



“Increasing the Civic and Political Participation of Women: Understanding the Risk of Strong Resistance”

LITERATURE REVIEW

Prepared for the USAID Democracy Fellows and Grants Program

January 2017

University of Virginia Research Team

Denise Walsh, Ph.D.

Vanessa Ochs, Ph.D.

Swati Chawla

Dannah Dennis

Paromita Sen

Catalina Vallejo

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Acknowledgements | 3 |
| Acronyms | 4 |
| Tables and Figures | 5 |
| Executive Summary | 6 |
| Introduction | 10 |
| Approach | 10 |
| Key Findings | 15 |
| Resistance | 15 |
| Do No Harm? | 15 |
| Backlash and Entrenched Resistance | 15 |
| Life Cycle of Resistance | 25 |
| Violence Against Women Politicians and Voters | 26 |
| Review Process | 30 |
| Protocol | 31 |
| Crosschecks and Annotations | 31 |
| Evaluating Sources | 32 |
| Disagreements and Resolutions | 32 |
| Types of Sources | 34 |
| Findings: Women’s Civic and Political Participation | 36 |
| Research Question | 36 |
| Key Terms | 36 |
| Seven Effective Strategies | 38 |
| Findings: Risk of Resistance | 41 |
| Strong Resistance | 41 |
| Moderate to Low Resistance | 45 |
| Sites of Resistance | 46 |
| How to Mitigate Resistance | 47 |
| Recommendations | 51 |
| Lessons for USAID | 51 |
| Priorities for Future Research | 52 |
| Conclusion | 55 |
| Bibliography | 56 |
| Appendices | 70 |
| Appendix A: Systematic Review Protocol | 70 |
| Appendix B: Methods Evaluations Checklists | 75 |
| Appendix C: Word Bank for Search Strings | 86 |

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to thank USAID staff members from several divisions, including the Learning Division, Elections and Political Transitions Divisions, Human Rights Division, Governance and Rule of Law Division, Civil Society and Media Division, and the team of scholars from Wayne State University (working simultaneously on a similar project), and Susan Markham for their comments and questions on earlier drafts. We also thank the UVA librarians and grey literature specialists in the Global South who contributed suggestions on key resources. Finally, we would like to thank Laura Adams for her exceptionally helpful feedback throughout the literature review process and Kristin Farthing of the Institute of International Education for her expert liaison between the reviewers and USAID.

ACRONYMS

DFID: Department for International Development (UK)

IIE: Institute of International Education (US)

INGO: International Non-Governmental Organization

IPU: Inter-Parliamentary Union

JBI-QARI: Joanna Briggs Institute – Qualitative Assessment and Review Instrument

LGBTQI: Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer and Intersex

MENA: Middle East and North Africa

MP: Member of Parliament

NGO: Non-Governmental Organizations

NDI: National Democratic Institute

ODI: Overseas Development Institute

RCT: Randomized Controlled Trial

SE Asia: South-East Asia

SHG: Self Help Group

SSA: Sub-Saharan Africa

USAID: United States Agency of International Development

UVA: University of Virginia

VAW: Violence Against Women

VAW-E: Violence Against Women in Elections

VAWIP: Violence Against Women in Politics

WHO: World Health Organization

WHRD: Women Human Rights Defenders

TABLES AND FIGURES

| | |
|---|----|
| Figure 1: Types of Interventions Covered in Existing Research | 33 |
| Figure 2: Methods Employed in Existing Research | 34 |
| Figure 3: Regional Focus of Existing Research | 34 |

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Widespread agreement exists among scholars and activists that women's civic and political participation is crucial for democracy and development. Nevertheless, obstacles to women's participation persist. Given these obstacles, how can agencies like the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) most effectively encourage women in the developing world to participate in civil society and politics? When agencies effectively intervene, what level of risk do women face as a result of strong resistance to that intervention? And where that risk is high, how can it best be mitigated? USAID commissioned a review of the evidence-based literature to answer these questions.

This literature review begins with a discussion of multidisciplinary approaches to resistance, often referred to as backlash. *Because the literature on resistance is under-theorized, the reviewers compare and contrast theories and claims about backlash in different disciplines. This leads to a series of insights about different forms of resistance. Specifically, the reviewers:*

- Distinguish between social and individual forms of resistance
- Differentiate backlash from entrenched resistance
- Explain the likelihood of and pathways to violence at times of backlash and entrenched resistance
- Highlight three manifestations of backlash
- Explain the policy implications of these insights for agencies like USAID

The comparison definitively demonstrates that resistance is not simply a response to changing gender norms but is a multi-faceted and complex phenomenon that not only offers risks but also opportunities to those challenging the status quo. Indeed, resistance is shaped by a variety of

factors, including the willingness of activists to provoke violence, the partisan appeal of threat narratives, and the extent to which individual women exhibit “agentic” characteristics, such as aggression and competitiveness. Few, if any, of these insights guide the evidence-based literature in the review, underscoring the need for concept building and theory-development in the field.

The literature review next identifies seven strategies for effectively encouraging women’s civic and political participation. These strategies are elaborated in the United Kingdom’s (UK) Overseas Development Institute (ODI)’s report on “Women’s Voice and Leadership in Decision-Making: Assessing the Evidence” (2015). According to the ODI (2015, 4), the “key areas where international actors may best be able to support and strengthen women’s voice and leadership in decision-making” are:

1. Attend to the specific context
2. Require field agents to think and act politically
3. Encourage diverse women’s organizing and mobilizations
4. Work with multiple stakeholders
5. Target participation in both formal politics and civil society
6. Build women’s political and leadership skills
7. Take a multidimensional rather than a silo approach

The literature review builds on these seven strategies. Using a flexible systematic review process that included defining and operationalizing strong resistance, the reviewers find limited evidence-based research on strong resistance in response to these seven strategies. Moreover, the literature that does exist focuses almost exclusively on female politicians. *With these limitations in mind, the reviewers find that strong resistance in response to these seven strategies is not pervasive but does occur, and that it can discourage women’s participation.* The reviewers

further find that low to moderate resistance is ubiquitous, but generally has less deleterious effects. Importantly, the sites where strong resistance occurs vary within countries and even among local areas within a single country. ***This suggests that a country-level analysis of gender norms is inadequate and ineffective for assessing and understanding women's risk of strong resistance.***

The implications of these findings is that ***risk assessments should be:***

- Routine and done prior to engaging in any intervention, and require information extending far beyond local gender norms
- Focused on low to moderate forms of resistance in situations of backlash, and attentive to the possibility of strong resistance in situations of entrenched resistance
- Designed for the specific site where the intervention occurs, while remaining attentive to national and individual-level factors that shape resistance

Given the limits of the literature on resistance, particularly in response to the seven effective interventions that encourage women's civic and political participation, ***the reviewers recommend the following research priorities:***

- Concept-formation and theory-building about resistance, and the development of methodologies for studying it and assessing its incidence and prevalence
- Empirical research on resistance to women's civic participation, as the existing literature focuses almost entirely on women politicians
- Multidisciplinary, context-based studies, including cross-comparative research that is not solely at the country-level, as well as multi-method studies, all of which should target understudied geographical areas

- Men's and women's movements that fuel or engage in resistance to women's civic and political participation
- The disaggregation of women, not only by class, ethnicity, race, and religion, but also by age, gender identity, and sexuality
- The role of media in shaping the emergence, persistence, and/or dissipation of resistance to women's participation
- Positive cases, e.g., sites where strong resistance dissipated quickly, to learn more about mitigation of risks to participation
- Positive spillover effects of women's civic and political participation

Finally, the reviewers recommend that multidisciplinary scholarly teams advance this research agenda, and that those teams not only share their findings with agencies like USAID, but that they study the experiences and concerns of development workers to ensure a more complete understanding of resistance to effective interventions that encourage women's civic and political participation.

INTRODUCTION

Approach

This review approaches women's civic and political participation and resistance to it through a feminist, intersectional lens. The review critically analyzes gender from disciplinary perspectives that include anthropology, history, political science, religious studies, and sociology. While the approach is feminist, the researchers are aware of the body of literature that has rightly critiqued mainstream feminism for focusing primarily on the concerns of women in position of relative privilege and for its complicity in neo-imperialist projects that justify themselves in terms of "saving" or "liberating" women who are "oppressed" (e.g., Abu-Lughod 2013, Riley et al. 2008). For this reason, the researchers emphasize that those who wish to upgrade the status of women must respect the agency of the women whom they seek to help, and that they act in solidarity with local women's goals and initiatives that aim to end women's subordination. Further, the researchers emphasize that a non-imperialist feminist approach to research, activism, and development must be sensitive to the ways in which women's experiences vary greatly across the world, and even within relatively small countries, and are always shaped by a multitude of contextual factors.

The approach taken here shapes the reviewers' understanding of how to think about women's risks of strong resistance when interventions encourage them to engage in civic and political participation. For example, *resistance*—which may include physical and sexual violence, social and familial censure, ostracization by the religious community, and various overt or subtle forms of restriction, deprivation, and exclusion—*varies according to multiple factors, including but not limited to gender norms, the broader cultural context, regime type, local power structures, economic opportunities, and the form of participation sought*. Moreover, all

women do not experience the same levels of risk, nor are they vulnerable to the same types of resistance. For example, even within a single socio-cultural context, women who are marginalized (economically, racially, linguistically, religiously, or otherwise) are likely to bear greater burdens of risk than women who have social protections by virtue, for instance, of their family relationships. Furthermore, while women in one country may face few risks when they engage in formal politics through quotas, those same women may face greater risks while advocating in civil society for the right to divorce.

Key Findings

Research on resistance that aims to limit or end challenges to the status quo is under-theorized and is in need of concept building. The field requires multidisciplinary engagement, as institutional and structural level research coming mostly out of the disciplines of political science and sociology does not appear to engage with individual level research (i.e., psychology). As a result, much remains to be learned about resistance. The reviewers take several steps to address these limitations through a discussion of multidisciplinary theories and empirical findings on backlash. ***Our discussion suggests that making analytical distinctions is critical for assessing resistance, but that these distinctions are rarely theorized or even acknowledged in the literature:***

- Social and individual forms of resistance are distinct, but share some commonalities
- Backlash is distinct from entrenched resistance
- The pathways to violence during backlash are distinct from the pathways to violence during entrenched resistance
- Backlash has at least three possible manifestations

- Individual women who engage in “agentic” behavior (e.g., aggressiveness, competitiveness) are at a higher risk for backlash than women who do not

The review then turns from the literature on backlash to the evidence-based literature on how to effectively encourage women’s civic and political participation. This discussion draws on the UK Overseas Development Institute (ODI)’s report on “Women’s Voice and Leadership in Decision-Making: Assessing the Evidence” (2015). The report follows the feminist, intersectional, and context-based approach taken in this review, uses the same systematic review guidelines followed here, highlights many sources familiar to the reviewers, and adopts an approach to women’s participation akin to that developed by the lead reviewer (Walsh 2010).

ODI’s approach to participation targets what the authors refer to as “women’s substantive voice and leadership *looking beyond women’s presence and the number of women participating to address the politics of influence*” (2015, 8, italics in original). The ODI Report thus focuses on how international agencies can best encourage women’s empowerment, voice, access to decision-making, and leadership; it does so by analyzing the literature on both civil society and formal politics.

The seven effective strategies that the reviewers adapt from ODI are:

1. Attend to the specific context
2. Require field agents to think and act politically
3. Encourage diverse women’s organizing and mobilizations
4. Work with multiple stakeholders
5. Target participation in both formal politics and civil society
6. Build women’s political and leadership skills
7. Take a multidimensional rather than a silo approach

The reviewers then use a systematic, flexible review process to locate sources investigating the risk of strong resistance in response to these seven strategies. The findings were few:

- The sources concentrated primarily on quotas and violence against women politicians
- Most sources lacked a broad base of empirical evidence
- Regional gaps meant nearly a third of all sources focused on South Asia
- Few comparative analyses exist

With these caveats in mind, *this review finds low to moderate levels of resistance to effective interventions is far more common than strong resistance*. Strong resistance, including arson and murder, does emerge in several sources, and not surprisingly, has a deleterious effect on women's participation. But it is not as widespread as moderate resistance (such as sexual harassment and physically blocking women's access to spaces of decision-making) or low resistance (such as stereotyping or the enforcement of women's invisibility), both of which limit women's civic and political participation, but rarely discourage most women from entering political and civic spaces altogether. Even these lesser forms of resistance, however, sometimes discredit not only the intervention but also the people associated with it, diminishing their standing in the community.

The sources also reveal widespread regional variations not only across countries but also within them, thereby making it difficult to offer national-level generalizations. Resistance to women's participation was reported within all possible sites: the family, society at large, political parties, governmental agencies, and within developmental agencies themselves, as well as across multiple social domains at once. The most optimistic finding from the literature is that

initial resistance, even if it manifests as *strong resistance*, does not always portend a complete failure of the intervention: resistance in some sites might decrease over time.

Until field agents are skilled in distinguishing between backlash and entrenched resistance (discussed below), ***low to moderate resistance should be expected when implementing the ODI strategies, and agents should be prepared for occasional incidents of strong resistance.*** Given the evidence-based findings, USAID might consider doing risk assessments at the specific site(s) where the intervention is to occur prior to undertaking any action. This assessment should engage with people in the local communities about possible reactions to proposed interventions, after which, in conversation with local participants, USAID could weigh the possible costs and benefits of those interventions.

RESISTANCE

Do No Harm?

It is laudable to aim to avoid strong resistance against women when agencies like USAID encourage women to participate in civil society and politics. It is possible, however, that *the principle of “do no harm” is an inappropriate guiding principle in this case, particularly if it is interpreted to mean that all interventions must avoid harm of any kind or else cease.*

Rubenstein (2015) explains that international agencies cannot do significant good while also avoiding every negative effect, as they are “embedded in political dynamics beyond their control” which ensures that “they regularly have unintended negative effects” (94). She adds that if international agencies have “mostly good intentions, some good effects, and contribute knowingly but unintentionally to injustices perpetrated primarily by others,” then they “sometimes have a responsibility to *allow their hands to be spattered*—that is, they sometimes have a responsibility to grudgingly accept contributing to injustices perpetrated primarily by others” (103, italics in original). This decision need not always rest with international agencies, but rather, with those who are most at risk. *The policy implication is that it is crucial for international agencies to learn more about risks to women who participate in civil society and formal politics, and that agencies and the women themselves must carefully weigh this knowledge against the likely benefits of their participation.*

Backlash and Entrenched Resistance

Resistance, in the feminist literature on women’s civic and political participation, commonly refers to the actions that women take to challenge their subordination, including but not limited to gender subordination. As women’s resistance to their subordination gains traction and women’s presence in politics and civil society grows, scholars across a range of disciplines

note that a backlash against these gains might ensue.¹ In this review, resistance does not refer to women's challenges to their subordination; *rather, as prompted by USAID, resistance refers to actions and attitudes ranging from unintentional hostility through physical violence in response to women's political and civic participation.*

Resistance to women's equality in the feminist literature is commonly referred to as backlash (e.g., Faludi 1991). Social scientists and historians also refer to backlash to discuss conservative reactions to racial progress and immigrant rights in the United States (e.g., Abrajano and Hajnal 2015; Anderson 2016; Kimmel 2013). However, the concept has not been fully theorized (e.g., Bishin, Hayes, Incantalupo and Smith 2016; Mansbridge and Shames 2008). Backlash generally refers to attitudes and actions by those who feel threatened by changes in the status quo, and who take action to secure or reinstate it. As Mansbridge and Shames note (2008, 625), although backlash involves force to uphold the status quo, "many, if not most, forms of force are not violent;" further, those engaging in backlash generally avoid violence as it makes force visible (also see Anderson 2016). The findings of Kanthak and Krause (2012) on the United States Congress underscore this point. In their study, reports of overt resistance were rare and most women reported low levels of harassment that would be invisible to outsiders. The invisibility of force, however, is disadvantageous for challengers. Activists, such as civil rights protesters, thus sometimes provoke opponents to use violence and make force visible to demonstrate the credibility of their claims and to win public sympathy (Mansbridge and Shames 2008). Backlash, even violent backlash, therefore offers opportunities as well as threats to challengers of the status quo.

¹ Women's organizing, however, is not always progressive; right-wing women's activism such as the examples documented by Basu (1998) and Bacchetta and Power (2013) might challenge progressive reform. Thus, "increasing women's civic and political participation" as a goal in and of itself does not always result in the kind of progressive reforms that USAID might wish to promote.

Opportunities extend beyond gaining credibility and public sympathy. In her analysis of postfeminism and backlash, Jordan (2016) argues that backlash does not signal a rejection of all change, but instead selectively labels some change as going too far. Thus backlash validates innovations to the status quo even as it rejects others. Further, Jordan finds that backlash “re-politicizes” feminism in contexts where it has been presented as “inherently unreasonable and/or irrelevant” (28). While this re-politicization threatens feminist goals, it rallies dormant advocates of women’s rights to enter the political arena and counter defenders of the status quo. Thus, backlash can secure some achievements and provide an incentive for feminists to mobilize, even as it threatens women’s emancipation.

Many questions about backlash remain. How, when, and where does backlash as a social phenomenon occur? Why does it occur in some places and not others? What constitutes backlash (including its range and types)? How, when, and why does the public endorse backlash and public policies to buttress the status quo? When backlash occurs, when is it effectual? Bishin, Hayes, Incantalupo, and Smith (2016) agree that the literature on backlash is under-theorized and elicits confusion. They argue that it often refers to two different things: 1) a sudden, negative shift in public opinion in response to a policy change, and 2) negative actions by groups that had always opposed policies threatening the status quo. The authors suggest that the term backlash be reserved for the former, and define it as a “large, negative, and enduring shift in opinion against a policy or group that occurs in response to some event that threatens the status quo” (626). Although both forms of resistance are likely to work together at times, they are distinct and might require different responses by change agents. While both types of resistance are evident in the literature reviewed here, scholars rarely note the distinction.

Bishin et al. (2016) also warn that claims of backlash are often made “without considering that the outcome may have occurred regardless of the supposed backlash-inducing event” (639). Careful causal analysis is essential to avoid this mistake, but it is often lacking (particularly in the grey literature reviewed here, see below). Indeed, Bishin et al. (2016) and Flores and Barclay (2014) find no evidence of public opinion backlash *in response to* the expansion of gay rights policies over several decades in the United States. Hence, they conclude that the frequency of backlash in public opinion as a response to policy change is overestimated.

In contrast, Abrajano and Hajnal (2015) find evidence of a backlash in public opinion and policy in response to recent immigrant groups arriving to the United States. They argue that the conditions for this backlash included a sizeable demographic change, an immigration threat narrative promoted by political entrepreneurs and the media that gained credence among a majority of Whites and, most importantly, took on partisan characteristics. As a result, a nativist backlash shaped not only public opinion but also voting patterns and public policy. Ayoub’s (2014) study of backlash against lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender right also points to the salience of threat narratives. He finds that a threat narrative succeeded in Poland but failed in Slovenia given the different symbolic role played by the Catholic Church in the national imaginary of each country.

This research on backlash in public opinion and policy suggests that:

- Backlash in public opinion in response to policy change occurs less frequently than assumed
- Causal analysis examining the link between backlash and the presumed trigger is rare

- A backlash may not have an effect on elections or public policy unless a majority of the voting population subscribes to the threat narrative, and political parties respond to that narrative along partisan lines
- The effect of threat narratives on popular mobilization varies with media publicity, political competition, and the symbolic role of powerful opponents
- Backlash is distinct from entrenched resistance

How might analysts distinguish between entrenched resistance and backlash? The successes of the international women's movement in many developing countries since the 1990s, including near universal ratifications of the Convention on the Elimination and Discrimination Against Women; the tremendous participation of governments and NGOs at international women's conferences like the Fourth World Conference on Women, Beijing 1995; and the adoption of quotas and gender mainstreaming by many states, suggest that concerns about backlash are most appropriate when interventions to encourage women's civic and political participation are made at the national level. Concerns about entrenched resistance are appropriate when intervening among corporate groups, often powerful at the local level, that rely on patriarchal forms of rule to maintain their power and survival.

Backlash occurs in different forms. *Violent backlash, a backlash in public opinion, and a public policy backlash are each distinct from the other.* The research suggests that those concerned about limiting backlash of any kind must first identify the political actors and groups who believe that encouraging women's participation will go too far because it will challenge the status quo. Those concerned about preventing *violence* must then assess whether these individuals and groups are likely to use violence against individual women or their organizations if provoked. Those concerned about a backlash in *public opinion* will need to assess the capacity

of the opposition to mobilize and win popular support from a powerful voting majority (in liberal democracies) and powerful elites (in liberal democracies and authoritarian regimes). And those concerned about containing a backlash in *public policy* should assess a) whether voter and elite resistance falls along partisan lines, as partisan support for public policy initiatives intensifies the salience of an issue and can become a litmus test for party success, and b) the symbolic power of entrenched resistance. Finally, it is possible that some of the factors that shape one of these forms of backlash also shape others.

Similar factors are relevant when assessing the likelihood that corporate groups expressing entrenched resistance to women's participation, such as clans, will use violence and be able to shape majority public opinion and public policy. Charrad (2001) in her comparative study of women's rights in Morocco, Tunisia, and Algeria, finds that tribes in Tunisia were unsuccessful in opposing advancements in women's rights. She argues that the tribes were not institutionalized in the post-colonial state, and instead competed with nationalizing elites. State leaders thus approved sweeping policy reforms in women's rights to undercut their competitors. Htun (2003), Walsh (2010), and Hudson, Bowen, and Nielsen (2015) confirm this pattern of elites using women's rights to thwart their opponents, indicating that partisan competition is crucial when assessing resistance to women's political and civic participation.

Hudson et al. also observe that clans "are characterized by extreme subordination of women effected through marriage practices" (2015, abstract). This is because marriage practices are essential for the group's longevity and vitality; they are what Htun and Weldon (2010, 210) label "doctrinal issues." When women's participation challenges doctrinal issues, corporate groups expressing entrenched resistance are likely to strongly and even violently resist. Indeed,

corporate groups such as clans often have norms condoning violence against women when their behavior threatens doctrinal issues, e.g., honor killings. Violence is thus likely if women's participation in politics and civil society threatens doctrinal issues, for example, if women attend late-night meetings with men outside their kinship group. That violence, however, is likely to be checked by capacitated states led by elites who aim to undermine patriarchal corporate groups like clans. Violence is likely to be condoned or tacitly accepted by states where ruling elites rely on these groups for support, or when states lack the capacity to successfully challenge them.

Therefore, in addition to identifying contexts where resistance to changing gender norms is strong, attending to the likelihood of violence also requires the following:

- Identifying whether potential resistance is entrenched or is a backlash
- Knowledge of elite interests and competition among elites
- Attentiveness to doctrinal issues and norms that sanction violence when resistance is entrenched
- Attentiveness to coercive force that is not violent, and attentiveness to activists who might instigate violence to make force visible during a backlash

If concerns about resistance include not only violence, but also public opinion and policy outcomes, analysts must also assess:

- Factors that facilitate mobilization in civil society and the state against women's participation
- The potential appeal of threat narratives regarding women's participation among majority voting blocs and/or elites
- Factors that shape public policy outcomes, such as partisanship

Resistance to women's participation in civil society and politics can also occur at the individual level; moreover, resistance can shape individual women's willingness to participate.

In a comprehensive psychology review article on backlash research, Rudman, Moss-Racusin, Glick, and Phelan (2012) find that individuals who do not conform to gender and racial stereotypes invite backlash, by which they mean punishment that has social and economic costs. (This definition does not distinguish between entrenched resistance and backlash.) Rudman et al. (2012) also find that individuals participate in backlash behavior only when they believe it is appropriate, namely, when gender and racial non-conformity threatens what the authors refer to as status hierarchies.

The authors also suggest that individuals defend the status quo for a variety of reasons. To be sure, some individuals aim to protect their power and authority, or their personal self-worth. Some members of marginalized groups, however, also act to perpetuate the status quo. Some do so to stave off hopelessness about their group status. Others value existing stereotypes about their group, even when those stereotypes relegate them to second-tier status. For example, some women may insist that they are naturally better caretakers than men, and therefore insist that no woman should participate in civil society or in politics when she has young children at home. Indeed, the authors find that women are just as likely as men to uphold gender stereotypes and punish other women for gender deviance (Rudman et al. 2012, 173,186).

In masculinist institutions like legislatures, Kanthak and Krause (2012) contend that women who have been tokens and rewarded with special treatment by men also are likely to defend the status quo. Kanthak and Krause argue that token women, in an effort to maintain their special treatment, are unsupportive of incoming women. As a result, increasing numbers of women in a legislature do not automatically create a woman-friendly environment; on the

contrary, increasing numbers can make legislatures more hostile as men withdraw special treatment for token women who now are no longer tokens, and token women neglect or even oppose newcomers. Kanthak and Krause also find that resistance by token women can hobble the capacity of women legislators to organize as women and challenge masculine norms and male dominance.

Rudman et al. (2012) find that many individuals engage in backlash avoidance because of its social costs, and contend that this avoidance also has costs. The authors confirm that most individuals seek to conform to gender norms rather than challenge them in an effort to prevent negative reactions, rejection, and social ostracism. Indeed, the authors cite studies that find “the mere threat of becoming a social outcast will suffice” to trigger backlash avoidance (172). Rudman et al. add that this avoidance also has costs. First, individual women pay a cost as they police their own behavior by not pursuing the full range of opportunities formally available to them. Second, society pays a cost as vanguard role models remain rare and talent takes a backseat to gender stereotypes. The authors thus conclude that backlash avoidance leads to a vicious cycle that reinforces stereotypes at grave social cost.

We note, however, that when individual women vanguards embrace agentic behavior over “communal” behavior such as compassion, they reinforce the primacy of agentic behavior and masculinity, which also has social costs. While individual women vanguards can challenge gender stereotypes by transgressing them, individual transgressions alone are unlikely to dismantle the hegemony of masculinity or increase the social worth of communal behavior that has been devalued as feminine. Instead, as Kanthak and Krause (2012) underscore, organizing as women is the most effective means for enhancing women’s power and has the added benefit of not requiring women to become honorary men.

Importantly, Rudman et al. (2012) also note that not all deviations from the status quo are equally threatening and thus equally punished. Drawing on gender stereotypes that are “cross-culturally consistent” (177), the authors find that the problem is not simply that women leaders trigger individual censure. Indeed, they note that women leaders in masculine domains can compensate for bias. For example, women can address concerns about their competence by emphasizing their accomplishments. However, when a woman extolls her competence she must do so without being as aggressive, competitive, or otherwise agentic as men, or she will be disliked and punished (178). As the authors note, “women are proscribed from exhibiting high-status signs of dominance” (185). ***This suggests that a woman who exhibits high-status signs of dominance triggers backlash, regardless of whether she is a leader in a masculine domain or not.***

Insights from Rudman et al. (2012) on backlash have not, to the reviewers’ knowledge, been integrated with the social science research on backlash discussed above. Doing so would bring valuable insights to the field. For example, one might imagine that women tokens in the United States Congress, as described by Kanthak and Krause (2012), were hostile to newcomers and women’s caucuses not only because they aimed to preserve their special status but also to avoid backlash from dominant men. Or consider the possibility that agentic behavior is reserved for men across much of Morocco, where clans retain some influence with the monarchy. If this is the case, analysts might expect that a female politician who exhibits agentic behavior, and who also advocates marriage reforms would be a prime target for an individual act of violence, that the clans would be likely to condone that violence, and that many Moroccans would be unsympathetic toward the victim.

Several policy implications flow from the literature on backlash at the individual level.

When organizations like USAID seek to avoid resistance by individuals in response to women's civic and political participation, they should expect that:

- Resistance will be perpetrated by women as often as men, although its form may vary
- Resistance will occur when a woman exhibits agentic behavior
- Many women, especially tokens, will be reluctant to exhibit agentic behavior for fear of repercussions or because they aim to secure special treatment
- Curtailing women's civic and political participation out of fear of resistance will contribute to a vicious cycle that further entrenches gender stereotypes
- Women who organize as women will face low-level resistance but organizing can improve their participation

Finally, the reviewers suggest that, in light of this discussion, scholars and international agencies refer to opposition, rather than resistance or backlash, reserving the latter two terms for specific forms of opposition to women's civic and political participation.

Life Cycle of Resistance

What is the life cycle of resistance to women's political and civic participation? Some scholars have found that resistance to women's participation in civic and political life declines over time (e.g., Ochs 2007, Carreiras 2006, Duncanson and Woodward 2016). In the case of Israel, for example, women's participation is now routine, even though it was initially resisted on the grounds that this participation either was of a foreign source, having been "imported" from America, or was perceived to be incompatible with religious law (Ochs 2007). However, gender scholars in comparative politics looking across an array of cases find that women's participation

and resistance to it ebbs and flows over time. In this research, the factors that most affect women's participation are regime type, type of electoral institutions, the strength of the women's movement, and masculinist norms in institutional bodies like legislatures, trade unions, and social movements (e.g., Walsh 2010, Waylen 2007). While the first set of case studies suggest that resistance to women's civic and political participation is a normal aspect of politics that diminishes in intensity as women become routine participants, the latter body of research suggests that while resistance may diminish within each cycle over time, it can reemerge with renewed intensity at the beginning of a new cycle.

A third body of research offers insights as to how the above two trends might work in tandem (or that at least three trends are possible under a range of circumstances). In some cases, improvements to women's civic and political participation in one site can prompt a backlash in another. Consider women's political participation at the village level in much of South Asia (Bhatla and Rajan 2003). In response to women's participation, *khap panchayats* (all-male, unelected village councils) have emerged to punish women for putative gender transgressions in the social sphere, such as owning cell phones and listening to music (Bharadwaj 2012, Kaur 2010, Yadav 2010). This trade-off between participation in formal politics that is offset by greater gender policing in another site is not isolated to South Asia (e.g., Burnet 2008). ***The concept of a "vicious spiral" illuminates how resistance can ebb and flow within a site but can also move across them;*** it might therefore be a promising avenue for future research that seeks to assess the trajectory of women's civic and political participation over time.

Violence Against Women Politicians and Voters

Women's presence in formal politics is often secured through quotas, not only in South Asia but also in many regions across the globe. Over 100 countries have adopted quotas,

dramatically increasing the number of women in national legislatures (Krook 2010). *As women's presence in formal politics has increased over the past twenty years, organizations and scholars are beginning to investigate violence against women politicians (VAWIP)*. In April 2016, for example, the National Democratic Institute (NDI) launched the international campaign [#NotTheCost, Stopping Violence against Women in Politics](#), which includes an online Incident Report Form. Engaging in original research, the Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) sponsored a qualitative study of 55 women politicians from 39 countries (2016). That study finds that although sexual, physical, and economic violence is relatively rare, psychological violence against women politicians frequently occurs. The IPU notes 65.5 percent of respondents reported humiliating sexual or sexist remarks; 44.4 percent reported threats of violence (often made online) such as death, rape, beatings, or abduction. The leading aggravating factor was belonging to the opposition party, followed by youth or minority status. The report thus suggests that male Members of Parliament (MPs) and voters treat different women politicians differently, and that partisan politics can be psychologically abusive for women (whether it is similar for men is a pressing question if researchers are to disentangle political norms from violence against women politicians).²

The discussion of VAWIP is in its infancy in academia, with conceptual and methodological questions driving initial debates.³ Scholars argue, for example, about the importance of local context (e.g., extensive civilian insecurity in weak and predatory states), whether VAWIP occurs because the targets are women, because they are politicians, or because

² Research by Kanthak and Krause (2012) suggests that women politicians might be able to counter some of this abuse by creating a woman's caucus. However, their research also indicates that an infusion of a large number of women into the legislature at one time (e.g., via a quota) antagonizes the majority group by threatening its dominance while also creating cooperation challenges for women.

³ Momsen (2001), however, does investigate resistance to women's economic success from successful development programs that sometimes led to their increased political power and strong resistance, e.g., a witch-hunt.

they are women politicians, and how researchers might be able to parse the difference (e.g., Krook and Sanín 2016, Piscopo 2016[b]). It also remains unclear what the intent of perpetrators is and how this violence affects women politicians and their political behavior. Organizations determined to redress VAWIP tend to avoid these thorny problems.

Developmental agencies, NGOs, and other organizations seeking to foster women's participation in politics do grapple with conceptual and methodological issues when developing guidelines for field agents. Hubbard and DeSoi (2016) of NDI, for example, take a feminist approach to electoral violence against women (VAW-E), which offers guidelines for election monitors. They define VAW-E; operationalize it; insist upon the integration of local knowledge and participation, the centrality of women's experiences, and the importance of comparing women's experiences with men's. The authors also suggest distinct observation methodologies to be used at different stages of the electoral cycle according to resource availability and the aims of the assessment. This foundational work is a critical resource for all those concerned about the risk of resistance that might occur in response to women's civic and political participation.

However, grey literature justifications for a focus on VAWIP and VAW-E tend to equate both with a deliberate intention to prevent women from participating in politics *because* they are women. In these cases, organizations such as the NDI make arguments that outstrip their evidence. Claims such as the “phenomenon of violence against women in politics is one of the most serious barriers to women's political participation around the world, regardless of country or context,” (Hubbard and DeSoi 2016, 12) cannot currently be proven. Doing so would require, among other things, a systematic investigation of causality and ranking of other barriers to women's participation, both of which are lacking in the sources reviewed here. While claims like these may provide organizations with a powerful justification for monitoring and advocacy, they

also obfuscate important questions that the field must address if it is to gain credibility and succeed in its aims to reduce resistance to women's civic and political participation.

The extent to which violence against women is preventing women from participating in civil society and politics, and the extent to which this violence is deliberately being used to prevent this participation, will remain uncertain for some time. A fruitful way forward would be for organizations that have spearheaded this field of inquiry to work more closely with scholars, ensuring that both groups draw upon one another's expertise to investigate rather than assume the causal effects and intentions of violence in politics that women experience.

REVIEW PROCESS

Protocol

The reviewers designed a protocol to enhance the rigor, transparency, and replicability of this evidence-based literature review by making it systematic. The protocol served a dual purpose: it required the reviewers to conduct a pilot study that led to greater efficiency, and it ensured that all reviewers met consistently high standards. The reviewers developed the protocol following initial research on how to build a comprehensive literature review about development. Dr. Richard Handler, the director of Global Studies at the University of Virginia, provided research guidance. Useful, as well, were the bibliographies of reports written for developmental agencies (Isserles 2003, Mahmud 2003, Hickey and Mohan 2004, Mosse 2004, Bateman 2012, DFID 2014, Hagen-Zanker and Mallet 2013, Harrison 2013, Mosse 2013). The process chosen by the reviewers followed Hagen-Zanker and Mallet's (2013) systematic but flexible review strategy that adheres to the central principles of a systematic review while also being sensitive to time constraints and reflexivity. For Hagen-Zanker and Mallett (2013) a research protocol requires: a) establishing research collections for use; b) generating search strings; c) an explicit exclusion criteria; and c) the evaluation of individual sources.

Drawing on a range of interdisciplinary specializations, researchers collected recommendations of databases, search engines, and journals from UVA librarians, and grey literature sources from practitioners and area experts (Appendix A). In consultation with the USAID team, the researchers generated inclusion/exclusion criteria for the project (Appendix A). These inclusions/exclusions clarified which populations, methodologies, sources, and countries would be the focus of the review. For instance, stemming from an approach emphasizing intersectionality, the researchers debated the exclusion of privileged/elite women in developing

countries given that they would not necessarily be the focus of USAID interventions or face the same barriers that women members of marginalized communities face.⁴ However, the researchers chose to include elite women given the centrality of resistance to the review and the likelihood that even elite women might be at risk as they are more likely than marginalized women to occupy leadership positions in both civil society and politics.

The reviewers designed search strings according to the seven interventions specified in the 2015 ODI Report. The team created a word bank which provided a wide range of synonyms for key terms (Appendix C); each author searched for strong resistance generated in response to a specific intervention identified by ODI. The Team used the online data repository Zotero to store sources and organize them by intervention. Team members identified sources by restricting search string words to abstracts, title, and keywords rather than entire texts, thus ensuring that resistance was a key element of the text. Additionally, bibliographies of exceptionally rich sources were consulted and mined for sources.

Crosschecks and Annotations

All sources found in the initial search were allotted to a team member for the first round of assessment. The allocation was determined by the division of labor as proposed in the protocol, and congruent with individual areas of specialization. Each team member then assessed initial sources according to the inclusion/exclusion criteria (Appendix A). Excluded sources were reserved for the final bibliography; those retained were then assigned to another team member for a crosscheck. Again, area of expertise informed allocation. Efforts were made to complement these checks as opposed to duplicate. For example, if a team member fluent in the intervention

⁴ Research on South Asia and Southeast Asia, for instance, has illustrated that women can rise to power and even national executive office through the “Widow’s Walk,” their familial proximity to men in power. These women therefore face considerably fewer barriers to their political participation, while the Queen Butterfly effect ensures that their coming to power does little to benefit other women.

conducted the first check, someone familiar with the method or region conducted the second check. This ensured that each source was read twice, but from complementary angles. The crosschecks therefore exploited the team's range of disciplinary and thematic expertise. The secondary crosscheck documented brief insights on each source to facilitate efficient annotation, such as notes on methodology or applicability of findings to regions beyond those surveyed.

Evaluating Sources

To ensure reliability, the reviewers adapted JBI-QARI (Joanna Briggs Institute) to inform their evaluation of qualitative sources and adapted Department For International Development (2013) to inform their evaluation of quantitative sources. Studies that were indeterminate on whether they met the evaluation criteria were excluded from the annotations (Appendix B). Several sources failed to meet the second crosscheck (they were reserved for the final bibliography), thus further winnowing the sources to only the most relevant. The sole exceptions were sources that provided insights into how key concepts, such as risk, resistance, and intersectionality, are treated in the literature. In short, these sources helped guide our overall approach to the project and our conceptual understanding. Team members then drafted annotations, initially by the person whose thematic expertise matched those of the source. The author consulted the notes generated during the crosschecks, and also provided key words identifying the intervention, the region, and method for each source. The latter information became the basis for surveying the entire project and evaluating the general state of the field.

Disagreements and Resolutions

Overall, the reviewers were largely in agreement about the objectives of the review and how to fulfill these objectives. Having met regularly to discuss the progress of the review, any differences that emerged were readily resolved through democratic discussion. To give one

example of how the minor differences that arose were resolved: as reviewers were creating the checklists for evaluating each article, one of the anthropologists was concerned that ethnography as a method does not lend itself well to such a technocratic form of evaluation as a checklist. However, another anthropologist maintained that it was still possible to ascertain the criteria the two used to judge the quality of ethnographic research. This list was refined through discussion and eventually finalized in a checklist (Appendix B). This is one example of how multidisciplinary work pushes scholars to make explicit their implicit understandings of what constitutes good scholarship and to convey those understandings to those inside as well as outside the discipline.

At the conclusion of the search, when only a very small body of literature met the search criteria and addressed the research question, the reviewers discussed whether a systematic, flexible search had yielded the results that a less systematic search would have provided. The reviewers were also concerned the list of search terms might not have been exhaustive, and sources that would be relevant to the research question might not have appeared in the results. The word bank was expanded to address this, and the reviewers also drew on their multidisciplinary expertise to think of all possible iterations of a concept. Two of the team members expressed concern that the systematic search did not generate works by some of the scholars whose work they had expected to be included in the search. They noted that one alternative to a systematic search would have been to draw on each team member's disciplinary and regional expertise, and consult the footnotes and bibliographies of the work of relevant scholars within each of their fields, to see whose work they cite, and to follow up on the bibliographical trail (a less systematic but nonetheless common method used by many scholars). Ultimately, however, the researchers agreed that the reviewers would have reached the same

conclusion: little research has been done and little scholarship has been written on resistance to the effective strategies recommended by ODI.

Types of Sources

Existing research primarily addresses instances of political interventions (quotas almost exclusively), followed by interventions targeting both formal politics and civil society and women’s leadership roles; research on contextual, multidimensional, and mobilization interventions comprised only a small portion of the literature we examined (10 percent or less).




Figure 1: Types of Interventions Covered in Existing Research

Further, little of this research has a broad base of empirical evidence. About a quarter of the sources reviewed were themselves reviews of existing (largely theoretical) literature, followed by a predominance of ethnographic, case-studies-and interview-based pieces, with only a handful based on quantitative analysis, field experiments, and multiple methods.




Figure 2: Methods Employed in Existing Research

Regional gaps were also evident. South Asia alone accounted for a third of all sources, sub-Saharan Africa close to a fifth, Central America comprised only 10 percent, and Latin America, the Middle East and North Africa less than 10 percent. Only a fifth of all literature surveyed made global comparisons and offered some generalizable conclusions.




Figure 3: Regional Focus of Existing Research

FINDINGS: WOMEN'S CIVIC AND POLITICAL PARTICIPATION

Research Question

The 2015 ODI Report finds that the most effective intervention strategies for encouraging women's civic and political participation are contextually informed interventions where field agents think and act politically, encourage diverse women's organizing and mobilizations, work with multiple stakeholders, target participation in both formal politics and civil society, build women's political and leadership skills, and take a multidimensional rather than a silo approach. This literature review draws on these findings by asking:

- *When the seven effective interventions to encourage women's participation are implemented, what are the risks to women of strong resistance? Where strong resistance exists, what factors mitigate it?*

Key Terms⁵

Resistance: Any conduct that maintains the status quo in the face of pressure to alter it (Duncan 1977: 63, cited in Waddell and Sohal 1998). In this review, resistance refers to the disruption, refusal, and prevention of changes to gender norms, specifically women's political and civic participation resulting from the intervention strategies itemized above.

“Strong resistance” here refers to violence, meaning the actual use of physical force or power against oneself, another person, group, or community that leads to (or is likely to lead to) injury, psychological harm, maldevelopment, deprivation, or death. Its sources include self-

⁵ Whereas USAID conceived of “strong resistance” as a country-level variable of general cultural attitudes that restricted the possibilities for women's civic and political activities, we conceptualized resistance as violence that could occur to varying degrees across a range of contexts in any given country. The literature we studied, and our own experience as researchers, did not support an interpretation of “strong resistance” as a variable which could be said to be either present or absent at a country level. Our concept of risk addressed women who might be affected by intervention efforts in the contexts where USAID works. The literature we reviewed did not address the possibility of risk to US interests.

directed violence, interpersonal violence (committed by family, intimate partner, community) and collective violence (social, political, economic) (WHO 2002).

Strong resistance is manifest, for example, as:

- Suicide
- Homicide
- Intentional physical injury and/or mental abuse
- Sexual assault
- Trauma
- Torture
- Malnutrition
- Impoverishment
- Social/familial condemnation or ostracization
- Withholding of access to goods and services essential for wellbeing and self-determination (e.g., health care, education, voting rights).

Moderate resistance operates at a lower threshold of violence; it includes verbal intimidation, sexual harassment, and physically blocking women's access to spaces of decision-making.

Low levels of resistance are behaviors that silence, stereotype, enforce invisibility, exclude, and challenge the epistemic authority of women but do not involve physical acts of violence (Hawkesworth 2003).

Risk: the likelihood that (some) women will be exposed to threats and the danger of strong resistance when agencies implement the strategies identified above and successfully

encourage women's civic and political participation.

Risk is evident when, for example, a Member of Parliament threatens a woman MP with violence *because she is participating in politics* and this woman gained access to parliament through one of the effective interventions itemized. If the woman is threatened with violence for other reasons, e.g., she plans to vote against her party on a bill, this would not be labeled "risk," as it is not an indicator of a problem with the specific intervention but, in this case, with some other factor or factors such as regime type, party control, norms of violence in politics, etc.

Mitigation: a lessening or diminishment of the risk (or experience of) strong resistance. Mitigation may be evident, for example, in improved government legislation on violence against women in response to a backlash, or in community forums dedicated to discussing strong resistance and devising and implementing context appropriate solutions.

While the researchers primarily sought evidence-based policy solutions, as the literature on this was small, the review includes sources with suggestions for future research and policy recommendations that stem from analyses of strong resistance.

Seven Effective Strategies Identified by the ODI Report

1 Contextual expertise

Having deep knowledge of the site where the intervention is to occur is critical as gender norms, civic and political institutions, and practices vary significantly by time and place. These variations will influence the potential for interventions to succeed or fail in specific sites and for specific women (and men). Local knowledge is critical. Interventions that are context-based are typically shaped and implemented by local actors.

2 Agents who think and work politically

This requires the redistribution of power and resources by facilitating, say, trust and alliance building within political parties, forging strategic political coalitions, or planning campaign strategies. Agents do not avoid politics; instead, they help women do the hard work politics requires. Most commonly in this literature review on resistance these interventions were quotas that redistributed power by catapulting women into political office.

3 Encouraging diverse women's organizing and mobilizations by helping women in different groups become ready and capable of action

This requires the provision of resources—such as leadership skills that are context appropriate, networks, and money—to facilitate organizational/movement autonomy for a variety of women's movements while also promoting linkages among them.

4 Working with multiple stakeholders and investing in long-term relationships with change agents, building partnerships between women's organizations and power brokers in both civil society (such as universities) and politics

These interventions help different women's groups gain powerful allies by, for example, persistent networking that forges strong bonds between the powerful and women's groups.

5 Simultaneously increasing women's participation both in formal politics and civil society

Developing strength in civil society can aid women's organizations in political participation. Examples include providing logistical and networking support to women's movements so they might make demands for greater political participation. This enhances women's participation in civil society while also promoting it within the state.

6 Building women's political and leadership skills

Women can hone these skills in a range of sites. Interventions target sites that most frequently lead to greater power both in civil society and in formal politics, and to the skills that are critical for success once women have accessed those sites. Examples include leadership and negotiation training in civic as well as political organizations.

7 Taking a multidimensional approach to tackle practical and structural obstacles to women's participation

This includes coordinating programs and activities that engage in consciousness-raising and developing women's social capital and capabilities, all of which aim to change gender norms. One example would be microfinance groups that include gender training for both women and men, with the latter provided by local women's organizations.

FINDINGS: RISK of RESISTANCE

Strong Resistance

The literature indicates that in situations in which resistance against women's civic and political participation is highly likely (Cerva Cerna 2014, Madhok and Rai 2012), an intervention to encourage women's participation may not generate strong resistance or backlash. That is to say, resistance does not always occur in situations where it might be expected (Bishin et.al 2016), and what appears to be resistance may in fact not be resistance at all (Iyer et.al 2012). ***The policy implications are that a general assessment of gender norms or even empirical research about earlier episodes of resistance to women's civic and political participation may not accurately predict responses to future interventions.***

With this caveat in mind, the reviewers find some evidence-based research that suggests strong resistance might occur in response to the effective strategies identified by ODI. Women's Human Rights Defenders, meaning women activists and NGOs working to promote women's rights, experience strong resistance when their activism challenges repressive state machinery and raises demands for freedom of opinion and expression from authoritarian states. For example, they are exposed to or targeted for gender-based violence and gender-specific attacks (including threats to their families); they also are charged with negligence and immorality. In authoritarian, and particularly authoritarian religious fundamentalist regimes, sexual harassment and assault, violence, or rape are used to "recast" women activists back into conventional gendered roles (Asoka 2012), and this makes it harder to convince communities that women's participation in civil society is beneficial in the long run (Bhattacharya et.al 2013).

The research suggests that even the most effective strategies are likely to trigger strong resistance and high risks for women where women's participation violates not only gendered

religious norms but also state control. This finding dovetails with that of Htun and Weldon (2015). In a survey of 70 countries, the authors find that family law is resistant to reform when religion is institutionalized in the state. As Htun and Weldon conclude, “the state, not religion, thwarts advances in women’s rights” (471). Regime type is likely to be a critical (although not determining) factor shaping women’s risks when participating in politics and civil society.⁶

In liberal democracies, strong resistance appears to be more frequently located at the community level, particularly in rural communities. In India, for example, archaic models of enforcing patriarchal will through communitarian discipline counter emerging feminist community justice models. The recent rise of *khap panchayats*—where local village councils control and extra-judicially punish members of minority communities for transgressing class, caste, gender, and religious boundaries—is a challenge to women’s political participation. The village councils created to empower women are now being subverted by patriarchal forces that use the local community model to punish and limit women’s socio-cultural autonomy. This serves as a useful caution that justice at the local level often is less friendly to women than at the level of centralized states, and that it requires oversight to ensure it is not usurped and hijacked by regressive forces (Bhatla and Rajan 2003).

While we might expect strong resistance to vary within India given its tremendous heterogeneity and large geographic and demographic size, variation is also evident in smaller nation-states, such as Bangladesh, where strong resistance varies among rural communities. In culturally conservative areas, women’s short-term membership in savings and credit groups was associated with significantly elevated risks of violence. In less culturally conservative areas, the

⁶ Indeed, as Asoka (2012) points out, resistance to women’s participation is evident in secular states where fundamentalist actors, meaning those who strategically deploy monolithic cultural, religious, ethnic, or nationalist discourses for the purpose of securing hegemonic political power, have power over some women.

risk of strong resistance to their participation was significantly lower. This lowered risk did not vary by the social status of individual women, suggesting that the savings and credit groups were “reinforcing nascent normative changes in gender relations” (Koenig et. al. 2003).

The evidence-based literature suggests that strong resistance to women’s civic and political participation varies by regime type, geographic locale, and gender norms in these geographic locales. However, no rigorous, evidence-based studies exist that compare strong resistance in response to the ODI strategies across regions. At best, reports such as “Combatting Violence Against Women in Politics” (2008) offer broad country-level generalizations, in this case on challenges in South Asia. That report notes that VAWIP is high in Sri Lanka; that the issue has not yet come to the fore in Pakistan despite the assassination of Benazir Bhutto and a woman Minister in 2004; and that VAWIP in India is more structural than physical, that is, at the national level the absence of a quota means that there are few women politicians.

Contrary to the logic of the research question posed by USAID, numerous sources indicate that interventions to encourage women’s political participation can reduce strong resistance. For example, sex workers in India organized and claimed their rights from the police and judicial administration, decreasing cases of harassment against them in the slums of Bangalore (De Souza 2008). Similarly, a development program that mandated women’s participation in local government in Afghanistan via a 50 percent quota received “no serious resistance” in the communities evaluated, and improved outcomes specific to female participation in some economic, social, and political activities, including increased mobility and income generation (Beath et al. 2013).

The research points to several sites where high levels of violence do obstruct women’s participation, for example in post-conflict reconstruction sites such as Palestine (Farr 2011).

Scholars have definitively established that post-conflict reconstruction and periods of political transition offer singular opportunities for women to increase their participation in formal politics (Burnet 2008, 2012, Ranchod-Nilsson 2008, Corrin 2000). Indeed, quotas have been adopted in much of sub-Saharan Africa during post-conflict negotiations and transitions to democracy (Tripp, Casimiro, Kwesiga, Mungwa 2009). Women's exclusion from post-conflict reconstruction would thus be of serious concern for organizations intent on increasing their public participation, particularly via quotas.

Quotas not only increase the number of women in politics, they also may have positive spillover effects in other sectors. South African women MPs in the early years of the post-apartheid regime, for example, not only secured substantial numbers of women in the national legislature through a 30 percent quota, they organized as women within the legislature and spearheaded the passage of numerous gender equality policies, including the right to abortion and customary marriage reform (Walsh 2010). Or consider the 50 percent quota for women in local government in Afghanistan that not only improved women's participation in income generation and social and political activities, but also increased their mobility and financial output absent any evidence of strong resistance. Contrary to findings in Rwanda, however, the Afghani quota generated no alterations in entrenched female roles or in attitudes toward women's role in society (Beath et al. 2013, Burnet 2008). The Afghani spillover effects across sectors nonetheless appear impressive when juxtaposed against other cases, including South Africa, where civic institutions such as trade unions and social movements were slow to bring women into leadership positions (Walsh 2010).

While quotas improve women's presence in politics and sometimes have positive spillover effects, they do not secure women's effective exercise of political power. For example, in Bangladesh, Pranab Kumar Panday (2008) has described a situation of “representation without participation” in which women are guaranteed presence at both the national and local levels of government while their ability to seriously participate in government is severely constrained (also see Kanthak and Krause 2012). As Arat (2015, 684) explains, “having access to some sources of power does not necessarily mean that one holds power and uses those sources to exercise power either over others or to claim autonomy.” Arat’s observation not only invites scholars to unravel the effects of quotas on women’s meaningful civic and political participation, it also invites development agencies to assess whether increasing women’s participation in existing institutions, without changing those institutions or attending to women’s capacity to shape institutional norms, can meaningfully empower women, and if so, which ones and at whose expense.

Moderate to Low Resistance

*Interventions to encourage women's political and civic participation are far more likely to generate moderate or low resistance than strong resistance. This lower level resistance is pervasive across sites.*⁷ Political parties, for example, may tolerate sexual harassment within their ranks or establish women’s wings that segregate women supporters and prevent them from shaping party policy (Cerva Cerna 2014, Waylen 2007). Male politicians also may disrespect their female colleagues by failing to refer to women politicians by their correct titles, by remarking on their appearance or dress in ways that demean or sexualize them, or by ignoring

⁷ This finding suggests that much of the resistance in the evidence-based literature is backlash as opposed to entrenched resistance, or that women’s civic and political participation did not threaten doctrinal issues of powerful corporate groups.

women when they raise their hand to speak in committee meetings (e.g., Geisler 2004, Walsh 2010).

In civil society, many groups, including NGOs, generate resistance to women's participation when they harm the women they aim to empower or lack local legitimacy. For example, microcredit schemes in Bangladesh pull poor women into a moral economy where "pre-existing coercive norms [...] have become institutionalized as part of the NGO technologies of loan recovery," (Grewal and Bernal 2014, 208). Failure to repay the loan results in humiliation and loss of assets. NGO dependence on donors' diktats also contributes to low through medium levels of resistance to women's participation in these organizations. Indeed, women's NGOs can easily be accused of implementing the "foreign ideas" of their international funders who have no local authority or accountability. This can lead to the discredit of the organization and its goals (Jasor 2016). In these cases of low to moderate resistance, women rarely abandon civic and political participation entirely (only one source [Gottlieb 2016] reports this outcome). As Ranchod-Nilsson (2008) argues, resistance in one arena does not mean resistance occurs in all others, which leaves the door open for women's participation elsewhere.

Sites of Resistance

Strong resistance to women's political and civic participation occurs both in the family (where that resistance will not necessarily be publicly tolerated or condoned), ***as well as in society*** (where that resistance might be publicly tolerated or even condoned). In some cases, women may gain political power (even if it is relatively little power compared to men) from interventions focused on formal politics, but they may experience resistance in other spheres of their life (e.g., domestic) (Burnet 2008, Ranchod-Nilsson 2008).

Resistance often occurs across multiple sites at once. For example, in the case of a women's Self-help Co-operative (SHG) in an indigenous Mexican community, resistance to women's participation in SHG occurred at three sites. The first was intra-familial—expressed through the direct prohibition of partaking in collective action, events and/or travel through manipulation and sometimes violence, and justified on the basis that the action violated gender norms. The second, intra-organizational, insisted women compromise by shirking on organizational responsibilities, causing tensions that affected the organisation's development. Finally, resistance from external actors such as external clients and suppliers, led to exploitation, as women were perceived as being vulnerable and uneducated (Arias et. al. 2016).

How to Mitigate Resistance

The literature offers several strategies for mitigation, but most are not evidence-based, hence they should be treated as suggestions only. For example, the report “Combating Violence against Women in Politics” (2008) recommends:

- Zero-tolerance declaration
- 33 percent quota adoption
- Direct elections for women in all elected positions
- Repeal of all discriminatory laws
- Improving election codes and commissions
- Harmonizing national laws with international instruments
- Data gathering on VAWIP

While the IPU (2016) report on VAWIP endorses some of these top-down mechanisms, it also recognizes the importance of data gathering and working through existing institutions and oversight bodies to reform norms. It thus also recommends:

- Reporting and calling attention to online threats and insults
- Creating parliamentary standing orders and codes of conduct against VAWIP
- Creating policies against sexual harassment and complaint settlement procedures
- Improving security in parliament
- Referral to the IPU Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians
- Women organizing to change the political culture

Indeed, most analysts favor bottom-up as opposed to top-down initiatives to minimize strong resistance. For example, in response to VAW-E, Hubbard and DeSoi (2016, 40) recommend that citizen observation groups:

- Adopt early warning systems
- Identify the root causes of VAW-E
- Document early warning signs and incidents of VAW-E
- Develop a rapid response platform to communicate findings to stakeholders (e.g., police, media) who can and will act
- Continue data collection, education, and awareness raising post-election

The political and social context, as detailed in the overview on resistance above, would shape which approach is most feasible as well as most likely to generate the best results. The reviewers caution, however, that feasibility and positive results may sometimes be at odds. Research confirms, for example, that when authoritarian leaders advance women's rights by fiat from above, which in some contexts may be feasible, those rights may become associated with the regime and therefore rejected by pro-democracy movements (e.g., Al-Ali 2000, Gilman

2007, Walsh 2010). Further, research like that of Kanthak and Krause (2012) indicates that women's organizing is the most effective mechanism for increasing their power and challenging resistance to their participation.

Bottom-up strategies suggest that agencies like USAID should work with multiple indigenous women's groups that have extensive local knowledge. Partnerships like these also are more likely to incorporate the shared priorities of women on the ground, which could help to minimize objections about "Western" intervention (Jasor 2016). Clearly, this must be done with sensitivity to the intersections of power and privilege that exist in communities so as not to reinforce inequalities among women. Further, some studies suggest that instead of focusing on a single outcome, such as economic self-sufficiency or mitigation of VAW-E, agencies would do better to work with local women to define the agenda (Rozario 2006, Schild 1998). This would require listening to an array of local women about their priorities before agencies endorse a specific outcome. At the very least, the literature suggests that steps must be taken to inform the community of the positive effects of an intervention, as in these cases people are more likely to believe that the intervention was justified (Arias et.al 2016).

Finally, it is important to turn a critical gaze to development agencies and NGOs themselves, and acknowledge the ways in which their practices might heighten the possibility of resistance. The research suggests that redressing gender bias among employees in these organizations and ensuring that these organizations are credible and accessible to the community they aim to serve is vital. Further, excessive bureaucratization and professionalization alienates these organizations from local actors. Unfortunately, these problems can be difficult to ascertain if auditors and their consultants are committed to the goals these organizations endorse and believe in the initiatives these organizations undertake, rather than critically evaluate these

organizations and their initiatives (Grewal and Bernal 2014). Encouraging and rewarding critical evaluations and improvements rather than stellar reports may be helpful in this regard; recognizing that most institutions grapple with these challenges may also open a space for more revealing internal evaluations and equitable practices that minimize local resistance.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Lessons for USAID

Any intervention carries the possibility of risk. Assessing which risks are likely involved and weighing those potential risks against the benefits that an intervention might secure are not easy tasks. Further, given the limited research on strong resistance to women's civic and political participation as a result of implementing ODI strategies, the policy recommendations generated by this review are tentative at best.

The strongest conclusion that can be drawn is that the social and political context matters. This suggests that if USAID field agents carry out a risk assessment, they should follow the policy recommendations set out above in the overview on resistance. They would also do well to work with the people who know the context best to ascertain what they think the likely risks might be, their intensity, who would be the most and least likely to experience risk, who would be most likely to resist, what local strategies women are already using to minimize their risks, and how to minimize risks for all. They might also use various combinations of the effective strategies identified by ODI depending on the context.

Conversations with local actors in a variety of different social positions about the risk of resistance would invite a methodology closely linked to the seven interventions recommended by the ODI Report. Indeed, conversations like these would help field agents develop context-based knowledge and get them thinking politically by recognizing that interventions bring shifts in power that are highly likely to generate some form of resistance, meaning powerful allies are essential. One way to win those allies is to demonstrate that women seeking greater participation have some power, which can be achieved by helping women to organize, develop leadership skills, and forge networks with a diverse array of powerbrokers

both in civil society and the state. All of this work would help to make women less vulnerable to strong resistance by providing them with a support network that has ties to those who exercise authority in the community. The seven effective strategies thus should help mitigate strong resistance. That is, even though the relationship between women's participation and resistance that appears in the literature appears to be recursive, meaning that each one calls up the other, the literature concurs that women's organizing is unlikely to generate strong resistance and can effectively increase women's power. Yet, the existing research is much too thin to explain precisely the dynamics between women's participation and resistance across geographic locations, or for different interventions, women, or even institutions in civil society and politics.

The reviewers also suggest that USAID consider religion an important contextual factor for women's civic and political participation. In many cases, gender roles are shaped and maintained through religious belief and practices that extend across the spheres of social life. Religious participation can also be closely linked to women's political and civic participation; for example, see Sen (2006) for a case study of Hindu nationalism and political mobilization among women living in Bombay slums. Drawing an artificial distinction between the religious and secular realms of life, and analyzing civic and political participation only with reference to the latter, is likely to limit our understanding of resistance (e.g., Mahmood 2016).

Priorities for Future Research

Resistance to women's civic and political participation requires further research. The vast majority of scholarly research does not study resistance against women's civic and political participation, but instead documents how women's organizations resist different systems of power arrayed against them and evaluates how and why women succeeded. *Given the interests of USAID, the reviewers therefore suggest the following research priorities:*

- Concept and theory building about all types of resistance, how to operationalize and investigate them, and a careful delineation of their constituent processes.

For example, Asoka’s “Global Report on the Situation of Women’s Human Rights Defenders” (2012) points out that resistance is sometimes ignored or misrecognized because of its entanglement with other aspects such as class, race, or legal status.

- Examining resistance as both an independent and dependent variable
- Careful causal analysis
- Multidisciplinary, multi-method, and single studies attentive to context
- Comparative studies within and across countries and regions that seek some generalizable findings while remaining attentive to context.

Some should focus on regions where analysis is sparse, such as Latin America.

- Resistance to women’s mobilization

This mobilization is crucial for the passage of sex equality policies, particularly legislation regarding violence against women (e.g., Htun and Weldon 2010).

- Groups and politicians (including women’s groups and politicians) that promote “men’s rights” discourse and movements (Taylor 2008, Jordan 2016, Minaker and Snyder 2006).

These actors have the potential to undercut efforts to encourage women’s participation by claiming reverse discrimination against men.

- Resistance that disaggregates women by multiple categories of disadvantage and privilege, and that analyzes how resistance produces and maintains those differences.

Given recent research funded by USAID, this research would include disaggregating women by age, gender identity, and sexuality.

- Impact of media for risk of resistance to women's political and civic participation

All media outlets are under-represented in the research surveyed here. Social media, in particular, has played a key role in offering marginalized populations and social movements a space to share common concerns and mobilize, but it also has become a notorious site for resistance to women's participation online, particularly for feminists. Applying a gender perspective to USAID's work with social media might be one avenue for advancing this agenda.

- Cases where resistance has been lacking, was mitigated relatively easily, or dissipated quickly.

Researchers might examine, for example, the role of support networks in these cases or if opportunities for participation developed organically within these communities.

- How and why women's participation persists over time despite resistance

This might be investigated through inter-generational studies of communities, or through work documenting multiple election cycles of a political constituency.

- Positive spillover effects of women's civic and political participation that occur without backlash in other sites, as in Afghanistan (Beath et al.2013).

CONCLUSION

It is vital for USAID to be concerned with strong resistance to women's civic and political participation. While this review brings the best available scholarly resources to light and derives recommendations from them, ultimately it reveals that there is limited evidence-based literature or scholarly analysis that can offer dependable information about the risk of strong resistance to women who benefit from the intervention strategies highlighted by ODI. Therefore, the reviewers suggest that scholars of diverse disciplines, sometimes working in multidisciplinary teams, conduct research using the full array of methods available and in different contexts to better understand resistance to women's civic and political participation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abdela, Lesley. "From Palm Tree to Parliament: Training Women for Political Leadership and Public Life." *Gender & Development* 8.3 (2000): 16–23.
- Abrajano, Marisa and Zoltan L. Hajnal. *White Backlash: Immigration, Race, and American Politics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2015.
- Abu-Lughod, Lila. *Do Muslim Women Need Saving?* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2013.
- Al-Ali, Nadjie. *Secularism, Gender and the State in the Middle East: The Egyptian Women's Movement*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Albrecht Schnabel and Anara Tabyshalieva, ed. *Defying Victimhood Women and Post-Conflict Peacebuilding*. New York, NY: United Nations University Press, 2012.
- Al-Sabah, Meshal. *Gender and Politics in Kuwait: Women and Political Participation in the Gulf*. New York, NY: I.B.Tauris, 2013.
- Anderson, Carol. *White Rage: The Unspoken Truth of Our Racial Divide*. New York: Bloomsbury, 2016.
- Arat, Zehra F. Kabasakal. "Feminisms, Women's Rights, and the UN: Would Achieving Gender Equality Empower Women?" *American Political Science Review* 109.4 (2015): 674–689.
- Arias, Carolina Contreras, Corinne Pernet and Stephan Rist. *Collective Action, Gender Dynamics and the Constraints for Upscaling Women Initiatives in Rural Mexico: The Case of 'El Color de La Tierra', an Indigenous Women's Network-Based Initiative in Western Mexico*. Geneva, Switzerland: UN Research Institute for Social Development, 2013.
- Asoka, Kaavya. *Global Report on the Situation of Women's Human Rights Defenders*. WHRD International Coalition through the Asian Forum for Human Rights and Development (Forum Asia), 2012.
- Atanga, Lilian Lem. *Gender, Discourse and Power in the Cameroonian Parliament*. Cameroon: Langaa RPCIG, 2009.
- Ayoub, Phillip M. "With Arms Wide Shut: Threat Perception, Norm Reception, and Mobilized Resistance to LGBT Rights." *Journal of Human Rights* 13.3 (2014): 337–362.
- Bacchetta, Paola, and Margaret Power. *Right-Wing Women: From Conservatives to Extremists Around the World*. New York: Routledge, 2013.
- Bandy, Joe, and Jennifer Bickham Mendez. "A Place of Their Own? Women Organizers in the Maquilas of Nicaragua and Mexico." *Mobilization* 8.2 (2003): 173–188.

- Barth, Elise Fredrikke. "Peace as Disappointment: The Reintegration of Female Soldiers in Post-Conflict Societies: A Comparative Study from Africa." Oslo: International Peace Research Institute (PRIO), 2002.
- Basu, Amrita. "Hindu Women's Activism in India and the Questions It Raises'." *Appropriating Gender: Women's Activism and Politicized Religion in South Asia*, edited by Patricia Jeffery and Amrita Basu, Routledge, 1998. 167–184.
- Bateman, Milford. "How Lending to the Poor Began, Grew, and Almost Destroyed a Generation in India." *Development and Change* 43.6 (2012): 1385–1402.
- Beath, Andrew, Fotini Christia, and Ruben Enikolopov. "Empowering Women through Development Aid: Evidence from a Field Experiment in Afghanistan." *American Political Science Review* 107.03 (2013): 540-557.
- Bedi, Train. *Transnationalism Reversed: Women Organizing Against Gender Violence in Bangladesh*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2011.
- Berg, Elisabeth, Jim Barry, and John Chandler. "Essentially Political." *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 12.1 (2010): 25–44.
- Berglund, Henrik. "Hindu Nationalism and Gender in the Indian Civil Society: A Challenge to the Indian Women's Movement." *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 13.1 (2011): 83-99.
- Bhalotra, Sonia, Irma Clots-Figueras, and Lakshmi Iyer. "Path-Breakers? Women's Electoral Success and Future Political Participation." *Women's Electoral Success and Future Political Participation*. Harvard Business School BGIE Unit Working Paper 14–035 (2016).
- Bharadwaj, Suraj Bhan. "Myth and Reality of the Khap Panchayats: A Historical Analysis of the Panchayat and Khap Panchayat." *Studies in History* 28.1 (2012): 43–67.
- Bhatla, Nandita, and Anuradha Rajan. "Private Concerns in Public Discourse: Women-Initiated Community Responses to Domestic Violence." *Economic and Political Weekly* 38.17 (2003): 1658–1664.
- Bhattacharjya, Manjima et al. "Why Gender Matters in Activism: Feminism and Social Justice Movements." *Gender & Development* 21.2 (2013): 277–293.
- Bishin, Benjamin G., Thomas J. Hayes, Matthew B. Incantalupo, and Charles Anthony Smith. "Opinion Backlash and Public Attitudes: Are Political Advances in Gay Rights Counterproductive?" *American Journal of Political Science* 60.3 (2016): 625–648.
- Blondet, Cecilia. "The 'Devil's Deal': Women's Political Participation and Authoritarianism in Peru." *Gender Justice, Development and Rights*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Boryczka, Jocelyn. *Suspect Citizens: Women, Virtue, and Vice in Backlash Politics*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2012.

- Bourey, Christine, Rob Stephenson, and Michelle J. Hindin. "Reproduction, Functional Autonomy and Changing Experiences of Intimate Partner Violence Within Marriage in Rural India." *International Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health* 39.4 (2013): 215–226.
- Bradshaw, Sarah. *Gender, Development and Disasters*. Cheltenham, United Kingdom: Edward Elgar Publishing, 2013.
- Braun, Yvonne, and Michael Dreiling. "From Developmentalism to the HIV/AIDS Crisis." *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 12.3/4 (2010): 464–483.
- Britton, Hannah. "Organising against Gender Violence in South Africa." *Journal of Southern African Studies* 32.1 (2006): 145–163.
- Burnet, Jennie E. "Gender Balance and the Meanings of Women in Governance in Post-Genocide Rwanda." *African Affairs* 107.428 (2008): 361–386.
- Burnet, Jennie. "Women's Empowerment and Cultural Change in Rwanda." *The Impact of Gender Quotas*, edited by Susan Franceschet, Mona Lena Krook, Jennifer M. Piscopo. Oxford University Press, 2012. 190–207.
- Byrne, Siobhan. "Troubled Engagement in Ethnicized Conflict." *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 16.1 (2014): 106–126.
- Cagan, Beth, and María Juliá. "Maintaining Wartime Gains for Women: Lessons from El Salvador." *International Social Work* 41.4 (1998): 405–415.
- Carreiras, Helena. *Gender and the Military: Women in the Armed Forces of Western Democracies*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2006.
- Castillejo, Clare. *Building a State That Works for Women: Integrating Gender into Post-Conflict State Building*. Working Paper. Madrid, Spain: FRIDE, 2011.
- Cerva Cerna, Daniela. "Political Participation and Gender Violence in Mexico." *Revista Mexicana de Ciencias Políticas y Sociales* 59.222 (2014): 117–140.
- Charrad, Mounira. *States and Women's Rights: The Making of Postcolonial Tunisia, Algeria, and Morocco*. Oakland: University of California Press, 2001.
- Chaudhry, Lubna N. "Flowers, Queens, and Goons: Unruly Women in Rural Pakistan." *Journal of International Women's Studies*, 11.1 (2009): 246.
- Chhoeun, Thavy, Panha Sok, and Clodagh Byrne. "'Citadel of Women': Strengthening Female Leadership in Rural Cambodia." *Gender and Development* 16.3 (2008): 535–547.
- Chigudu, Simukai. "The Social Imaginaries of Women's Peace Activism in Northern Uganda." *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 18.1 (2016): 19–38.
- Chin, Yoo-Mi. "Male Backlash, Bargaining, or Exposure Reduction?: Women's Working Status and Physical Spousal Violence in India." *Journal of Population Economics* 25.1 (2012): 175–200.

- Combatting Violence Against Women In Politics: Revisiting Policies, Politics and Participation*. Proceeding Report. 2nd South Asian Regional Conference on Violence Against Women in Politics. Nepal (2008).
- Crenshaw, Kimberle. "Intersectionality and Identity Politics: Learning from Violence against Women of Color." *Reconstructing Political Theory: Feminist Perspectives*, Mary Lyndon Shanley & Uma Narayan, eds., Philadelphia: Pennsylvania State University Press: 178-193. (1997).
- . "Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color." *Stanford Law Review* (1991): 1241–1299.
- Corrin, Chris. "Post-Conflict Reconstruction and Gender Analysis in Kosova." *Journal International Feminist Journal of Politics* 3.2000 (2010): 78–98.
- Day, Lynda R. "'Bottom Power': Theorizing Feminism and the Women's Movement in Sierra Leone (1981-2007)." *African & Asian Studies* 7.4 (2008): 491–513.
- de Souza, Rebecca. "Creating 'Communicative Spaces': A Case of NGO Community Organizing for HIV/AIDS Prevention." *Health Communication* 24.8 (2009): 692–702.
- DFID. *How to Note: Assessing the Strength of Evidence*. London: DFID. 2014.
- Domingo, Pilar, Rebecca Holmes, Tam O'Neil, Nicola Jones, Kate Bird, Anna Larson, Elizabeth Presler-Marshall and Craig Valters. *Women's Voice and Leadership in Decision-Making*. London: ODI, 2015.
- Domínguez-Ruvalcaba, Héctor, and Ignacio Corona, eds. *Gender Violence at the U.S.--Mexico Border: Media Representation and Public Response*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2010.
- Dreze, Jean, and Amartya Sen. *India: Development and participation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Duncanson, Claire, Rachel Woodward. "Regendering the Military: Theorizing Women's Military Participation" *Security Dialogue* 47.1 (2016): 3-21.
- Eltantawy, Nahed. "Pots, Pans, & Protests: Women's Strategies for Resisting Globalization in Argentina." *Communication & Critical/Cultural Studies* 5.1 (2008): 46–63.
- Emmett, Ayala H. *Our Sisters' Promised Land: Women, Politics, and Israeli-Palestinian Coexistence*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2003.
- Essof, Shereen. "She-Murenga: Challenges, Opportunities and Setbacks of the Women's Movement in Zimbabwe." *Feminist Africa* 4 (2005): 29-45.
- Eswaran, Mukesh, and Nisha Malhotra. "Domestic Violence and Women's Autonomy in Developing Countries: Theory and Evidence." *The Canadian Journal of Economics / Revue Canadienne d'Economique* 44.4 (2011): 1222–1263.
- Faludi, Susan. *Backlash: The Undeclared War Against American Women*. New York: Three Rivers Press, 1991.

- Farr, Vanessa. "UNSCR 1325 and Women's Peace Activism in the Occupied Palestinian Territory." *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 13.4 (2011): 539–556.
- Fearon, James, and Anke Hoeffler. "Benefits and Costs of the Conflict and Violence Targets for the Post-2015 Development Agenda." Conflict and Violence Assessment Paper, Copenhagen: Copenhagen Consensus Center (2014).
- Fleschenberg, Andrea. "Afghan Women Parliamentarians—Caucusing amidst Contestation and Insecurity." *Gender, Technology & Development* 14.3 (2010): 339–362.
- Flores, Andrew R., and Scott Barclay. "Backlash, Consensus, or Neutralization? Decomposing the Effect of Same-Sex Marriage Policy on Mass Attitudes." Manuscript Prepared for the 2014 American Political Science Association Meeting, Washington, DC (2014).
- Ford, Paula J. *Narratives of Social Healing: Cultural Politics and the Nicaraguan Women's Movement*. Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Iowa, 2000.
- Fredericks, Bronwyn. "Re-empowering Ourselves: Australian Aboriginal Women." *Signs* 35.3 (2010): 546–550.
- Friedemann-Sánchez, Greta, and Rodrigo Lovatón. "Intimate Partner Violence in Colombia: Who Is at Risk?" *Social Forces* 91.2 (2012): 663–688.
- Friedman, Willa, Michael Kremer, Edward Miguel and Rebecca Thornton. "Education as Liberation?" *Economica - LSE* 83.329 (2016): 1–30.
- Fuest, Veronika. "Liberia's Women Acting For Peace: Collective Action In A War-Affected Country." *Movers and Shakers: Social Movements in Africa* edited by Stephen Ellis and Ineke Van Kessel. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 2008. 114–137.
- Gangadharan, Lata et al. "Social Identity and Governance: The Behavioral Response to Female Leaders." *European Economic Review* 90 (2016): 302-325.
- Geisler, Gisela G. *Women and the Remaking of Politics in Southern Africa : Negotiating Autonomy, Incorporation, and Representation*. Uppsala : Nordiska Afrikainstitutet, 2004.
- Gilman, Sarah E. "Feminist Organizing in Tunisia: Negotiating Transnational Linkages and the State." *From Patriarchy to Empowerment: Women's Participation, Movements, and Rights*, edited by Val Moghadem. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 2007. 97-119.
- Goetz, Anne Marie. "No Shortcuts to Power: Constraints on Women's Political Effectiveness in Uganda." *The Journal of Modern African Studies* 40.4 (2002): 549–575.
- Gottlieb, Jessica. "Why Might Information Exacerbate the Gender Gap in Civic Participation? Evidence from Mali." *World Development* 86 (2016): 95–110.
- Green, Penny, and Tony Ward. "The Transformation of Violence in Iraq." *The British Journal of Criminology* 49.5 (2009): 609–627.

- Grewal, Inderpal, and Victoria Bernal. *Theorizing NGOs: States, Feminisms, and Neoliberalism*. Chapel Hill: Duke University Press, 2014.
- Hagen-Zanker, Jessica, and Richard Mallet. "How to do a Rigorous, Evidence-Focused Literature Review in International Development, A Guidance Note." London: Overseas Development Institute (2013).
- Halperin-Kaddari, Ruth, and Marsha A. Freeman. "Backlash Goes Global: Men's Groups, Patriarchal Family Policy, and the False Promise of Gender-Neutral Laws." *Canadian Journal of Women & the Law* 28.1 (2016): 182–210.
- Harrington, Carol. "Governing Sex Workers in Timor Leste." *Asia Pacific Viewpoint* 51.1 (2011): 29–41.
- Harrison, Elizabeth. "Beyond the Looking Glass? 'Aidland' Reconsidered." *Critique of Anthropology* 33.3 (2013): 263–279.
- Hawkesworth, Mary. "Congressional Enactments of Race–Gender: Toward a Theory of Raced–gendered Institutions." *American Political Science Review* 97.4 (2003): 529–550.
- Hayhurst, Lyndsay M. C., Margaret MacNeill, Bruce Kidd, Annelies Knoppers. "Gender Relations, Gender-Based Violence and Sport for Development and Peace: Questions, Concerns and Cautions Emerging from Uganda." *Women's Studies International Forum* 47, Part A (2014): 157–167.
- Hegland, Mary Elaine. "The Power Paradox in Muslim Women's Majales: North-West Pakistani Mourning Rituals as Sites of Contestation over Religious Politics, Ethnicity, and Gender." *Signs* 23.2 (1998): 391–428.
- Hickey, Samuel, and Giles Mohan. *Participation—from Tyranny to Transformation?: Exploring New Approaches to Participation in Development*. New York: Zed Books, 2004.
- Hossain, Naomi. *Security and the Pathways of Women's Empowerment: Findings from a Thematic Synthesis of the Pathways of Women's Empowerment Research*. Institute of Development Studies – Pathways of Women's Empowerment, 2012.
- Htun, Mala. *Sex and the State: Abortion, Divorce, and the Family under Latin American Dictatorships and Democracies*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- , *Inclusion without Representation in Latin America: Gender Quotas and Ethnic Reservations*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2016.
- Htun, Mala, and S. Laurel Weldon. "When Do Governments Promote Women's Rights? A Framework for the Comparative Analysis of Sex Equality Policy." *Perspectives on Politics* 8.1 (2010): 207–216.
- Htun, Mala, and S. Laurel Weldon. "State Power, Religion, and Women's Rights: A Comparative Analysis of Family Law." *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies* 18.1 (2011): 145-165.

- , "Religious Power, the State, Women's Rights, and Family Law." *Politics & Gender* 11:451-477.
- Hubbard, Caroline and Claire DeSoi. *Votes Without Violence: A Citizen Observer's Guide to Addressing Violence Against Women in Elections*. Washington DC: National Democratic Institute, 2016.
- Hudson, Valerie M., Donna Lee Bowen, and Perpetua Lynne Nielsen. "Clan Governance and State Stability: The Relationship between Female Subordination and Political Order." *American Political Science Review* 109.03 (2015): 535-555.
- ICAN For Women's Rights Peace and Security International Civil Society Action Network. "Voice and Vision: What the Women Say MENA/Asia Women's Rights, Peace and Security Forum Key Findings." New York, NY: ICAN, 2012.
- Inter-Parliamentary Union. "Sexism, Harassment and Violence Against Women Parliamentarians." *Issues Brief*, Inter-Parliamentary Union, October 2016: 1-12.
- Isserles, Robin G. "Microcredit: The Rhetoric of Empowerment, the Reality of Development As Usual." *Women's Studies Quarterly* 31.3/4 (2003): 38-57.
- Iyer, Lakshmi, Anandi Mani, Prachi Mishra and Petia Topalova. "The Power of Political Voice: Women's Political Representation and Crime in India." *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* 4.4 (2012): 165-193.
- Jakimow, Tanya. "A Site for the Empowerment of Women? The Clash of Patriarchal Values and Development Norms." *Ethnography* 13.2 (2011): 213-235.
- Jasor, Oceane M. "Do Local Needs Matter?: The Relevance of Women's NGOs in Sub-Saharan Africa." *Gender, Place & Culture* 23.4 (2016): 694-713.
- Jayawardena, Kumari, and Malathi De Alwis. *Embodied Violence: Communalising Women's Sexuality in South Asia*. New York: Zed Books, 1996.
- Joanna Briggs Institute. "JBI QARI Critical Appraisal Checklist for Interpretive & Critical Research." http://joannabriggs.org/assets/docs/jbc/operations/criticalAppraisalForms/JBC_Form_CritAp_IntCrit.pdf, accessed September 6 (2010).
- Jordan, Ana. "Conceptualizing Backlash: (UK) Men's Rights Groups, Anti-Feminism, and Postfeminism." *Canadian Journal of Women and the Law* 28.1 (2016): 18-44.
- Kabeer, Naila. "Is Microfinance a 'Magic Bullet' for Women's Empowerment? Analysis of Findings from South Asia." *Economic and Political Weekly* 40.44/45 (2005): 4709-4718.
- Kakuru, Doris M. "Rural Livelihoods, HIV/AIDS and Women's Activism: The Struggle for Gender Equality in Primary Education in Uganda." *Journal of International Women's Studies* 10.1 (2008): 36-47.

- Kandiyoti, Deniz. *The Politics of Gender and Reconstruction in Afghanistan*, Occasional Paper 4, New York: United Nations Research Institute for Social Development, (2005).
- Kanthak, Kristin, and George A. Krause. *The Diversity Paradox: Political Parties, Legislatures, and the Organizational Foundations of Representation in America*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Kannabirān, Kalpana. *From Mathura to Manorama: Resisting Violence against Women in India* edited by Kalpana Kannabiran & Ritu Menon. New Delhi, India: Women Unlimited, 2007.
- Kardam, Nuket. *Turkey's Engagement With Global Women's Human Rights*. Aldershot, Hants, England: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2005.
- Kaufman, Michelle R., and Mary Crawford. "Research and Activism Review: Sex Trafficking in Nepal: A Review of Intervention and Prevention Programs." *Violence Against Women* 17.5 (2011): 651–665.
- Kaur, Ravinder. "Khap Panchayats, Sex Ratio and Female Agency." *Economic and Political Weekly* 45.23 (2010): 14–16.
- Keating, Christine. "Developmental Democracy and Its Inclusions: Globalization and the Transformation of Participation." *Signs* 29.2 (2004): 417–437.
- Kempadoo, Kamala. "Globalizing Sex Workers' Rights." *Canadian Woman Studies* 22.3/4 (2003): 143–150.
- Kim, Julia C. et al. "Understanding the Impact of a Microfinance-Based Intervention on Women's Empowerment and the Reduction of Intimate Partner Violence in South Africa." *American Journal of Public Health* 97.10 (2007): 1794–1802.
- Kimmel, Michael. *Angry White Men: American Masculinity at the End of an Era*. New York: Nation Books, 2013.
- Kiss, Ligia et al. "Brazilian Policy Responses to Violence against Women: Government Strategy and the Help-Seeking Behaviors of Women Who Experience Violence." *Health and Human Rights* 14.1 (2012): 64–77.
- Kittilson, Miki Caul, and Leslie A. Schwindt-Bayer. *The Gendered Effects of Electoral Institutions: Political Engagement and Participation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Klouzal, Linda Ann. *Rebellious Affinities: Narratives of Community, Resistance, and Women's Participation in the Cuban Revolution (1952--1959)*. Santa Barbara: University of California, 2006.
- Koenig, Michael A. et al. "Women's Status and Domestic Violence in Rural Bangladesh: Individual- and Community-Level Effects." *Demography* 40.2 (2003): 269–288.
- Kohen, Beatriz. "Gender Training for the Judiciary in Argentina." *International Journal of the Legal Profession* 21.3 (2014): 333–344.

- Krook, Mona Lena. *Quotas for Women in Politics: Gender and Candidate Selection Reform Worldwide*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Krook, Mona Lena, and Juliana Restrepo Sanin. "Gender and Political Violence in Latin America." *Política y gobierno* 23.1 (2016): 125-157.
- Kruger, Mark H. "Community-Based Crime Control in Cuba." *Contemporary Justice Review* 10.1 (2007): 101–114.
- Kubik, Jan, and Amy Linch. *Postcommunism from Within: Social Justice, Mobilization, and Hegemony*. New York: New York University Press, 2013.
- Kumar, Pushpesh, and G.S. Yelne. "Women Resisting Violence: The Economic as Political." *Sociological Bulletin* 52.1 (2003): 91–113.
- Kuumba, M. Bahati. "African Women, Resistance Cultures and Cultural Resistances." *Agenda: Empowering Women for Gender Equity* 68 (2006): 112–121.
- , "You've Struck a Rock': Comparing Gender, Social Movements, and Transformation in the United States and South Africa." *Gender and Society* 16.4 (2002): 504–523.
- Lewis, Ruth. "Making Justice Work: Effective Legal Interventions for Domestic Violence." *The British Journal of Criminology* 44.2 (2004): 204–224.
- Lilja, Mona. "Gendering Legitimacy Through The Reproduction of Memories and Violent Discourses in Cambodia." *Asian Perspective* 32.1 (2008): 71–97.
- Lombardo, Emanuela, and Lut Mergaert. "Gender Mainstreaming and Resistance to Gender Training: A Framework for Studying Implementation." *NORA - Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research* 21.4 (2013): 296–311.
- Madhok, Sumi, and Shirin M. Rai. "Agency, Injury, and Transgressive Politics in Neoliberal Times." *Signs* 37.3 (2012): 645–669.
- Maharaj, Nuthan, and Brij Maharaj. "Engendering Local Government in Post-Apartheid South Africa - Experiences of Female Councillors in Durban (1996-2000)." *GeoJournal* 61.3 (2004): 263–272.
- Mahmood, Saba. *Religious Difference in a Secular Age: A Minority Report*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2016.
- Mahmud, Simeen. "Actually How Empowering Is Microcredit?" *Development and Change* 34.4 (2003): 577–605.
- Mansbridge, Jane, and Shauna Shames. "Toward a Theory of Backlash: Dynamic Resistance and the Central Role of Power." *Politics & Gender* 4.4 (2008): 623–634.
- Marshall, Katherine, and Susan Hayward, eds. *Women, Religion, and Peacebuilding: Illuminating the Invisible*. Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press, 2015.

- Materka, Edyta. “‘This Land Is Our Land’: Local Thai Women’s Struggle for Land and Housing Rights in Post-Tsunami Thailand.” *International Journal of Diversity in Organisations, Communities & Nations* 7.3 (2007): 27–36.
- Meier, Petra. “From Laggard to Leader: Explaining the Belgian Gender Quotas and Parity Clause.” *West European Politics* 35.2 (2012): 362–379.
- Menon, Kalyani. *Everyday Nationalism: Women of the Hindu right in India*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010.
- Mills, Mary Beth. “From Nimble Fingers to Raised Fists: Women and Labor Activism in Globalizing Thailand.” *Signs* 31.1 (2005): 117–144.
- Minaker, Joanne C., and Laureen Snider. “Husband Abuse: Equality with a Vengeance?” *Canadian Journal of Criminology & Criminal Justice* 48.5 (2006): 753–780.
- Minority Rights Watch. “Iraq’s Minorities: Participation in Public Life.” *Minority Rights Group*. <http://www.refworld.org/pdfid/4ed612bc2.pdf>, accessed September 6 (2010).
- Momsen, Janet Henshall. “Backlash: or how to snatch failure from the jaws of success in gender and development.” *Progress in Development Studies* 1.1 (2001): 51-56.
- Mosse, David. “Is Good Policy Unimplementable? Reflections on the Ethnography of Aid Policy and Practice.” *Development and Change* 35.4 (2004): 639–671.
- Mosse, David. “The Anthropology of International Development.” *Annual Review of Anthropology* 42 (2013): 227–246.
- Natanel, Katherine. “Resistance at the Limits: Feminist Activism and Conscientious Objection in Israel.” *Feminist Review* 101 (2012): 78–96.
- Naved, Ruchira T. et al. “Violence Against Women with Chronic Maternal Disabilities in Rural Bangladesh.” *Journal of Health, Population and Nutrition* 30.2 (2012): 181–192.
- Norwan, Mariam, and Nasima. “Afghanistan in Three Voices.” *The Wilson Quarterly (1976-)* 37.1 (2013).
- Novak, Alison N., and Emad Khazraee. “The Stealthy Protester: Risk and the Female Body in Online Social Movements.” *Feminist Media Studies* 14.6 (2014): 1094–1095.
- Ochs, Vanessa L. *Inventing Jewish Ritual*. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Jewish Publication Society, 2007.
- ODIHR. “Handbook on Promoting Women’s Participation in Political Parties.” Warsaw, Poland: OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR), 2014.
- Okimoto, Tyler G., and Victoria L. Brescoll. “The Price of Power: Power Seeking and Backlash Against Female Politicians.” *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 36.7 (2010): 923–936.

- Oladejo, O., O. B. Yusuf, and O. S. Arulogun. "Factors Influencing Gender Based Violence among Men and Women in Selected States in Nigeria." *African Journal of Reproductive Health* 15.4 (2011): 78-86.
- O'Reilly, Kathleen. "Women Fieldworkers and the Politics of Participation." *Signs* 31.4 (2006): 1075–1098.
- O'Rourke, Catherine. *Gender Politics in Transitional Justice*. New York: Routledge, 2013.
- Osanloo, Arzoo. *The Politics of Women's Rights in Iran*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009.
- Panday, Pranab Kumar. "Representation without Participation: Quotas for Women in Bangladesh." *International Political Science Review* 29.4 (2008): 489–512.
- Papa, Michael J. et al. "Organizing for Social Change Through Cooperative Action: The [Dis]Empowering Dimensions of Women's Communication." *Communication Theory* 10.1 (2000): 90–123.
- Park, You-me. "The Crucible of Sexual Violence: Militarized Masculinities and the Abjection of Life in Post-Crisis, Neoliberal South Korea." *Feminist Studies* 42.1 (2016): 17–40.
- Pickup, Francine, Suzanne Williams, and Caroline Sweetman. *Ending Violence Against Women: A Challenge for Development and Humanitarian Work*. Oxfam, 2001.
- Pierotti, Rachael S. "Increasing Rejection of Intimate Partner Violence: Evidence of Global Cultural Diffusion." *American Sociological Review* 78.2 (2013): 240–265.
- Piper, Nicola. *New Perspectives on Gender and Migration: Livelihood, Rights and Entitlements*. Geneva, Switzerland: UN Research Institute for Social Development, 2007.
- Piscopo, Jennifer M. "When Informality Advantages Women: Quota Networks, Electoral Rules and Candidate Selection in Mexico." *Government and Opposition* 51.3 (2016): 487–512.
- Piscopo, Jennifer M. "State Capacity, Criminal Justice, and Political Rights: Rethinking Violence against Women in Politics." *Política y Gobierno* 23.2 (2016b): 437–458.
- Pitkin, Hanna Fenichel. *The Concept of Representation*. London, England: University of California Press, 1967.
- Profitt, Norma Jean. "Resisting Violence against Women in Central America: The Experience of a Feminist Collective." *Canadian Social Work Review/Revue Canadienne de Service Social* (1994): 103-115.
- Radcliffe, Sarah A. *Dilemmas of Difference: Indigenous Women and the Limits of Postcolonial Development Policy*. Chapel Hill: Duke University Press, 2015.
- Radcliffe, Sarah A., Nina Laurie, and Robert Andolina. "The Transnationalization of Gender and Reimagining Andean Indigenous Development." *Signs* 29.2 (2004): 387–416.

- Ranchod-Nilsson, Sita. "Gender Politics and Gender Backlash in Zimbabwe." *Politics & Gender* 4.4 (2008): 642–652.
- Rao, Smriti. "Reforms with a Female Face: Gender, Liberalization, and Economic Policy in Andhra Pradesh, India." *World Development* 36.7 (2008): 1213–1232.
- Rashid, Sabina Faiz et al. "Creating a Public Space and Dialogue on Sexuality and Rights: A Case Study from Bangladesh." *Health Research Policy & Systems* 9 (2011):1–9.
- Ray, Raka. "Feminism and the History of the Indian Nation." *Contemporary Sociology* 33.6 (2004): 640–642.
- Richards, Patricia. *Pobladoras, Indígenas, and the State: Conflicts over Women's Rights in Chile*. Rutgers: Rutgers University Press, 2004.
- Riley, Robin, Chandra Talpade Mohanty, and Minnie Bruce Pratt, eds. *Feminism and War: Confronting US Imperialism*. New York, NY: Zed Books, 2008.
- Romero, María Xosé Agra. "Escaping/Transgressing the Feminine: Bodies, Prisons and Weapons of Proximity." *Historical Social Research* 39.3 (149) (2014): 115–134.
- Rozario, Santi. "The New Burqa in Bangladesh: Empowerment or Violation of Women's Rights?" *Women's Studies International Forum* 29 (2006): 368–380.
- Rudman Laurie A., Corinne A. Moss-Racusin, Peter Glick, and Julie E. Phelan, "Reactions to Vanguard: Advances in Backlash Theory," Patricia G. Devine and Ashby Plant, eds., *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, Volume 45, Oxford: Academic Press, 2012 :166-225.
- Rubenstein, Jennifer. *Between Samaritans and States: The Political Ethics of Humanitarian INGOs*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.
- Salazar, Eglá Martínez. "State Terror and Violence as a Process of Lifelong Teaching-Learning: The Case of Guatemala." *International Journal of Lifelong Education* 27.2 (2008): 201–216.
- Salem, Rania, Barbara Ibrahim, and Martha Brady. "Negotiating Leadership Roles: Young Women's Experience in Rural Egypt." *Women's Studies Quarterly* 31.3/4 (2003): 174–191.
- Salvatore, Armando, Mark Le Vine, and Mark Le Vine. *Religion, Social Practice, and Contested Hegemonies: Reconstructing the Public Sphere in Muslim Majority Societies*. New York, NY: Springer, 2005.
- Schild, Veronica. "Market Citizenship and the 'New Democracies': The Ambiguous Legacies of Contemporary Chilean Women's Movements." *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society* 5.2 (1998): 232–249.
- Schuler, Sidney Ruth, Syed M. Hashemi, and Shamsul Huda Badal. "Men's Violence against Women in Rural Bangladesh: Undermined or Exacerbated by Microcredit Programmes?" *Development in Practice* 8.2 (1998): 148–157.

- Schuller, Mark. “‘Pa Manyen Fanm Nan Konsa’: Intersectionality, Structural Violence, and Vulnerability Before and After Haiti’s Earthquake.” *Feminist Studies* 41.1 (2015): 184–210.
- Sen, Atreyee. “Reflecting on Resistance Hindu Women ‘Soldiers’ and the Birth of Female Militancy.” *Indian Journal of Gender Studies* 13.1 (2006): 1–35.
- Shaheed, Farida. “The Cultural Articulation of Patriarchy: Legal Systems, Islam and Women.” *South Asia Bulletin* 6.1 (1986): 38–44.
- Shames, Shauna. “Barriers and Solutions to Increasing Women’s Political Power.” Conference Paper published on *Scholars Strategy Network*. 2015.
- Siddiqi, Dina M. “In the Name of Islam? Gender, Politics and Women’s Rights in Bangladesh.” *Harvard Asia Quarterly* 10.1 (2006): 4–14.
- Sperandio, Jill, and Alice Kagoda. “Balance, Persistence and a Thick Skin: Challenges to Community Building for Female School Leaders in Uganda.” *International Studies in Educational Administration (Commonwealth Council for Educational Administration & Management (CCEAM))* 39.3 (2011): 21–36.
- Stephen, Lynn. *Zapotec Women: Gender, Class, and Ethnicity in Globalized Oaxaca*. Chapel Hill: Duke University Press, 2005.
- Suet-lin, Shirley Hung, and Fung Kwok-kin. “Organizing Women for Policy Advocacy in Hong Kong: Identities and Perspectives of Women Organizers.” *Community Development Journal* 45.4 (2010): 423–438.
- Sutton, Barbara. “Poner El Cuerpo: Women’s Embodiment and Political Resistance in Argentina.” *Latin American Politics and Society* 49.3 (2007): 129–162.
- Swanger, Joanna. “Feminist Community Building in Ciudad Juárez: A Local Cultural Alternative to the Structural Violence of Globalization.” *Latin American Perspectives* 34.2 (2007): 108–123.
- Taft, Angela, and Rhonda Small. “Preventing and Reducing Violence against Women: Innovation in Community-Level Studies.” *BMC Medicine* 12.1 (2014): 155–157.
- Taylor, John P. “The Social Life of Rights: ‘Gender Antagonism’, Modernity and Raet in Vanuatu.” *Australian Journal of Anthropology* 19.2 (2008): 165–178.
- Thania Paffenholz, Nick Ross, Steven Dixon, Anna-Lena Schluchter and Jacqui True. *Making Women Count - Not Just Counting Women: Assessing Women’s Inclusion and Influence on Peace Negotiations*. New York: UN Women: Inclusive Peace and Transition Initiative (2016).
- Thompson, Mark. *Saudi Arabia and the Path to Political Change: National Dialogue and Civil Society*. New York, NY: I.B.Tauris, 2014.
- Tinkler, Justine E. “Resisting the Enforcement of Sexual Harassment Law.” *Law & Social Inquiry* 37.1 (2012): 1–24.

- Tripp, Aili Mari, et al. *African women's movements: Transforming Political Landscapes*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Tripp, Aili Mari. *Women and Politics in Uganda*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2012.
- True, Jacqui. *The Political Economy of Violence Against Women*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- USAID, Office of Democracy and Governance. *Approaches to Civic Education: Lessons Learned (Technical Report)* USAID, 2002.
- Vanya, Magdalena. "Marketing Social Change after Communism: The Case of Domestic Violence in Slovakia." *Gender and the Local-Global Nexus: Theory, Research and Action Advances in Gender Research* 10 (2006): 163–194.
- Vung, N D, and G Krantz. "Childhood Experiences of Interparental Violence as a Risk Factor for Intimate Partner Violence: A Population-Based Study from Northern Vietnam." *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health* (1979-) 63.9 (2009): 708–714.
- Waddell, Dianne, and Amrik S. Sohal. "Resistance: a Constructive Tool for Change Management." *Management Decision* 36.8 (1998): 543-548.
- Wakoko Florence, and Linda Lobao. "Reconceptualizing Gender and Reconstructing Social Life: Ugandan Women and the Path to National Development." *Africa Today* 43.3 (1996): 307–322.
- Walsh, Denise M. *Women's Rights in Democratizing States: Just Debate and Gender Justice in the Public Sphere*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Wardak, Susan, and Edna Mitchell. "Why Women Are Missing: Women's Leadership in Afghanistan's Education Policy and Practice." *Culture and Gender in Leadership*. Ed. James Rajasekar and Loo-See Beh. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013: 275–296.
- Waylen, Georgina. *Engendering Transitions: Women's Mobilization, Institutions, and Gender Outcomes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Weldon, S. Laurel. "Beyond Bodies: Institutional Sources of Representation for Women in Democratic Policymaking." *The Journal of Politics* 64.4 (2002): 1153–1174.
- Wells, Diana. "Re-Dyeing the Cloth: The Women's Political Platform and Trinidad and Tobago's General Election of 1995." *Identities* 5.4 (1999): 543–569.
- Wing, Susannah. *Constructing Democracy in Transitioning Societies of Africa: Constitutionalism and Deliberation in Mali*. New York, NY: Springer, 2008.
- World Health Organization, *World Report on Violence and Health*. Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization, 2002.
- Xiaoxian, Gao. "From the Heyang Model to the Shaanxi Model: Action Research on Women's Participation in Village Governance." *The China Quarterly* 204 (2010): 870–898.

- Yadav, Bhupendra. “Khap Panchayats: Stealing Freedom?” *Economic and Political Weekly* 44.52 (2009): 16–19.
- Yadav, Stacey Philbrick, and Janine A. Clark. “Disappointments and New Directions: Women, Partisanship, and the Regime in Yemen.” *Hawwa* 8.1 (2010): 55–95.
- Zanotti, Laura. “Resistance and the Politics of Negotiation: Women, Place and Space among the Kayapó in Amazonia, Brazil.” *Gender, Place & Culture: A Journal of Feminist Geography* 20.3 (2013): 346–362.
- Zetterberg, Par. “Political Engagement and Democratic Legitimacy in Mexico.” *The Impact of Gender Quotas* (2012): 173–89.
- Zulver, Julia. “High-Risk Feminism in El Salvador: Women’s Mobilisation in Violent Times.” *Gender & Development* 24.2 (2016): 171–185.

APPENDICES

Appendix A Systematic Review Protocol

UVA Interdisciplinary Team on Women’s Civic and Political Participation: Systematic Review Protocol

Purpose

The purpose of a literature review protocol is to enhance the rigor, transparency, and replicability of evidence-based reviews by making them more systematic. Protocols also ensure comprehensiveness and accuracy. The UVA Team has opted for what Hagen-Zanker and Mallet (2013) call a systematic but flexible review strategy that adheres to the central principles of a systematic review while also being sensitive to time constraints and reflexivity.

USAID Question

The question for this systematic review is: What are the most effective ways to encourage women’s civic (*e.g.*, volunteer, advocacy, *etc.*) and political (*e.g.*, voting, running for office) participation? When effective ways to encourage women’s participation are implemented, what are the risks to women where resistance to changing gender norms is strong? Additionally, where there is strong resistance directed at women, what factors mitigate it? Researchers are to consider developing countries and other contexts where there is strong resistance to changing gender norms and may define (empirically or theoretically) what “strong resistance” means and which cases fall into this category.

The UVA Team proposes to focus on the second question, risk of strong resistance and its mitigation. During the Team’s initial research phase we learned that the UK Overseas Development Institute (ODI) produced a systematic literature review on women’s civic and political participation in 2015 that takes a feminist and context specific approach similar to that proposed by our Team.

The ODI review finds that the most effective intervention strategies for encouraging women's civic and political participation are contextually informed interventions where field agents think and act politically, encourage diverse women's organizing and mobilization, work with multiple stakeholders, target participation in both formal politics and civil society, build women's political skills, and take a multidimensional rather than a silo approach. The UVA Team therefore proposes to focus on the second of the USAID questions and review sources that can tell us whether the implementation of strategies identified by ODI meet strong resistance. Where these strategies do result in strong resistance, the UVA Team will seek to discern whether this strong resistance is directed at women, and if so, which women, when, where and how, as well as how it might be lessened. A focus on this question will ensure an in-depth analysis and innovative report.

Key Terms

The UVA Team has identified several key terms for the review.

Resistance

Resistance is any conduct that serves to maintain the status quo in the face of pressure to alter it (Duncan 1977, 63, cited in Waddell and Sohal 1998). For this systematic review, we define resistance as the disruption, refusal, and prevention of changes to gender norms, specifically women's political and civic participation resulting from the intervention strategies itemized above.

We define "strong resistance" as violence, meaning the actual use of physical force or power against oneself, another person, group, or community that leads to (or is likely to lead to) injury, psychological harm, maldevelopment, deprivation or death. Its sources include self-directed violence, interpersonal violence (committed by family, intimate partner, community) and collective violence (social, political, economic) (WHO).

We understand this type of violence to be manifest, for example, as suicide, homicide, intentional physical injury and/or mental abuse, sexual assault, trauma, torture, malnutrition, impoverishment, social/familial condemnation or ostracisation, and the withholding of access to goods and services necessary for wellbeing and self-determination (e.g., health care, education, voting rights).

Risk

The definition of risk used by the UVA Team is the likelihood that (some) women will be exposed to threats and the danger of strong resistance when agencies like USAID implement the strategies identified above and women's civic and political participation increases. Risk is evident when, for example, a Member of Parliament (MP) threatens a woman MP with violence *because she is participating in politics* and this woman gained access to parliament through one of the effective interventions itemized. Note that if the woman is threatened with violence for other reasons, e.g., she plans to vote against her party on a bill, this would not be labeled "risk," as it is not an indicator of a problem with the specific intervention but, in this case, with regime type, party control, norms of violence in politics, etc.

Mitigation

The UVA Team defines mitigation as a lessening or diminishment of the risk (or experience of) strong resistance, however small or large. Mitigation may be evident, for example, in improved government legislation on violence against women in response to a backlash, or in community forums dedicated to discussing strong resistance and devising and implementing context appropriate solutions. While the Team will seek evidence-based policy solutions, if the literature on this is small, the Team will include suggestions for future research and policy recommendations that stem from analyses of strong resistance as well as solutions offered in other sectors, such as women's experiences of strong resistance in the military.

Effective Strategies

The UVA Team seeks to learn through its review whether successful strategies for encouraging women's civic and political participation are associated with risks of strong resistance for women. Participation in this review means achieving improvements in women's substantive voice and leadership in decision-making, in the state and in organizations and social movements that aim to shape decision-making in politics or the market. Substantive voice refers to effective demands for women's shared priorities; leadership in decision-making refers to exercising influence in leadership positions that affect power and resource allocation (ODI 2015).

The first successful intervention, contextual expertise, means having deep knowledge of the site where the intervention is to occur. For example, an intervention may be shaped and led by local actors. The second successful intervention is agents who think and work politically. These are interventions by agents who aim to redistribute power and resources by facilitating, say, trust and alliance building within political parties, forging strategic political coalitions, or planning campaign strategies. Agents do not avoid politics; instead, they help women do the hard work politics requires. The third successful intervention encourages diverse women's organizing and mobilization by helping women in different groups become ready and capable of action. That requires the provision of resources—such as leadership skills that are context appropriate, networks and money—to a variety of women's movements and promoting linkages among them.

The fourth successful intervention is to work with multiple stakeholders and invest in long-term relationships with change agents. These interventions would help different women's groups gain powerful allies by, for example, persistent networking that forges strong bonds between the powerful and women's groups. The fifth successful intervention aims to encourage women's participation *both* in formal politics and civil society simultaneously. Examples of this intervention would be to provide logistical and networking support to women's movements so they could make demands for greater political participation. The sixth intervention is building women's political skills, by, for instance, supporting leadership and negotiation training in an array of civic as well as political organizations. The final intervention entails taking a multidimensional approach to tackle practical and structural obstacles to women's participation. This means coordinating programs and activities that engage in consciousness-raising and developing women's social capital and capabilities, all of which aim to change gender norms. One example would be microfinance groups *that include* gender training for both women and men, with the latter provided by local women's organizations.

Probable Sites of Resistance

The Team anticipates that strong resistance to women's political and civic participation will occur both in the family (where that resistance will not necessarily be publicly tolerated or condoned), as well as in society (where that resistance will be publicly tolerated or even condoned).

Based on our current knowledge of the literature on violence as defined above, the Team also anticipates that strong resistance is most likely to occur in societies where men's employment expectations are unfulfilled and with high rates of economic instability (True 2012), in theocracies (Htun and Weldon 2011), in patriarchal clans (Hudson et al. 2015), and in post-conflict societies and societies with high rates of political instability like revolution and civil war (True 2012). While only a systematic review can confirm that these conditions are most likely to interact with the effective intervention strategies to produce strong resistance against (some) women, we will ensure that all of these sites are included in our search.

Research Methodology

The UVA Team will follow the population, intervention, comparator, and outcome methodology as recommended by Hagen-Zanker and Mallett (2013). We note, however, that while ideally our sources would include comparator groups of women, we do not anticipate that this will be common enough in the literature to be a guiding principle of our research methodology.

Inclusions/Exclusions

1. All relevant scholarly and grey literature/No newspaper articles, editorials or other forms of popular/social media
2. All women, including transwomen/No men or other gender categories
3. Effective interventions identified above /No other interventions
4. Effective interventions identified above /No interventions applied to private organizations or other forms of non-civic/non-political participation
5. All sources that include a comparator population
6. All sources that address increases or decreases in risk, resistance, mediation that are associated with the effective interventions identified above/No sources that do not address any of the outcomes of interest or that do not link the outcomes of interest to the effective interventions
7. All methods eligible/No methods ruled out *a priori*
8. All developing countries where USAID works
9. All sources will be in English or Spanish/No other languages
10. All sources will be published in 1985 or after/No sources before 1985
11. All sources that pass our quality criteria checklists (see Appendix B)/No sources that fail to pass our quality criteria checklists

Search Strings

- Women AND contextually informed interventions AND participation AND risk OR violence AND mitigation
 - Chawla
- Women AND political interventions OR leadership training AND participation AND risk OR violence AND mitigation
 - Walsh

- Women AND organizing/mobilizing interventions AND participation AND risk OR violence AND mitigation
 - Vallejo
- Women AND multiple stakeholders interventions AND participation AND risk OR violence AND mitigation
 - Dennis
- Women AND civic interventions AND political participation interventions AND risk OR violence AND mitigation
 - Sen
- Women AND multidimensional interventions AND participation AND risk OR violence AND mitigation
 - Ochs

The Team will start by searching for these key words in article abstracts and use an iterative process to adapt the search strings as needed (see Appendix C for the Team’s search string Word Bank).

Division of Labor for Annotations and Team Crosschecks

- Annotations
 - Ochs and Chawla: resistance in family/personal law and educational institutions, disasters, miscellaneous
 - Dennis and Walsh: resistance in formal political institutions, trade unions, and perpetrated by the state
 - Sen and Vallejo: resistance in social movements, new(s) media and post-conflict, disaster situations
- Crosschecks
 - Walsh: Middle East, post-communist states, SSA, social movements, family/personal SSA, case studies, mixed methods
 - Dennis: education, ethnography, family/personal law ME and South Asia
 - Vallejo: interviews, focus groups, and content analysis; Latin America, disasters
 - Sen: most quantitative work, South Asia, formal politics
 - Ochs: West Bank Gaza, civil society, ethnography, miscellaneous
 - Chawla: NGOs, archival methods, post-conflict, miscellaneous

Sample of Search Tools

- Databases
 - JSTOR, Science Direct, Academic Search Complete, ELDRIS, Women’s Studies International, CIAO, ALTAReligion, EBSCO, Anthropology Plus, ASR Bibliographical Database, ARDA, Center for the Study of Religion and American Culture Indiana University Center, Center for the Study of Religion in Public Life, Pew Forum on Religion & Public Life, Religion–online.org, WorldWide Religious News, Google Scholar, Virgo (UVA online library)
- Journals
 - International Feminist Journal of Politics; Journal of Middle Eastern Women’s Studies; Annual Reviews of Sociology, Anthropology, and Politics; Signs; Women’s Studies International Forum; Conflict Resolution

Note: UVA librarians with disciplinary expertise in our assorted fields informed the Team's journal and database selections.

- Grey Literature Sources
 - USAID, ODI, ELDIS, UNRISD; World Bank, UNIFEM, Harvard Humanitarian Initiative, UNDP, IDS, CGD, DAWN, AWID
- Global South experts contacted
 - Adriana Quiñonez: Manager, UN Trust Fund to End Violence against Women at United Nations for Latin America
 - Dr. Seira Tamang, political scientist, Martin Chautari Research Institute (Nepal)
 - Julie Ballington Policy Advisor on Political Participation in the Leadership and Governance Section, UN Women, United Nations (South African)
 - Geeta Patel, Middle East and South Asian Languages and WGS, UVA (currently based in India)
 - Susan Weiss, PhD, Founder and Executive Director of the Center for Women's Justice (Israel)

Evaluation of Individual Sources

The Team considered several assessment scales, including: DFID 2013, MSMS, and JBI-QARI. We adapted JBI-QARI to inform our evaluation of qualitative sources and adapted DFID for our evaluation of quantitative sources. We will reject studies that are indeterminate on whether they met our evaluation criteria (see Appendix B for the Checklists). The UVA Team will not use a scale based on type of methodology for reasons discussed in the literature on systematic reviews (e.g., Hagen-Zanker and Mallett 2013, 15). Note: GRADE was unavailable during the time the protocol was written.

**Appendix B
Methods Evaluation Checklists**

1. Field Experiment Checklist

Article/Book:

Author:

Reviewer:

| | Yes | No | Maybe/ Unsure | NA |
|---|-----|----|------------------|----|
| Was assignment to treatment fairly done? | | | | |
| Was the sampling strategy representative of the population of interest? | | | | |
| Do the instruments reflect the topic of interest? | | | | |
| Does the study explicitly consider any context-specific cultural factors that may bias the analysis/findings? | | | | |
| To what extent does the author consider the study's limitations and/or alternative interpretations of the analysis? | | | | |

Overall Conclusion:

Include _____ Exclude _____

Guidelines:

Include if:

5 Yes

4 Yes, 1 No/Maybe

3 Yes, 2 Maybe OR 3 Yes, 1 Maybe, 1 No

2. RCT Checklist

Article:

Author:

Reviewer:

| | Yes | No | Maybe/ Unsure | NA |
|---|-----|----|------------------|----|
| Was assignment to treatment truly random? | | | | |
| Were groups treated identically except for the named interventions? | | | | |
| Were outcomes measured in the same way for all groups? | | | | |
| Does the study explicitly consider any context-specific cultural factors that may bias the analysis/findings? | | | | |
| To what extent does the author consider the study's limitations and/or alternative interpretations of the analysis? | | | | |

Overall Conclusion:

Include _____ Exclude _____

Guidelines:

Include if:

5 Yes

4 Yes, 1 No/Maybe

3 Yes, 2 Maybe OR 3 Yes, 1 Maybe, 1 No

3. Survey Checklist

Article/Book:

Author:

Reviewer:

| | Yes | No | Maybe/ Unsure | NA |
|---|-----|----|------------------|----|
| Was the sampling strategy representative of the population of interest? | | | | |
| Do the questions/instruments reflect the topic of interest? | | | | |
| Was an appropriate statistical analysis used to analyze the results? | | | | |
| Does the study explicitly consider any context-specific cultural factors that may bias the analysis/findings? | | | | |
| To what extent does the author consider the study's limitations and/or alternative interpretations of the analysis? | | | | |

Overall Conclusion:

Include _____ Exclude _____

Guidelines:

Include if:

5 Yes

4 Yes, 1 No/Maybe

3 Yes, 2 Maybe OR 3 Yes, 1 Maybe, 1 No

4. Quantitative Checklist

Article:

Author:

Reviewer:

| | Yes | No | Maybe/ Unsure | NA |
|---|-----|----|------------------|----|
| Is the sample representative of the perceived population? | | | | |
| Does the study demonstrate measurement validity? | | | | |
| Is the statistical tool used appropriate for the outcome variable? | | | | |
| To what extent does the author consider the study's limitations and/or alternative interpretations of the analysis? | | | | |
| Are the conclusions clearly based on the study's results? | | | | |

Overall Conclusion:

Include _____ Exclude _____

Guidelines:

Include if:

5 Yes

4 Yes, 1 No/Maybe

3 Yes, 2 Maybe OR 3 Yes, 1 Maybe, 1 No

5. Mixed Methods Checklist

Article:

Author:

Reviewer:

| For quantitative methods: | Yes | No | Maybe/ Unsure | NA |
|---|-----|----|------------------|----|
| Is the sample representative of the perceived population? | | | | |
| Does the study demonstrate measurement validity? | | | | |
| Is the statistical tool used appropriate for the outcome variable? | | | | |
| To what extent does the author consider the study's limitations and/or alternative interpretations of the analysis? | | | | |
| Are the conclusions clearly based on the study's results? | | | | |

For qualitative methods: see checklist for specific qualitative methods used.

Overall Conclusion:

Include _____ Exclude _____

Guidelines:

Include if, for both and quantitative and qualitative methods used:

5 Yes

4 Yes, 1 No/Maybe

3 Yes, 2 Maybe OR 3 Yes, 1 Maybe, 1 No

6. Case Studies Methods Checklist

Article:

Author:

Reviewer:

| | Yes | No | Maybe/ Unsure | NA |
|---|-----|----|------------------|----|
| Was there sufficient description of the cases? | | | | |
| Does the study demonstrate internal validity? | | | | |
| If the study is comparative, were the criteria for case selection clearly defined and appropriate? | | | | |
| To what extent does the author consider the study's limitations and/or alternative interpretations of the analysis? | | | | |
| Are the conclusions clearly based on the study's results? | | | | |

Overall Conclusion:

Include _____ Exclude _____

Guidelines:

Include if, for both and quantitative and qualitative methods used:

5 Yes

4 Yes, 1 No/Maybe

3 Yes, 2 Maybe OR 3 Yes, 1 Maybe, 1 No

7. Interviews Checklist

Article/Book:

Author:

Reviewer:

| | Yes | No | Maybe/ Unsure | NA |
|--|-----|----|------------------|----|
| Does the study demonstrate why interviews are well suited to answer the research question? | | | | |
| Does the study use a sample of at least 20 in-depth interviews? | | | | |
| Was an appropriate coding methodology used to analyze the results? | | | | |
| Does the study explicitly consider any factors related with the interviewees and their role as interviewers that may bias the analysis/findings? | | | | |
| To what extent does the author consider the study's limitations and/or alternative interpretations of the analysis? | | | | |

Overall Conclusion:

Include _____ Exclude _____

Guidelines:

Include if:

5 Yes

4 Yes, 1 No/Maybe

3 Yes, 2 Maybe OR 3 Yes, 1 Maybe, 1 No

8. Ethnography Checklist

Article/Book:

Author:

Reviewer:

| | Yes | No | Somewhat | NA |
|--|-----|----|----------|----|
| Is the description thick and thorough, giving the sense that the writer has gained a solid understanding of the topic through ethnographic field research? | | | | |
| Does the author explain relevant context (historical, geographical, etc) in order to deepen the reader's understanding and to demonstrate the importance of the work? | | | | |
| Does the piece balance broader theoretical engagements with attention to local specificities? | | | | |
| Does the author avoid making claims that are greater than what the ethnographic evidence warrants? | | | | |
| Does the author demonstrate a reflexive awareness of their own position within the social setting that they describe and understand the ways in which this may have influenced the work of observation and interpretation? | | | | |
| Does the piece speak to humanistic and anthropological interests/concerns that are broader than the immediate phenomenon being described? | | | | |

Overall Conclusion:

Include _____ Exclude _____

Guidelines:

Include if:

6 Yes

5 Yes, 1 No/Somewhat

4 Yes, 2 No/Somewhat

3 Yes, 3 Somewhat

9. Textual Analysis Checklist

Article/Book:

Author:

Reviewer:

| | Yes | No | Maybe/ Unsure | NA |
|---|-----|----|------------------|----|
| Was the sampling strategy justified by the authors? | | | | |
| Does the study demonstrate why textual data is well suited to answer the research question? | | | | |
| Was an appropriate coding methodology used to analyze the results? | | | | |
| Does the study explicitly consider any factors related with the sources that may bias the analysis/findings? | | | | |
| To what extent does the author consider the study's limitations and/or alternative interpretations of the analysis? | | | | |

Overall Conclusion:

Include _____ Exclude _____

Guidelines:

Include if:

5 Yes

4 Yes, 1 No/Maybe

3 Yes, 2 Maybe OR 3 Yes, 1 Maybe, 1 No

10. Archival Work Checklist

Article/Book:

Author:

Reviewer:

| | Yes | No | Somewhat | NA |
|---|-----|----|----------|----|
| Is the research question clearly identified and referenced with respect to the existing historiography? Does the author clearly identify a gap in research that the present work addresses? | | | | |
| Is the time period and geographical area under study clearly and persuasively demarcated? Is it clear what the work is <i>not</i> about? | | | | |
| Is the work sufficiently grounded theoretically, and is it reflexive about its theoretical underpinnings? | | | | |
| Does the author avoid making claims that are greater than what the archival evidence warrants? | | | | |
| Does the author demonstrate an awareness of limitations of the archives s/he consults, understand the ways in which this may have influenced their conclusions, and look prospectively at how these might change with fresh evidence? | | | | |
| Does the work look prospectively at how its analyses might be relevant in the present context, or speak to how they might have informed developments after the historical period under study or in a wider geographical area? | | | | |

Overall Conclusion:

Include _____ Exclude _____

Guidelines:

Include if:

6 Yes

5 Yes, 1 No/Somewhat

4 Yes, 2 No/Somewhat

3 Yes, 3 Somewhat

Appendix C

Word Bank for Search Strings

Women

- elite/poor/working class/middle class
- educated/uneducated/unskilled/skilled
- rural/urban
- minority /immigrant/refugee/indigenous/aboriginal/tribal/stateless
- transgender/third gender
- migrant labour/domestic labour/employed/unemployed/ unorganized sector employment

Resistance

- disruption, refusal, prevention, backlash, retaliation, sidelining, setbacks
- force/power against, suicide, injury, psychological torture, maldevelopment, deprivation, death, interpersonal violence, family violence, intimate partner violence, community violence, collective violence, social violence, political violence, economic violence, structural violence, gender-based discrimination, honor killings, dowry, GBV, VAW, religious violence, religious law, Islamic Law/Shari'a, Taliban

Risk

- threats, intimidation, danger, abuse and violence (see synonyms above)

Mitigation

- Risk reduction, risk management, risk response, risk assessment, mitigation activities, risk monitoring

Social Context

- political transition, post-conflict, post-disaster, revolution, political instability, civil war
- justice system, personal status/family law (ex: marriage and divorce, inheritance rights, adoption and/or child custody rights)
- public, private, formal, informal, family, domestic, community, clans, tribal culture
- theocracy
- poverty, economic instability

Effective strategies

(Tags: context intervention, political intervention, leadership intervention, organizing intervention, multiple stakeholders intervention, civic & political intervention, multidimensional intervention)

- Contextual expertise, locally led, grassroots, participatory, community ownership, training for providers

- Political interventions, redistribute power, resources, community, civil society, unions, political parties
- Mobilization of resources, leadership skills training, money, networks, networking, feminist leadership, alliance-building, strategic networks, coalitions, consciousness raising, social capital, capabilities, capacity-building
- Multiple stakeholders, allies, power brokers
- Civic and political participation
- Multidimensional, coordinated programming

Intervention

- International actors, donors, external funders, implementers, funders, international agencies, aid agencies, development agencies

Civic participation

- decision-making, negotiation, influence, implementation, changing social norms, mentoring/political inexperience, contesting norms, contesting power structures, women's organizations, gender justice
- Social Movements: networks, coalitions, women's networks, women's movements, high-risk activism
- Styles of engagement and access: empowerment, voice, organizing, lobbying, mobilization, strategic networking
- Top down, bottom up, trickle down

Political Participation

- candidacy, election, representation, women and peace process, political change, reform, alliance-building, voting, citizenship
- Leadership: feminist leadership, strategic networks
- Gender: gender responsive laws, gender mainstreaming
- Inter-generational change, sustainable change, democratic transfer of power

Regions

- Tags: Latin America, South Asia, Southeast Asia, MENA, Caribbean, Sub-Saharan African, West Africa, Eastern Africa, Central Africa, Southern Africa, Eurasia, Eastern Europe, Indian subcontinent, Global South, Postcolonial world, developing world, non-West

Methods

- Tags: Survey, RCT, Field Experiment, Statistical Analysis, Ethnography, Interview, Multi-method, Textual Analysis, Archival Analysis, Comparative cases, Conference Report, Research Report, Literature Review, Participant Observation