

NGOization revisited: Feminist Mobilizations Amidst Organizational, Resource, and Strategic Challenges

SABINE LANG

Henry M. Jackson School of International Studies, University of Washington

Abstract

Over the past three decades, the term NGOization has turned from a heuristic concept conceived to analyze the power dynamics in a particular organizational form of feminist civil society into a concept in danger of normative overstretch. NGOization has come to stand for a postfeminist politics that is coopted into the mainstream and incentivizes depoliticization and deradicalization. I argue in this essay that it is time to take stock of the conceptual framings of NGOization and examine the contingencies and resistances it produced.

Feminist organizations have encountered the tensions produced by the pull to NGOize early and debated its effects more ardently than other civic sectors. Since the mid-1990s, feminist NGOization literature had identified a pull among women's movement actors to formalize organization and thus to professionalize, institutionalize and bureaucratize feminist civil society.

The apparent fit of an NGOized feminist civic sector with neoliberal economic and individualizing societal imperatives can, however, not account for the breadth of feminist activism worldwide. NGOization, in other words, is not an iron cage, it is a political, economic, and cultural pull factor that invites stretching, bending, tensions, opposition and thus dialectical responses. The essay identifies three sets of challenges that an NGOized feminist civil society faces, pertaining to resources, strategy, and mobilization capacity.

Keywords: *feminism, civil society, NGOs, NGOization, mobilization, social movements*



Introduction

Over the past three decades, the term NGOization has turned from a heuristic concept conceived to analyze the power dynamics in a particular organizational form of feminist civil society (Lang 1996; Alvarez 1997; Ana 2024) into a concept in danger of normative overstretch. Neera Chandhoke’s instructive quip “...people struggling against authoritarian regimes had demanded civil society, what they got instead were NGOs” (Chandhoke 2003: 9) evokes a narrative in which the nongovernmental sector in essence has turned into a pillar of neoliberal governance. In feminist discourse, NGOization has come to stand for a postfeminist politics that kindles the “cooptation and erasure of critical social movements” (Charkraborty 2021: 1). Cooptation into mainstreamed gender politics, specifically, is argued to lead to depoliticization and deradicalization (De Jong/Kimm 2017). Those working in the sector are frequently perceived as having ‘sold out’ and being part of elites “with closer ties to international institutions than to their local communities” (Arda/Banerjee 2021: 1691). By some accounts, NGOs have become what botanists call an ‘indicator species’: “The greater the devastation caused by neoliberalism, the greater the outbreak of NGOs” (analogy by Roy 2016: 335).

I submit that it is time to lower the normative heat in order to take stock of the conceptual framings of NGOization that emerged over the past three decades and examine the contingencies and resistances it produced. The substantive critique of the NGO sector has political, economic, and cultural roots: Politically, as neoliberalism has led to the outsourcing of crucial social services to civic sector actors, those working in these sectors are seen as stabilizing and abetting a system that perpetuates inequalities and compensates for a politics of minimizing public sector resources. Economically, the ‘commercialization of the sector’ that leads to a particular strata of NGOs receiving considerable funding from governments, business and private donors and in turn urges organizations to utilize business models to advance their public-facing goals (Mitchel et al., 2020; Prakash & Gugerty, 2009), invites critics to see NGOs as the source of economizing society and as unfit to initiate radical social change. Moreover, the impressive rise of the nonprofit sector as one of the largest employment sectors globally, spurred by foundations whose budgets dwarf those of many governments, has accentuated how civil society has the potential to hollow out representative democracy by practicing undemocratic agenda setting. Culturally, the ‘bonds’ between the aid industry in the Global North and the receivership of deprived and poorer communities in the Global South have been identified as neo-colonial oppressive practices.

Feminist organizations have encountered the tensions produced by the pull to NGOize early and debated its effects more ardently than other civic sectors. Since the mid-1990s, feminist NGOization literature had identified a pull among women’s movement actors to formalize organization and thus to professionalize, institutionalize and bureaucratize feminist civil society. Empirical evidence and effects of gendered and NGOized civil societies have been

studied in Europe (Lang, 2013; Paternotte, 2016; Jacobsson & Saxonberg 2013; Bernal/Grewal 2014; Ana, 2024) in the Americas (Alvarez, 2009), the Middle East (Herrold, 2016; Arda/Banerjee 2021), and Africa (Al-Karib 2018). As some scholars criticized the NGOization paradigm for stipulating a pre-NGOized “innocent” autonomous women’s movement (Bernal/Roy 2017),³⁵ others pointed to the shifts in women’s organizing as an empirically observable and heuristically validated development (Lang 2013; Ana 2024).

The apparent fit of an NGOized feminist civic sector with neoliberal economic and individualizing societal imperatives can, however, not account for the breadth of feminist activism worldwide. NGOization, in other words, is not an iron cage, it is a political, economic, and cultural pull factor that invites stretching, bending, tensions, opposition and thus dialectical responses. As feminist research attends to power dynamics and tries to avoid static and hermetic conceptualizations, feminist theorizing has rightly situated NGO activism within a broad range of intersectional claims making and diverse subjectivities (Bernal/Roy 2017; Irvine et al 2019). Feminist mobilizations today reside in a multitude of places from hyper-local to transnational, in diverse spaces from grassroots and physical to the cloud, and exhibit a delimited set of strategies from productively engaging the political and economic political status quo to resisting it altogether. With powerful street-level protests such as the Polish Black Protests or the Latin American NiUnaMenos mobilizations, women and gender activists have reclaimed public spaces and harness the power of physical or social media-based mass action. Established women’s NGOs often concentrate on changing legal and policy aspects of gendered inequalities and carry gender equality demands into the institutional spheres of parties, governments, business and international organizations. Street-level organizers and institutional actors alike harness the power of social media to advance their issues and bolster campaigns. New technologies enable feminist actors to jump scale between different locales and modes of intervention and align mobilizations across borders at low cost.

Does the ‘flowering landscape’ of recent feminist mobilizations in the first quarter of the 21st century debunk earlier assessments that articulated NGOization as a core mode of early 21st century feminist organizing (Lang 1996 and 2013, Alvarez 2009, Ana 2024)? Have feminist activists proven those wrong who saw the future of gender equality claims encapsulated and moderated in an incorporated women’s civil society sector? I would like to offer a cautionary perspective on abandoning the heuristic lens of an NGOized civil society altogether. I argue that, to the contrary, NGOized feminism continues to be the predominant mode of organization and advocacy for gender equality. Resisting NGOization, however, as well as producing alternative mobilization strategies has become a central modality of gender activism today. Opposition to NGOized modes of addressing gender equality has led to counter-movements, challenging the organizational form of institutionalized feminism and offering alternative

³⁵ In the area that I mostly study, Western Europe, there has been a self-identified autonomous women’s movement in the 1970s and 1980s that, far from innocent, nonetheless did deliberately not take state money and instead operated women’s shelters, centers, and self-help groups through personal time investment and small donations.

modes of doing politics. Younger generations of feminists, in particular, have become impatient with another round of gathering facts that might eventually inform evidence-based policy making, with another conference in which impact assessments of policies on women's lives are being debated. In other words, what we are witnessing as a broad range of gendered mobilizations might also articulate itself as resistance to institutionalized, bureaucratized, and professionalized advocacy. Social media enable these activist voices on a scale that nobody anticipated in the 1990s.

Three Challenges of NGOized Feminist Civil Society

After three decades of the NGOization pull in civil society, we can observe its effects as well as challenges to its dominance in three ways, pertaining to organization, resources, and strategy: One, incorporating as an NGO continues to be the predominant operational form of the struggles for gender equality worldwide. Organized women's NGOs help convert equality agendas into legislation and are part and parcel of global policy accomplishments. At the same time, the quest for radical feminist societal change is frequently reduced to more adaptive strategies for reform under the auspices of neoliberalism. As a consequence, and pushed also by the affordances of social media campaigns, younger feminist generations, in particular, are eschewing organizational forms and instead develop mobilization repertoires that rely less on hierarchical professionalism and more on distributed networks of activism. Two, as the perceived tensions inherent in an NGOized feminist civil society sector have borne innovative and more radical forms of feminist activism and resistance, the resource question has gained more urgency. New forms of mobilization that incite street level resistance do rarely synergize with and do not count on the support and on resources of NGOized feminist organizations. An observable effect is that some larger donors now incorporate aspects of the NGOization critique into revised funding strategies. Embedded in the resource issue, moreover, are questions pertaining to the financial and emotional costs of feminist engagement and the making of feminist expert 'careers'. An increasingly prolific literature investigates the self-exploitative nature of political care work (De Jong 2017; Wang 2022; Ana 2024) under NGOized conditions and seeks to identify alternatives. Three, as institutionalized gender equality actors have carved out particular spaces for political advocacy in government and legal contexts, they have witnessed different strategic decisions by feminist activists outside of these institutions. This has ambivalent effects, because the current challenges to gender equality are in need of a renewed coalition building. In order to counter the massive anti-feminist challenges we are currently witnessing, a 'division of labor' argument between institutional actors and street-level and networked feminist resistances won't suffice – the recent U.S. decision to strike down *Roe v. Wade* being a case in point, or the massive violence against women in areas of limited statehood. The strategic challenge ahead is how to coordinate NGOized feminist actors and street-level mobilizations, harnessing the respective powers of each.

Organizational Challenges

Women's organizations have become an ingrained part of a project-culture based civil society. Like civil society organizations in other advocacy fields, they have learned to adapt their goals to institutional norms of feasibility (Lang, 2013; Banks et al. 2015). Managerial practices

established within a shared social space result in the production of “good projects” as a commodity that NGOs sell. Through the sale, beneficiaries “become part of” this commodification of civil society (Krause, 2014: 4). As donors and other stakeholders provide funds only for specific projects, showcasing short-term results becomes paramount and admitting to failure is not an option. Instead, civil society development needs to be ‘measurable’ and thus in essence quantifiable according to mostly economic or government-led data points. Accountability thus becomes directly related to the “marketization of the nonprofit sector” (Eikenberry/Kluver, 2004, also Sandberg et al., 2020). Within this market of projects, moreover, NGOs are pitted against each other in competing for grants and thus often forced to operate highly individualized. At the same time, this might lead to ‘association overload’ as layers of NGOs, alliances, and networks potentially replicate each other’s mission and projects (Lang, 2023, also Herrold/Atia, 2016).

Countering these trends in organizational self-referentiality, an increasingly visible number of gendered mobilizations deliberately avoid formal organization (Armstrong 2002) and instead build horizontally-networked communities of activists that do not rely on established women’s organizations to advance their messages (Irvine et al. 2019). The #MeToo movement, Women’s March actions, street-level reproductive choice marches and many others point to what researchers have labeled an explosion of feminist organizing (Forester et al. 2020; Htun/Weldon 2018). Young feminists, in particular, have risen to counter NGOized civil society. In a 2016 survey by the *Frida* network’s *Young Feminist Fund* and *Awid*, only a small majority of young feminist organizations were registered in their respective countries and fall under NGO laws. (Frida et al. 2016: 4). In Latin America and the MENA region, in particular, less than half of the groups of young feminists had registered as an NGO, and aside from financial reasons (registration being too expensive) one third articulated not being registered as a political choice and instead preferring “not to ask for money from ‘regular funders’ to avoid being politically controlled from the outside of the collective” (Frida et al. 2016: 32). Thus, the pull to NGOize has also bred resistances, enabling conscious decisions among young activists not to formalize their engagement and actions and instead pursue other, strongly networked, horizontally structured, and social media driven modes of organizing.

Resource Challenges

NGOs tend to “projectify” feminism (Scott/Rönblom 2022) and sell their projects as ‘products’ in settings in which donors are turned into the *prima facie* consumers (Krause, 2014, p. 4). As private and public donor demands structure the operational logics of NGOs (Heiss/Kelley 2017; Mitchell/Schmitz 2014) more generally, women’s and feminist organizations cannot evade donor logics. The European Union funding structures, for an example, while enabling project-and evidence-based activities by women’s actors, at the same time curate their work in three ways, shaping their priorities, project goals, and public outreach activities. In terms of priorities, women’s activities are narrowed to a specific set of intergovernmental priorities that are defined by EU institutions and member states. EU goal orientation makes funds available for specific activities by women’s NGOs which might be well spent and guarantee survival and growth of a certain arena of gender equality; but this

might invite “goal-displacement at the micro-level” (Sanchez Salgado, 2010: 526) by way of signaling what is more likely to be funded and what not. Finally, this focus on donor rationales undermines “citizen’s appropriation of the policy process” (ibid: 527) and potentially stifles bottom-up engagement with gendered inequalities. Research has delineated how particular funding streams for advocacy deter “organizations from engaging in contentious or transgressive social movement activity” (Suarez 2020: 502).

The resource question in NGOization is not just about organizational survival and modes of mobilization, it also impacts individual survival in an organization. With the growth of the NGO sector in the gender equality arena, precarious work conditions have become embedded in a professionalized structure that counts on temporary, project-driven labor by committed and caring feminists (de Jong 2017; Ana 2024; Wang 2022). *Frida* and the *AWID Young Feminist Organization* find in their report on the state of young feminist activism that “despite the fact that young feminist organizations are using innovative strategies to tackle some of the most pressing issues of our time, with some of the most vulnerable populations, they are strikingly under-resourced and their sustainability is in jeopardy” (Frida/Awid 2016: 3). According to Alexandra Ana, financial dependency of feminist organizations “functions both as a channel through which governmental precarization as a mode of governance is being deployed and as an instrument that helps to hierarchize, classify and distribute precariousness in relations of inequalities (Ana 2024). In effect, lack of resources, precarity of work and self-exploitation in the care economy structure not just what kind of actions are being promoted, but it informs relationships within organizations and between them.

As this critique has gathered momentum globally, it has led some donors and funders to start re-imagining their tenders and modes of engagements with grantees. New approaches to women’s NGO funding are again at the forefront of this change and reflect resistances to NGOized women’s organizations. Initiatives such as the feminist collaborative ‘*Count Me In!*’³⁶ founded the ‘Money and Movement Initiative’³⁷ (MMI) in 2018 to articulate and address the complex relationship between donors and project-based feminist organizations in the Global South. MMI organizes dialogues between funders and grantees that focus specifically on the power dynamics built into their relationships and offers best practice models of funding. Based on Michael Edwards concept of a transformative funding ecosystems (Edwards 2013), activists from *Count Me In!* have pushed for stronger reflection on the ‘ties that bind’ in project-based funding for gender equality and offered ideas for change (Count Me In! 2018). An example of structural adjustments on the funders side is the Dutch development engagement with women’s organizations. Instead of project evaluations based on outcomes, the Dutch

³⁶ The Count Me In! (CMI!) consortium consists of eight member organizations: Mama Cash (MC), the Association for Women’s Rights in Development (AWID), CREA, Just Associates (JASS), and the Sister Funds Urgent Action Fund (UAF) and Urgent Action Fund Africa (UAF-Africa). The sex worker-led Red Umbrella Fund (RUF) and the Dutch gender platform WO=MEN are strategic partners of the consortium.

³⁷ <https://cmiconsortium.org/money-and-movements-initiative/>

Foreign Ministry has adopted a ‘theory of change’ model of evaluation that “focuses more on qualitative results and outcomes than on output and activities” (Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs 2018). The model allows for adaptation and change to be part of women’s NGO work, validating local experience over grant execution metrics. Thus, resistances to NGOized forms of project culture and execution breed new ideas that challenge established practices; and these new ideas originate often in spaces where funders and established women’s NGOs are confronted with new, younger, non-incorporated groups.

In the Global North as well, some large international foundations are in the process of altering their grantmaking in response to critiques about ‘project funding’ calls for reaching gender equality and intersectionally grounded goals. The *Ford Foundation* sponsored *Black Feminist Fund*, for an example, articulates directly “We want to model for the philanthropic sector to fund Black feminists like you want them to win. That means you fund them for a long time because the struggle is long. You fund them at large levels; you don’t ask them to win freedom with \$25,000” (Ford Foundation 2021).³⁸ These initiatives, at this point in time, are far and few in-between and limited in scope. But as the discursive context for civil society work changes, they might gain momentum and lead to new gender equality engagement practices based on constructive critiques of NGOization.

Strategic Challenges

NGOization has not just fostered specific organizational architectures and resource challenges, it has also molded strategic decisions on how to communicate and mobilize (Lang 2013). As expertise has become the prime currency to be validated by donors and governments, organizing broader public engagement and political activism has taken a back seat. NGOs’ focus on organizational reproduction incentivizes a reorientation of communication from publicity to public relations, delivering different types of communication (policy reports, press releases, donor reports) to different audiences (Powers, 2016: 7). Managing their brand (ibid.) has become an area of increasing attention, which in turn deters from public outreach in a more inclusive and participatory sense. Organizing publicness by making issues known to wider audiences and organizing these audiences into powerful citizen voices are the most pressing among challenges for an NGOized civil society. But all too often these public-facing empowerment projects are the ones that are least ‘fundable’ in the eyes of donors as they showcase little immediate results and measurable output. The call for rethinking NGOs’ role in public mobilization processes thus has become louder across policy fields (f.e. Tortajada, 2016; Crosman et al., 2022), but it is particularly loud in the arena of feminism.

Feminists mostly acknowledge that NGOized feminism occupies a specific space and plays a central role in the overall push for gender equality. Similar to the femocratic move into

³⁸ Expanding on the dynamics of large funders such as the Ford Foundation creating long-term funding relationships with particular groups is beyond the scope of this essay, but should be on the agenda of feminist organization research.

institutions since the 1980s, professionalized women’s organizations are now present in most countries as experts that lobby institutional actors, help draft laws and regulations, and watch over implementation of gender equality measures. At the same time, most of these women’s NGOs have not been at the forefront of the #MeToo mobilizations, the *Black Lives Matter* actions, or global reproductive right protests. Are we observing an increasingly visible ‘division of labor’ between an incorporated women’s NGO sector and street-level activism? And, if so, what are the costs to such a strategic dual track approach to gender equality?

Illustrating Mobilization Challenges

An instructive example presents with the 2023 mobilizations in the U.S. against the Supreme Court overturning of the 1973 *Row v. Wade* right to abortion. A draft of the decision had already been leaked about two months before the ruling was handed down – time to prepare immediate, visible, and strong responses on the streets of Washington D.C. Institutionalized American women’s organizations, however, did not showcase preparedness for public protests. No nation-wide walk out or strike was planned by “K-Street”, the organizational advocacy hub of lobbying and social justice organizations in the U.S. capital. Instead, it was diverse locally coordinating women’s groups who took to the streets, their numbers small in regard to the magnitude of the decision. A similar pattern emerged during the following months, when many states outlawed or severely limited the right to abortion. As, for an example, the Idaho legislature on March 31, 2023 announced that any aiding of abortion would be a felony that could get a mother or a helpful friend up to five years in prison, the major women’s organizations in the U.S. showcased the following on their websites:

24 hours after the decision was made public, the Washington D.C. based *Center for Reproductive Rights* under their ‘events section (“panels and events. Addressing current topics in reproductive rights”), had no events scheduled for the future.³⁹ The *National Organization for Women* (NOW) under ‘upcoming events’ had a header “NOW is taking action” that read “NOW it taking action. Attacks on abortion care keep coming. But NOW is defending our access to reproductive freedom. Donate and together we can secure equality for all women”.⁴⁰ The *Feminist Majority Foundation* had published their last news on abortion on International women’s day more than three weeks before the Idaho decision.⁴¹ *NARAL*, the premier national pro-choice organization in the U.S. targeted a ‘National Ban on Medication Abortions’ on their site with the tag-line “Help NARAL fight back. Donate”.⁴² Finally, *Planned Parenthood*, the most visible reproductive rights provider in the US, as well only offered donations or volunteering as possible strategic choices to counter anti-abortion policies. The ‘get involved’ tab took the interested party to a 501c(4) political advocacy organization, separate from Planned Parenthood, that offered exactly one option: to volunteer for the organization.⁴³ In

³⁹ <https://reproductiverights.org/events/>

⁴⁰ <https://www.now.org/events/>

⁴¹ <https://feminist.org/news/>

⁴² <https://www.prochoiceamerica.org> access 4/1/23

⁴³ <https://weareplannedparenthood.org>

sum, collective preparedness to respond directly and publicly to these massive and cumulative attacks on women's reproductive rights by NGOized women's organizations was not visible.

These points of evidence challenge Suzanne Staggenborg's notion that the Pro-Choice movement in the US had managed to effectively organize a division of labor between "K Street" (Washington DC advocacy hub) oriented lobbying and direct action as a grassroots strategy, and that formal organizations are in fact frequent supporters of local/regional direct-action activities (Staggenborg 1988 and 2013). I submit that the lack of a massive, large scale and coordinated women's movement response after the overturn of *Roe v. Wade* in the United States is indicative of the challenges that an NGOized women's civic sector presents as it forfeits the option of aligning itself with or coordinating street-level activism. To be clear, this is not to deny the important contributions of lobbying and legal struggles that K-Street women's organization spearhead. As the U.S. reproductive rights struggle to some large degree has relocated into the state- and city-levels legal system, the professional resources that the D.C. beltway organizations provide are crucial. At the same time, many organizations have put their public mobilization coordination function aside and appear unable to muster decisive support for street-level protests and direct action.

On the upside, another generation of feminist activists stepped in to "meet the moment" (Flowers, op. cit. Kinery 2022). Black women leaders of several groups across the country harnessed the feeling of being "unsure of what was next" that many women experienced and networked to stage 'Day Without Us', inviting protesters to skip work and instead attend an online teach-in or meet up for "local pop-ups" to discuss ways to move forward in the aftermath of the Supreme Court ruling and show public presence on and offline (ibid. 2022).

In sum: Challenging the depoliticisation effect of NGOization (Ana 2024), groups of younger and diverse feminist activists take up the void in public presence that institutionalized women's organizations left and channeled omnipresent women's frustration with the ruling into direct action. In other conflicts and in other parts of the world, young feminist organizations use similar strategies and carry out a range of public protests with low organizational density, no vertical lines of decision making, and very little financial support. With their actions, they bridge not only different gender constituencies and act interjectionally, they work specifically also across generational lines of activists (Frida 2016: 3) and thus bridge different mobilization strategies. The same survey indicates that half of the young feminist activist groups surveyed were created within the last decade since 2010 (ibid.) and thus in response to earlier and heavily NGOized modes of organizing.

Conclusion

Different groups of feminist actors today work within, with, parallel to and against the women's spaces they inherited. The rising mode of organizational practices that respond to the

NGOization pull can also be seen as an expression of what Scott and Rönnblom in the tradition of Deleuze call ‘assemblage thinking’ (Scott/Rönnblom 2021: 252): the notion that contingencies and selective adaptations in the process of feminist transformations are not only ‘living’ in theoretical projects, but live in organizational structures as well. Projectified feminist cultures under neoliberal conditions are a result of NGOization. But, at the same time, feminist activism challenges, continuously re-works, and re-imagines the affordances of feminist mobilizations. New, often younger, actors immersed in queer and intersectional practices try to compensate resource challenges with crossover strategies and the use of new technologies, in the process staying attuned to social cleavages in how we design, utilize and implement activism (Benschop 2021). This does not de-validate the questions that the NGOization concept raises; instead, it highlights the ambiguities that an NGOized feminism left gender activists with. The central task for the future is how to make these contingencies productive and allow for a feminist crossover politics between institutionalized actors and new forms of mobilization.

One way to assess this re-imagining is to orient towards Latin America’s development of NGOized feminism and the resistances in produced in the past decade. Here, attempts to recruit younger feminists into the established structures of organized feminism failed. This failure, however, did not turn into antagonistic younger generation mobilizations, but instead into “spin-off” activism (Friedman/Rodriguez Gustá 2023). In Ecuador and Peru, for an example, older feminist organizations were committed to recruiting younger generation participants, but they did so with what Anna-Britta Coe calls “in/exclusionary practices” (Coe 2020: 22). They offered, on the inclusionary side, participation in formal activities, training and leadership skill development in order to foster institutional change. These very offers, however, had also an exclusionary dimension by employing mainly trained experts, investing in a bureaucratized organizational structure, and emphasizing state institutions over other sites of inequality (ibid.). As a consequence, “...younger participants turned to generating their own spaces, structures, and practices of feminism. As a result, the younger generation was able to make use of experiences gained within an older women’s movement. However, they did so by establishing ‘new forms of activism’ emphasizing horizontality and autonomy” (Friedman/Rodriguez Gustá 2023), while building on the inclusive aspects of NGOized feminism. The way forward thus might need imagining feminist spaces “in which formal official organizations and informal groups” not just “co-exist” (Ana 2024), but communicate and collaborate to address the massive challenges that the reactionary right poses to gender equality worldwide.

Bibliography

- Al-Karib, Hala (2018) The dangers of NGO-isation of women's rights in Africa. Aljazeera 12/13/18, Access at <https://www.aljazeera.com/opinions/2018/12/13/the-dangers-of-ngo-isation-of-womens-rights-in-africa>.
- Alvarez, Sonja E. (2009), Beyond NGO-ization. Reflections from Latin America, *Development*, 52 (2), 175-184.
- Ana, Alexandra (2024) The NGO-ization of social movements in neoliberal times: Contemporary feminisms in Romania and Belgium. Palgrave (forthcoming).
- Arda, Lama/ Banerjee Subhabrata Bobby (2021) Governance in Areas of Limited Statehood: The NGOization of Palestine. In: *Business & Society* 60(7): 1675-1707.
- Armstrong, Elisabeth (2002) *The Retreat from Organization. U.S. Feminism Reconceptualized*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Banks, Nicole/Hulma, David/Edwards, Michael (2015) NGOs, states and donors revisited: Still too close for comfort? In: *World Development* 66, 707-718.
- Benschop, Yvonne (2021) Grand Challenges, Feminist Answers. In: *Organization Theory* 2: 1-19.
- Bernal, Inderpal/Roy, Srila (2017) The positive side of co-optation? Intersectionality: a conversation between Inderpal Grewal and Srila Roy. In: *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 19(2): 254-262.
- Chakraborty, Proshant (2021) Rethinking NGOization as Postfeminist Practice: Interstitial Intimacies and Negotiations of Neoliberal Subjectivity in Violence Prevention. In: *Frontiers in Sociology* 6. Art. 654909.
- Count Me In (2018) Reflections on the Future: Toward a Transformative Funding Ecosystem. Available at https://cmiconsortium.org/wp-content/uploads/cmi_money_and_movements_reflections_amp_ecosystem_framework.pdf
- Crosman, Kate M., Singh, Gerald G., Lang, Sabine (2022). Confronting Complex Accountability in Conservation with Communities. *Frontiers in Marine Science*, 8.
- De Jong, Sara (2017) *Complicit Sisters: Gender and Women's Issues across North-South Divides*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- De Jong, Sara/Kimm Susanne (2017) The co-optation of feminism: a research agenda. In: *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 19(2), 185-200.

- Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs (2018) Women’s rights and gender equality task force. Good practices and lessons learned from the diverse funding modalities in the field of women’s rights and gender equality: the Dutch example. The Hague. Access at https://cmiconsortium.org/wp-content/uploads/dutch_mfa_good_practices_funding_modalities_1_.pdf.
- Eikenberry, A. M., Kluver, J. D. (2004). The Marketization of the Nonprofit Sector: Civil Society at Risk? *Public Administration Review* 64(2), 132-140.
- Edwards, Michael (2013) “Beauty and the Beast”. Can Money Ever Foster Social Transformation? Hivos Knowledge program. The Hague.
- Ford Foundation (2021) Meet the Black Feminist Fund funders out to transform philanthropy. At <https://www.fordfoundation.org/news-and-stories/stories/posts/meet-the-black-feminist-fund-founders-out-to-transform-philanthropy/> (Access 5/2/23).
- Forester, Summer/Lusvardi, Amerb/Kelly-Thompson, Kaitlin/Weldon, S. Laurel (2020) New Dimensions of Global Feminist Influence: Tracking Feminist Mobilization Worldwide, 1975-2015. Feminist Mobilization and Economic Empowerment Project Working Paper 1. Vancouver: Simon Fraser University.
- Frida/The Young Feminist Fund & AWID Young Feminists Development Program (2016) Brave. Creative. Resilient. The Global State of Young Feminist Organizing.
- Friedman, Elisabeth Jay (2017) Interpreting the Internet. Feminist and Queer Counterpublics in Latin America. Oakland; University of California Press.
- Friedman, Elisabeth Jay/Rodríguez Gustá, Ana Laura (2023) “Welcome to the Revolution”: Promoting Generational Renewal in Argentina’s Ni Una Menos. In: *Qualitative Sociology* (publ. online 2/23).
- Goss, Kristin A. (2013) The Paradox of Gender Equality. How American Women’s Groups Gained and Lost Their Public Voice. Ann Arbor: Michigan University Press.
- Herrold, C., Atia, M. (2016). Competing Rather than Collaborating: Egyptian Nongovernmental Organizations in Turbulence. *Nonprofit Policy Forum* 7(3), 389-407.
- Htun, Mala/Weldon, S. Laurel (2018) The Logics of Gender Justice. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Irvine, Jill/Lang, Sabine/Montoya, Celeste (2019) Gendered Mobilizations and Intersectional Challenges. London: Rowman & Littlefield/ECPR Press.
- Kinery, Emma (2022) ‘Day without Us’ protesters walk out over abortion-rights reversal, days before Supreme Court returns’. In: CNBC 9/30/22 Access at <https://www.cnbc.com/2022/09/30/abortion-rights-protest-spurred-by-supreme-court-ruling-in-dobbs-.html>
- Krause, Monika (2014) The Good Project. Humanitarian NGOs and the fragmentation of reason. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lang, Sabine (1997) The NGOization of Feminism. Institutionalization and Institution

- Building within the German Women’s Movements’, in Kaplan Cora, Scott Joan W, Keates Deborah (eds.) *Transitions, Environments, Translations; Feminism in International Politics*. New York: Routledge, 101-120.
- Lang, Sabine (2013) *NGOs, Civil Society, and the Public Sphere*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lang, Sabine (2023) “NGOization of Civil Society”, in Gisela Goncalves/Evandro Oliveira (eds.) *Routledge Handbook of Non-Profit Communication*, London: Routledge, 32-38.
- Powers, Matthew (2018). *NGOs as Newsmakers. The Changing Landscape of International News*. Columbia University Press.
- Roy, Arundhati (2016) *The End of Imagination*. Chicago: Haymarket Books.
- Sanchez Salgado, Rosa (2010). NGO Structural Adaptation to Funding Requirements and Prospects for Democracy: The Case of the European Union. *Global Society* 24 (4), 507-527.
- Sandberg, B., Elliott, E. & Petchel, S. (2020). Investigating the Marketization of the Nonprofit Sector: A Comparative Case Study of Two Nonprofit Organizations. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations* 31, 494-510.
- Scott, David/Rönnblom, Malin (2022) Projectifying feminism: exploring the conditions for feminist politics in international development aid. In: *European Journal of Politics and Gender* 5(2): 250-266.
- Staggenborg, Suzanne (1988) “The consequences of professionalization and formalization in the pro-choice movement”. In: *American Sociological Review* 53(4), xxxx.
- Staggenborg, Suzanne (2013) “Bureaucratization and Social Movements” in: Snow, D.A./Della Porta, Donnatella/ Klandermans, P.G. McAdam, Dough (eds.) *The Wiley-Blackwell Encyclopedia of Social and Political Movements*. Malden: Wiley.
- Suarez, David (2020) *Advocacy, Civic Engagement, and Social Change*. In: Walter W. Powell/Patricia Bromley (eds.) *The Nonprofit Sector – A Research Handbook*. 3rd ed. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 491-506.
- Tortajada, C. (2016). *Nongovernmental Organizations and Influence on Global Public Policy. Asia and the Pacific Policy Studies* 3(2), 266-274.
- Wang, Yingyi (2022) *Cruel activism: precarity, labor, and affect of Chinese feminist and LGBTQ organizations*. Dissertation: Seattle: University of Washington.