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 (Reich,
But what is new is the fact that actors driven largely by private and economic motives have entered the realm of public policymaking 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, Betsill and Bulkeley, 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 governance arrangements produce change in gender relations. 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 (Joachim, 2007; Locher and Prügl, 2001; 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 International Relations 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; True, 2011, True, Forthcoming). 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 (Elgstrom, 2000; Krook and True, 2012; Zwingel, 2013); through the translation efforts of activists in local contexts (Levitt et al., 2013; Sabat, 2013; Zwingel, 2012, 2013); and through mechanisms of power in governance institutions (Hoskyns, 2008; True, 2008; True, 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 provides 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 (Bakker and Gill, 2003; Rai, 2004; 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, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and transnational corporations (TNCs), ‘that converge on promoting women’s equality, particularly in the Global South’ (Roberts, 2012: 87). Although 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; Caglar, 2009; Kinsella, 2005; Reese, 2012). 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,
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 (Bedford, 2007, 2012; Griffin, 2009). They are also perceived to be constrained in their economic agency by male violence (True 2012; World Bank, 2013). Integrated into neoliberal governmentality, feminism has been co-opted: gender equality delivered through responsibilized 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 (Clinton, 2010; Sen, 1999; UNDP, 2012; World Bank, 2012).

Some scholars have gone so far as 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; 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). 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 (Bergeron and Healy, 2013; Ferguson, 2009; 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 (Ackerly and True, 2008, 2010; Bustelo and Verloo, 2009; Coleman and Porter, 2000). 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 revealing potential for gender and other biases in the program design? 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 (Grant and Keohane, 2005; Keohane, 2003). 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 in which 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 that 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, that is, 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 solicits 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 neo-
liberal form of governmentality that looks for commitments for change, a
responsibilization 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 USA 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 Master of Business Administration (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 unraveling 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 its US$100 million investment in businesswomen from the Global South over five years will be more competitive, open and growing economies. It quotes compelling data that increases in women’s labor market participation could lift incomes globally by 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, Rangan and Ross, 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 20 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 towards 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 that 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: 16). Rwanda is cited as a success case where sales increased by 40 per cent, and 90 per cent of participants hired employees a year after the program (Financial Times, 2010). Effectiveness of the program can also be assessed through the Washington DC-based International Center for Research on Women’s (ICRW, 2011s) independent evaluation of the 10,000 Women program in India. That evaluation found that at least half of the graduate ‘scholars’ doubled their business revenue and increased the number of employees from six to 10 on average 18 months after completion of the program. (However, there is no mention of whether those employees were women or men or of the quality of the jobs created, contrary to what would be expected 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 and so on.

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 20 countries. However, the collaboration is clearly skewed towards US organizations with approximately half of the academic institutions being American (including seven of the top 10 business schools) and more than half of the not-for-profit partners being based in the USA. 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 WEF’s 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 (1999), and ironically after her by Samuel Huntington (2004) – was that the meeting in Davos consisted mostly of middle-aged men from the USA and Europe, the ‘Davos men’. The Forum reacted against these criticisms by co-opting 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 that 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 that 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’ (World Economic Forum, n.d.a). 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 WEF, 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 among themselves, away from the public limelight. The formation of the WEF’s 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 per cent members from the business community (Saadia Zahidi, phone interview, 24 February 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. There is also 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 (Saadia Zahidi, phone interview, 24 February 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 on Women’s Empowerment, 2012). The Council includes about 20, all female members from business, academia, the media and civil society organizations. In 2008 and 2009, about half of these came from the USA, but the 2013 Council has diversified considerably. In 2008, academics accounted for three quarters of the members, in 2009 for half, and in 2013 for less than a quarter. 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 women working in fields that are traditionally more practical and favor problem-solving types of scholarship, such as business and
management, psychology and economics, predominate. This skewed emphasis is deliberate since the Forum hand-selects individuals it deems fit for participating in the conversations. Despite WEF 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 of 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 (Saadia Zahidi, phone interview, 24 February 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. Elias (2013: 155) identifies four framings that characterize these policies: ‘the linking of gender equality to competitiveness; the representation of women as driving global economic recovery; the representation of women and girls as a good investment; and a diversity management frame that serves to legitimate rich Davos women as standard bearers for (all) women’s causes’. 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 meeting – from 8 per cent in 2002 to 15 per cent in 2005 (Pigman, 2007: 132), but has largely remained stuck there (Saadia Zahidi, phone interview, 24 February 2011; Elias, 2013). This might appear meager, yet it is higher than the average representation of women on the executive boards of corporations, which averaged 11 per cent globally in 2012 (Gladman and Lamb, 2013). At the 2011 Forum, the organization implemented a quota: the Forum’s ‘strategic partners’, that is, 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 per cent of strategic partners attended Davos in mixed delegations, with some noticeably recalcitrant such as Deutsche Bank (Saadia Zahidi, phone interview, 24 February 2011; Chiang 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 WEF leaders may have embraced quotas, the topic was highly contentious among Davos participants engaging in debates on the topic (World Economic Forum, n.d.b).

Effectiveness with regard to the program’s other goal, to help close gender gaps, is much more difficult to gauge. The Forum’s annual Global
Gender Gap reports are highly popular and are 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 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 (Saadia Zahidi, phone interview, 24 February 2011).

**EU Programme on Gender Balance in Decision-Making Positions**

The EU’s 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. 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).

A short survey sent to members of the network shortly after its establishment showed that they ‘found the network very useful’ (Fatima Ribeiro, personal correspondence, 6 January 2011)). 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 (Fatima Ribeiro, personal correspondence, 6 January 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 programme 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 towards 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, who use it to support 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’ (Fatima Ribeiro, personal correspondence, 6 January 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. 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 WEF, EU 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 however, the WEPs involve high-level commitment from global chief executive officers (CEOs) whose personal signatures and statements can be found on the UN website, lauding the economic gains to be had from empowering women. (UN Global Compact n.d.; UN Global Compact n.d.)

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 (7) transparency, measurement and reporting. The seven principles emphasize that equality lies in increasing women’s leadership (equal outcomes), introducing work/life balance policies in employment, and ensuring that women are included as equals (equal treatment) at work. For instance, a key element drawn from principle 2 suggests that 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. The discussion of principle 2 goes so far as 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’ approach to women’s representation (Bratton,
2005) and the now popular ‘30% clubs’ in the USA and the UK that adva-
cate 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’ (UN Global Compact, 2010).

It is notable, given our feminist evaluation criteria, that transparency is
itself a core WEP: principle 7 ensures publicity in the implementation of
all the WEPs. Companies need to do more than promote the principles
and their attendant initiatives online; they must ‘make public the com-
pany policies and implementation plan for promoting gender equality;
establish benchmarks that quantify inclusion of women at all levels; mea-
sure and report on progress, both internally and externally, using data
disaggregated by sex’ (UN Global Compact/UNIFEM, 2010: 3). The UN
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 predate the 2010 WEPs, but show how key multi-
national businesses in energy, finance, services/tourism and manufacturing
sectors have implemented processes aligning with the principles (UN
Global Compact, 2011). The effects of the empowerment principles are
demonstrated even before they have been formally signed on to and
implemented since companies want to ensure that they can fully comply
with them. However, the working document of ‘best practice’ implemen-
tation 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,
2011). Another activity intended to nudge corporations to sign on to the
WEPs are the inaugural WEP Leadership Awards begun in 2013 to recog-
nize and celebrate corporate achievements in implementing the WEPs.
These awards fall into five categories: ‘benchmarking for change’, ‘busi-
ness 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 recognized along with their organization were men.8
Although transparency is achieved by the requirement that companies
measure and report on progress towards implementing the WEPs, actual
public involvement and accountability need not be integral to this report-
ing. 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. 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.

All these approaches suggest the potential for a two-way street of engagement wherein businesses influence communities 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 WEPs reflect on some if not all the workings or effects of power. Nowhere are the causes of women’s 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/UNIFEM, 2010: 6–7). In addition, the WEPs promote the recognition of women in power (e.g. focusing on female employees’ accomplishments and women’s IT achievements (UN Global Compact/UNIFEM, 2010: 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/UNIFEM, 2010: 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. A bottom-up notion of power as the capacity for collective action involving women as active participants in change is not emphasised.

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 programs aim to create awareness about the collective economic benefits from gender equality by providing an evidence base of statistics and enabling benchmarking that explicitly targets 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 (cf. Towns, 2010). The 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, that is, that it is desirable to empower women to run their own businesses. Together with our other private-led partnership, the WEF’s Gender Program, the Goldman Sachs 10,000 Women Initiative is based on the theory that promoting women’s entrepreneurship and employment, 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 2007/08 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 2007/08, which was highly gendered in its impacts10) 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 that 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? There is considerable overlap in the actors involved in the different programs. For example, Goldman Sachs is a key player in the WEF, as are other companies that have signed up to the WEPs. Academics from business schools that support the Goldman Sachs initiative also reappear in the WEF gender groups. The former US Ambassador-at-Large for Global Women’s Issues in the US State Department (under Secretary Clinton), Melanne Verveer, is featured as a key partner in three of four of the initiatives, suggesting that there are key policy or norm entrepreneurs at work here (cf. Finnemore and Sikkink, 1998; Mintrom and Norman, 2009). Gender governance programs seem to spawn a new network of global actors who may be developing a new consensus on gender equality policies, with distinct problem definitions and solutions. Again, we consider this a fruitful line of inquiry: What kinds transnational networks of global policy and/or business feminism exist or are emerging? What is the shape of these networks, who is included, who is excluded? How does one become a member? How does one gain access to these networks as a researcher?

With respect to the new consensus on gender equality, what new technologies of power do the four programs make available for governing
gender? Our case study research points 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 neoliberal 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 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 precondition for economic success and well-being 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 pronounced differences 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 WEPs’ 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 WEF 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 that 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,
Rangan and Ross, 2010), and with the ICRW (2011). Effectiveness is somewhat more difficult to assess in the cases of the UN WEPs 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 an EU-wide policy on company quotas. The outcomes of the WEPs 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 WEPs, 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; Hoskyns and Rai, 2007). The fact that most of the actors involved in the partnerships do not self-identify as feminists diminishes the importance 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, that is, women’s presence in businesses, and a substantive representation, that is, 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 WEPs – is moving towards 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 mainstrea...viding gendered differences. Our assessment of this reality in light of various feminist principles is decidedly ambiguous, revealing a dearth of reflexivity, and 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 neoliberalism and feminism, with different results 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.

NOTES


2. The 2008 report of the Africa Forum announced the first meeting of the African Gender Parity Group and on its last page it 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, 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 Palestine Liberation Organization (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. Lists of members are in Appendix B.


5. See <http://www.weprinciples.org> (accessed 29 October 2013). The title of this article ‘Equality means business’ is taken from the WEPs promotional documentation.

6. For a full formulation of the WEPs, see Appendix D.

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

9. This lists the bullet points present under principle 6 ‘community leadership and engagement’ (UN Global Compact/UNIFEM, 2010: 3).

10. See special issues 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 – on the one hand, promoting women entrepreneurs, while, on the other, having played an infamous role in popularizing collateralized debt obligations that initiated the subprime mortgage crisis in the USA and spiraled into a financial crisis. Poor women were disproportionately targeted for these financial products and many lost their homes during the crisis.
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## APPENDIX A
Goldman Sachs 10,000 Women Initiative partners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic partners</th>
<th>Non-profit partners and advisors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American University of Afghanistan</td>
<td>Acumen Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American University of Beirut</td>
<td>Africa America Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American University in Cairo</td>
<td>AMIDEAST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian University for Women</td>
<td>Ashoka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babson College</td>
<td>Aspen Institute – ANDE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown University</td>
<td>Camfed International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia Business School</td>
<td>CARE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuttington University</td>
<td>Case Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundação Dom Cabral</td>
<td>Center for Creative Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundação Getulio Vargas Escola de</td>
<td>Center for Global Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administração de Empresas de Sao Paulo</td>
<td>CHF International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown University/US Afghan</td>
<td>Endeavor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Council</td>
<td>Global Business School Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard Business School</td>
<td>Global Health Corps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEC Paris</td>
<td>Grameen Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAG Business School – PUC-Rio</td>
<td>Hispanic Scholarship Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE Business School</td>
<td>Institute of International Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IESE Business School</td>
<td>Inter-American Development Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian School of Business</td>
<td>International Center for Research on Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSEAD</td>
<td>LASPAU: Academic and Professional Programs for the Americas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keio University Graduate School of Media Design</td>
<td>Mibanco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Business School</td>
<td>National Entrepreneurship Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mills College</td>
<td>Opportunity International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Özyeğin University Center for Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Overseas Private Investment Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pan-African University</td>
<td>Room to Read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Said Business School, University of Oxford</td>
<td>TechnoServe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Finance and Banking</td>
<td>United Negro College Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford Graduate School of Business</td>
<td>Vital Voices Global Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathmore University</td>
<td>Women For Women International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tecnológico de Monterrey</td>
<td>Women’s World Banking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thunderbird School of Global Management</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsinghua SEM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universidad del Pacifico</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universidad del Valle de Guatemala</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universidad Tecnológica de Panama</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States International University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Asia and the Pacific</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Cambridge, represented by Judge Business School and the Cambridge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
### APPENDIX B

**Members of the WEF Global Agenda Council on Women’s Empowerment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Al Dabbagh, May (Saudi Arabia)</td>
<td>Al Dabbagh, May (USA)</td>
<td>Al Jaber, Fatima Obaid (Al Jaber Group, UAE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bohnet, Iris (Switzerland)</td>
<td>Bohnet, Iris (Switzerland)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, J. Frank (USA)</td>
<td>Duflo, Esther (France)</td>
<td>Asan, Akin (Ministry of Family and Social Policies of Turkey)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlson Nelson, Marilyn (USA)</td>
<td>Fisher, Helen (USA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton, Ann (UK)</td>
<td>Hewlett, Sylvia Ann (USA)</td>
<td>Bohnet, Iris (Harvard Kennedy School of Government)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duflo, Esther (France)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher, Helen (USA)</td>
<td>Ibarra, Herminia (USA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gnezy, Uri (Israel)</td>
<td>Kochar, Chanda (India). Vice-chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gratton, Lynda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hewlett, Sylvia Ann (USA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibarra, Herminia (USA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inoguchi, Kuniko (Japan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanter, Rosabeth Moss (USA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lang, Ilene H. (USA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lipman, Joanne (USA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liswood, Laura (USA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norris, Pippa (UK)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qing, Wu (People’s Republic of China)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resnick, Lauren</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX C
Members of the EU network to promote women in decision-making according to sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business and Entrepreneurship</th>
<th>Civil Society Organizations</th>
<th>Professional Associations and Academics</th>
<th>Public Sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marijo Bos, President, European Professional Women’s Network</td>
<td>Gabriella Canonica, 1st Vice President, BPW (Business and Professional Women) – International</td>
<td>Leena Linnainmaa, Member, European Women Lawyers Association</td>
<td>Irene Natividad, President; Maud Pagel/Member, Global Summit of Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helena de Felipe Lehtonen, President, Association of Organisations of Mediterranean Businesswomen</td>
<td>Sonja Lokar, Coordinator for the South East European Office, CEE Network for Gender Issues</td>
<td>Jocelyne Bougeard, President, Committee of Women Elected Representatives of Local and Regional Authorities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophia Economacos, President, Eurochambres Women’s Network</td>
<td></td>
<td>Irene Natividad, President, European Platform of Women Scientists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


(continued)
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 non-discrimination.
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.