

Female Political Leadership in Asia: Do women lead better?

Claudia Derichs

Drawing from preliminary results of a research project on female political top leadership in Asia¹⁾, this article addresses the question of women leaders' performance in politics. Do women lead better — or merely different? This is a question to take care of in the following paragraphs. I will introduce some models and types of leadership that have been presented in the theoretically oriented literature on this topic, that is models such as the transforming or the transactional leader and types such as the manager, the adjuster, or the innovator. I will then turn to ten cases of Asian female political top leadership and discuss them with regard to those theoretical assumptions. In this discussion, however, I will put the theoretical criteria for leadership and their application to Asian women leaders into question. My core argument is that political leadership cannot be evaluated properly as long as the conditions for the performance of such leadership are not met with scrutiny. Simply put: It is easy to claim that, for instance, Benazir Bhutto in Pakistan failed as a prime minister because her leadership did not meet her voters' expectations. But what were the conditions she had to accept when striving to meet voters' expectations? Could they be met at all under the political, social, and economic circumstances given during her incumbency? My final point is to suggest an expanded set of criteria for the evaluation of female political leadership and performance, hence a concept that includes the context of conditions, opportunities, and restraints of female leadership.

Types of leadership

Considerable research has been done on the topic of leadership models and different types of leadership. I want to start out with three authors who have contributed to the discussion of male and/or female leadership by introducing some important analytical dichotomies. In 1987, Rounaq Jahan published an article in the journal *Third World Quarterly*, suggesting that two models of female leaders should be distinguished, that is the women's leader and the populist leader.²⁾ The distinction between these two categories may not seem important or even appear trivial at first glance. Yet the orientation of each kind of leader is remarkably different. The women's leader-type refers to heads of women's organisations, women sections of mass political organisations, women's wings in political parties or leading figures in women's movements. Populist leaders find their position as heads of governments or leaders of social and political movements (including the female segment in such movements). Whereas the latter hardly cares for women's issues in an explicit manner, the former is identified with her (seldom his) engagement for women's demands and gender equality.

Women leaders — i.e. female leaders — may be populist leaders and women's leaders alike, but more often than not we find women in political top positions being everything but a women's leader. Women's issues are not on their political agenda, and if they are, they are relegated to second rank. Their access to power does usually not derive from an inner devotion to the struggle for women's rights. For the female heads of government in South Asia³⁾, for instance, Jahan attributes their ascendance to power to the dynastic environment rather than an outspoken care for women's issues. They "were all politicised within their family environment, and gained entry into leadership through family connections," he claims. Their assumption of power "was 'mediated' by a male relative," in contrast to leaders "whose careers were shaped from the beginning by their own choices, attributes and efforts."⁴⁾ The political efficacy of such leadership is linked to the leaders' moral capital and intergration capacity; her policy-making and decision-making skills count less.

A decade before Jahan's analysis of the South Asian female leaders, James MacGregor Burns tried to approach the question of leadership from the perspective of the leader's function within the systemic setting of his or her reference community. He distinguished between transforming and transactional leadership. A leader who seeks to transform a society "recognizes and exploits an existing need or demand of a potential follower." Moreover, "the transforming leader looks for potential motives in followers, seeks to satisfy higher needs, and engages the full person of the follower." Transforming leaders provide a vision and care to set about implementing that vision. Conversely, transactional leaders do not show that intensive an intention to transform the status quo. They "approach followers with an eye to exchanging one thing for another: jobs for votes, or subsidies for campaign contributions."⁵⁾ In comparison to the latter, transforming leadership seems to be the more demanding and the more potent one.

A good example for a transforming leader is the former Prime Minister of Malaysia, Mahathir Mohamad (1981–2003). With his *Wawasan 2020* (Vision 2020) he presented a transition concept that envisaged a fully developed Malaysia by the year 2020.⁶⁾ Much of this vision appealed to the motives in the sought-for followers to increase their business skills, economic gains and eventually the wealth of the nation. During Mahathir's 22 years in power, Malaysia reached the status of a middle income country and became one of the prominent "newly industrializing economies" (NIEs). Examples of *tit-for-tat* oriented, transactional leaders would probably be found in systems with a precarious political stability or, although this is an assumption and not an empirically established finding, in systems that appear quite mature in terms of political stability and people's level of satisfaction with the government: Why pursue transformation when keeping the status quo seems the more secure avenue for the power holder?

A third classifying distinction that I want to mention is that between positional and non-positional leadership. Karin Klenke analysed women leaders and women managers in the global community along this line of difference-in-status.⁷⁾ For women leaders in particular, status is of utmost importance in order to become formally recognised as a leader. The "women behind the man," as they have become famous in French politics, may occupy a leading position and exert considerable influence on her husband's political decisions, but since these women have never been elected,

nominated, appointed or officially acknowledged as political actors, they occupy highly informal positions. They can be categorized as non-positional leaders.⁸⁾ Positional leadership seen as leadership that has been acquired by way of election, nomination, appointment or official designation, provides the leader with a formal status. Even if it were a leadership that is exerted far away from the public sphere like the leadership of the *National Democratic League* in Myanmar/Burma by Daw Aung San Suu Kyi, her position is formally acknowledged because she is the popularly elected and thus legitimate party leader. This status is helpful for her and the party whenever foreign support for the democratization movement in Burma has to be mobilised.

Needless to mention, the position itself is not the core element of positional leadership. Rather than that, the opportunities accompanying the acquisition of a leading position are central to the performance of such kind of leadership. It is the instruments that can be utilized to carry out leadership which differ significantly regarding positional and non-positional leadership. A non-positional leader, for instance, usually needs a positional leader to implement his or her decisions. A recent case in point is Begum Zarrin Musharrafuddin or *Barri Amma* (“Grand Mama”), the mother of incumbent Pakistani president Pervez Musharraf. Her leadership is referred to as “soft reign” and she is said to be the one pulling the strings behind the president, deciding who should be lifted into important positions in the state.⁹⁾ On the formal side, it is of course the president who appoints certain persons to hold the respective positions.

There are other women who have been playing an important non-positional role as first ladies and have been in the limelight from their young days on, although they were not leading yet. Tanaka Makiko in Japan, Benazir Bhutto in Pakistan, or Park Geun-hye in South Korea are good examples. They have been thrown into the business of political representation at a young age because they had to stand in for their mothers who had either been assassinated or, as in Tanaka’s case, just did not show up in public (for whatever reason). The experience of such kind of training in their childhood has been a true advantage for their political careers in later years.

Leadership types

The different models of leadership mentioned above can be structured more deeply if we take a look at the various characters that give them “a face.” Jean Blondel’s typology is an analytical help in this regard because it not only presents analytical terms such as the manager, the adjuster, and the innovator, but also relates these characters to (political) change.¹⁰⁾ Blondel’s scheme reflects the following relations:

Type	Subtype	Subtype	Subtype	Change
Manager	saviour	confronter	manager	→ <i>no change</i>
Adjuster	paternalist/ populist	redefiner	adjuster/ tinkerer	→ <i>moderate change</i>
Innovator	ideologue	reformist	innovator	→ <i>significant change</i>

It goes without saying that all these types do not exclude one another but display a continuum, a floating scheme. With this floating pattern, Blondel breaks through the dichotomy of Burns' preceding pattern of transforming and transactional leaders. Although Burns did not fail to emphasize that transforming leaders can develop into transactional leaders, hence agreed to a continuum, too, his dichotomy seems rather rigid. Blondel prefers the floating model, and while his point of reference is the scope of political change, he draws attention towards the actual outcome of leadership.

The manager type

Blondel's manager type comes probably closest to Burns' model of transactional leadership. A managerially inclined leader strives to deal with what he finds in an administering or even technocratic manner. He manages the state, which means the guiding principle is governance in the sense of "steering the wheel." The manager-leader can behave like a saviour, preventing the state from — truly or not — falling apart without managerial leadership. He can also present himself as a comforter who takes the place of a "bad" leader and convinces his people that everything will be fine soon under the new leadership. The decisive managerial type then is prepared to introduce change-oriented policies if it worked for him having the upper hand of the situation. Leaders like Mr Karzai in Afghanistan or the new Iraqi administration following the US-lead occupation can be called managerial leaders. There is no doubt that they would like to become innovators as well, but their primary and basic task is to cope with what is at stake under the given circumstances of dependency and turmoil — and that is a governance task big enough to leave only too innovative thoughts behind for a while. Securing the support of the provincial warlords by trying to include them on his ticket for the elections has been Karzai's "transactional strategy." Interim leaders like Karzai function to manage the abrupt change that has been brought about by others, before leaving the stage again only to give way to new leaders who are supposed to instill their own, new rules of governance into people's minds.¹¹⁾

The adjuster type

Adjusters often draw attention towards themselves because they are believed to do better in adapting to the current situation than others. When the young generation of dynastic leaders in some Arab and North African countries (Jordan, Syria, Marokko) took over from their fathers a few years ago, they were widely expected to carry with them a strong wind of change. But they did not, or rather could not do so because of too many old guards who were (and are) still around and would not let them play the role of the dynamic innovator. Instead of becoming innovators, they became adjusters. King Abdullah in Jordan slipped into the paternalist role his father had played so many decades before. The youth and many of the progressive intellectuals in Syria and Marokko projected great hopes for change into the leadership of Bashar Al-Asad and Muhammad V respectively. The two leaders managed to redefine some political rules such as allowing political observers to articulate reformist thoughts in public and supporting the use of new technologies (particularly the internet). Aside from these small steps, however, they made no major inroads into the authoritarian setting of power and rule. They have become tinkers instead of real mechanics with an ability

to completely overhaul the engine of government. We see only moderate change in these countries.

The innovator type

To convey the blessings of innovation to a wider public audience costs energy and requires unshakeable determination on the hand of the leader. Things new are things unknown; proposing them does not only invite curiosity but also doubt and scepticism. When familiar structures are bound to be broken up, public reaction to the introduction of innovation can be very adverse. Japan and Germany have experienced this in the first years of the new millenium. Both Prime Minister Koizumi and German Chancellor Schröder had (and still have) difficulties in pushing their reform agenda through. Innovations in the social security system, for instance, are considered as attacks to homegrown privileges by those interest groups who have benefited most from them. The reformist attitudes of Koizumi and Schröder are hard to sustain against the criticism from various circles. They have, however, not given in to this pressure or employed an ideological frame to convince the public of their reform agendas. The reason for not making use of ideological tools — as, for instance, many fundamentalist leaders do — may lie in the determination of both leaders not to appear as stubborn ideologues but as flexible, open-minded reformists and innovators.

The evaluation of leadership in relation to political change is motivated by the conception that change is a more appropriate goal for a leader than the preservation of the status quo. We may also assume that in the context of Western political theory, the term change implies the idea of change towards democracy, that is the transition from an authoritarian to a democratic regime or the transformation from a totalitarian to a democratic system. Political change, however, can take place in consolidated democracies as well, as the cases of Japan and Germany in the current decade show. In lieu of the purpose of this article, we will look at change in relation to the leadership by female leaders.

Asian female leaders

It is striking how many women lead governments or opposition movements in Northeast-, Southeast-, and South Asia. Currently, there are four female politicians serving as the heads of state or government, that is Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo in the Philippines, Megawati Sukarnoputri in Indonesia (at least until September 2004), Chandrika Kumaratunga in Sri Lanka, and Begum Khaleda Zia in Bangladesh. We may add Sonia Gandhi in India as a fifth leader to this list, although she declined to become the prime minister of her country after the recent elections (May 2004). Her outstanding party position and her role in policy-making render her a formal and informal leader alike. In the Philippines, Mrs Arroyo is the second female leader, the first one being Corazon Aquino (1987–92), the widow of the country's martyr Benigno Aquino who had been assassinated on his return from exile to the Philippines in August 1983. The first female prime minister worldwide in 1960, Mrs Sirimavo Bandaranaike in Sri Lanka, preceded her daughter Chandrika, who leads the country since 1994. In India we find a similar family-based "second generation" female leadership with the famous Indira Gandhi, the mother-in-law to Sonia, Prime Minister

to India for 15 years (1966–77; 1980–84) and victim of assassination in 1984 during her second administration. In Bangladesh, there are two female leaders as well. Here, Sheikh Hasina Wajid, the leader of the Awami League, is the constant rival of Begum Khaleda Zia, the leader of the Bangladesh National Party. Sheikh Hasina became elected Prime Minister of Bangladesh in 1996, after a five-year term of her rival. In 2001, Khaleda Zia took over from Sheikh Hasina again. After all, female leadership succession does not seem alien to South and Southeast Asian countries.

In Bangladesh, Burma/Myanmar, Malaysia, Pakistan, and South Korea the opposition is led by female politicians. Whereas Sheikh Hasina in Bangladesh can operate quite freely, her colleague in Burma, Aung San Suu Kyi, has to suffer from house arrest and detention since the military denied her party the election victory in 1988. Malaysia's opposition party leader Wan Azizah Wan Ismail challenges the government in the name of her jailed husband Anwar Ibrahim, the country's former Deputy Prime Minister.¹²⁾ She leads the predominantly Muslim opposition coalition that evolved from the reform movement of 1998. Pakistan People's Party (PPP) leader Benazir Bhutto fled the country in 1999, after corruption charges against her and her husband led to a sentence of five years prison for each of them. Bhutto had served as Pakistan's prime minister from 1988–90 and in a second term from 1993–96. Both her governments were, however, dismissed by the nation's presidents Ghulam Ishaq Khan and Farooq Leghari respectively. Although the PPP is currently polling the highest percentage of votes in parliament (29%), it stands in opposition to president Musharraf's military-inclined ruling coalition. The military has oftentimes played a decisive role in Asian politics. South Korea's General Park Chung Hee would not have succeeded in putting the country under his iron-fist rule (1963–79) if he had not been able to engage the military in a coup in 1961. Today, his daughter Park Geun-hye leads the conservative opposition party GNP (Grand National Party) and does not hesitate to emphasize the merits of her father's dictatorial rule for South Korea's rapidly developed economy. In Japan, eventually, Tanaka Makiko has never assumed the highest government post of the country. Nonetheless she was appointed Foreign Minister in the first Koizumi cabinet (2001–03) and presented herself as a reformist of her ministry during her short period in office of barely one year. Moreover, with the other Asian female leaders Tanaka shares the family pedigree in politics. Her father Tanaka Kakuei has been one of the most influential politicians of postwar Japan.

Each of the female leaders introduced above looks back upon a family history in politics. As in the United States with the Kennedys or the Bushs, Asia has famous political dynasties, yet at times with a more brutal and bloody legacy than the American ones. The importance of the dynastic element for the women's ascendance to power is obvious in all cases. However, in terms of change brought about (or not) by these women, the family background did not matter extensively. Their actual political performance, their leadership skills and abilities do not derive from their coming from a famous family, but are determined by the conditions they meet in their day-to-day life as an active political leader. All women leaders introduced above are or have been positional leaders and each of them can be called transforming or transactional leader, manager, adjuster, or innovator. The criteria for applying such a tag to them are yet significantly different from those associated with male leadership.

Take the recent example of Sonia Gandhi: It was not the doubt regarding her leadership skills that brought many Indians up against her as the potential Prime Minister. It was the fact that she is an ethnic Italian, thus a fact completely ripped off the conventional, common criteria for leadership skills (toughness, decisiveness, determination, sense of justice, farsightedness etc.).

Sonia Gandhi did not challenge her opponents by taking on the prime ministership, whereas her colleague Benazir Bhutto in Pakistan has done so twice, only to become dismissed the first and the second time alike. In contrast to Sonia, Benazir is a “daughter of her country” with no suspicions put before her regarding her ethnic origin. Yet Benazir had to struggle against a league of dogmatic Muslims when she sought access to power. As a woman, let alone a single woman, educated abroad, not wearing any veil, young Benazir represented anything else to the influential Islamist elite in Pakistan but an appropriate national political leader. She gave in to the pressure to a considerable extent — she married, put on the *dupata*-headgear in public, and sought male co-operators in the political elite in order to gain a critical mass of supporters within the decision-making apparatus. One of her opponents, General Zia-ul Haq, called for elections in 1988 exactly during the expected period of her first child birth, hoping she would be weakened in such a situation and unable to show up in public. Benazir was smarter — she had purposely announced a later birth date and was thus fully present for the election campaign and on polling day. Her smartness, however, is hardly mentioned in interviews that tackle the characteristic features of Bhutto’s leadership.

Would such treatment happen to men? Most probably not — at least not when their acceptance as political leaders is at stake. In most cases of female leadership in Asia, we find women to represent a moral force. They function as the good against the evil, the pure and clean against the dirty and corrupt. Cory Aquino in the Philippines employed her moral and symbolic capital to an extreme extent: She symbolized the Christian Mother Mary when mourning the death of her husband, kneeling beside his blood-soaking body after he was shot. Throughout her political career, she had recourse to Christian symbolism and it definitely worked in her favour. Sirimavo Bandaranaike was also known as “the weeping widow,” although she did not strategize too much on religious symbols. Aung San Suu Kyi in Burma is perhaps the clearest example of a morally immaculate leader. The military junta plays the role of the evil, whilst Suu Kyi, the good one, bravely stands the junta’s repression. At the end of the day, moral capital forms two sides of a coin for women leaders. It helps them to ascend to power, but it may also facilitate their dismantlement. This flip side of the coin has caused some women leaders’ declining reputation. It has rendered them from transforming leaders — a role that was expected from them — to transactional leaders — pork barrel politics in exchange for power. Megawati in Indonesia and Pakistan’s Bhutto lost a lot of moral capital because of the corruption verdicts against them (and their husbands). Chandrika Kumaratunga in Sri Lanka played with the people’s trust when she revealed herself as a roaring tigress rather than a white dove that served the country’s peace with the Tamil Tigers. In the Philippines, Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo won the elections of May 2004, but rumours prevail that only massive vote-buying and other illegal practices prevented her from succumbing to her opponent, movie star

Fernando Poe.¹³⁾

Cross-culturally, a common expectation goes “for women to exert power in ways that depend on warmth, agreeableness, and democratic leadership.”¹⁴⁾ Women have frequently been chosen as leaders of a fragmented political movement, with the hope projected into them that the ‘warm, agreeable’ female leadership might lead to an integration of the quarrelling factions. No doubt, the (male) faction leaders behind the women were expecting to hold the strings of power in their hands. A case in point was the inauguration of Megawati Sukarnoputri in Indonesia, whose party had won the majority of popular votes in 1999, but who was yet denied the presidency because powerful forces in other parties wanted her competitor Abdurrahman Wahid in that position. She was chosen as vice president. As it turned out that president Abdurrahman was unable to live up to the requirements of the top political office, he handed over the business to Megawati so she could strive to administer the mess he left. She became the president of Indonesia officially in 2001 — symbolizing the hope of a 200 million-plus population to bring things back to order, thus to transform the crisis-shaken country to a full-fledged democracy.

However, once a woman assumes a top position like Megawati did, she is expected by the general public to exert *leadership* — in the very sense of the common male-dominant interpretation of the term. She faces the same competition as male leaders do, she has to perform — as a manager, adjuster, or innovator. Some women then turn to becoming an “iron lady,” Margaret Thatcher in England being the most well-known example for this type. In Asia, the term would probably apply to Chandrika Kumaratunga from Sri Lanka. Others seek refuge in silence (Megawati) or appear as open to every opinion, as able to listen before deciding (Wan Azizah in Malaysia). In either case the woman’s behaviour is perceived with an undercurrent of “otherness”: An iron lady is “un-feminine,” whereas a silence and patience are perceived as weakness and non-decidedness. Tanaka Makiko’s usage of “bold” language, Gloria Arroyo’s technocrat style, Benazir Bhutto’s involvement in corruption affairs, Sheikh Hasina’s and Khaleda Zia’s ruthless rivalry — all these features are allegedly not feminine in the general perception and do not fit the female image. If a female leader attempts to apply the ‘warm, agreeable’ and obviously feminine-like style of leadership, however, her action is not perceived as ‘real leadership’ but as weak. It seems that as long as the definition of leadership is male-oriented, women’s performance has few chances to become perceived as leadership in its own right. Blondel concludes that the common perception of leadership is overtly related to power, that leadership is eventually an element of power:

“It [= leadership, C. D.] is manifestly and essentially a phenomenon of power: it is power because it consists of the ability of the one or few who are at the top to make others do a number of things (positively or negatively) that they would not or at least might not have done.”¹⁵⁾

Power, in particular if the leader has set out to transform the status quo, needs a base, that is resources, reference, and agency. If we assume that the core of political leadership is power, we need to look more closely at what this concept means for the

engendered context in which female politicians operate. Does a woman's style deviate from a man's style in terms of interpersonal use of power and public leadership? If yes, what are the consequences for women as political leaders when they seek to exercise power? According to Hillary Lips' definition, interpersonal power consists of four traits:

- reward and coercion (perceived capacity to produce outcome for another person)
- expertise (perceived knowledge)
- legitimacy (perceived entitlement to exert influence) and
- referent power (ability to influence others because of their admiration, respect or liking).¹⁶⁾

Furthermore, interpersonal power is linked to different styles of influence, which might be used by leaders exercising power according to their social (gender) roles and accepted role behaviour: (a) directness vs. indirectness, (b) concreteness vs. personalness of resources, and (c) competence vs. helplessness.¹⁷⁾ These styles do not necessarily vary according to the gender of the power holder, but to the power held. Gender-related leadership theory holds the position that men and women are situated in a different context of social approval while exercising power. As studies indicate, "women pay a higher price for being direct and disagreeable than men do." Consequently, women often try to adjust their influence styles in order to exercise power successfully. Having said that,

"women end up experiencing a double bind. They can either convey modesty and be appealing to others but perceived as less competent, or they can self-promote and convey competence and risk rejection."¹⁸⁾

As we can see, the social and politico-cultural context determines to a significant the perception of a female leader as transforming or transactional, and as manager, adjuster, or innovator respectively. Attitudes towards female leadership competence and leadership performance differ from those towards male leadership and male performance. If the critical mass of support that a leader needs is not available for the woman in the beginning of her leadership term, she is forced to seek coalition partners — be it in the military (like Megawati or Arroyo), among religious actors (like Wan Azizah or Cory Aquino), or within a totally male-dominated political establishment (like Benazir Bhutto, Chandrika Kumaratunga, Park Geun-hye, or the two ladies in Bangladesh). If they fail to secure such a critical mass of supporters within the political establishment (like Tanaka Makiko in Japan), they are likely to be dismantled after a while. In democracies, the support from the electorate is an important constituent of the critical mass, as shows the case of Megawati, who is most likely to lose the second round of the presidential elections in Indonesia in September 2004 because of lacking popular support. In dictatorial regimes like Burma, Aung San Suu Kyi can count on a tremendous popular support, but it does not help her as long as the military rules with an iron hand.

Conclusion

A conclusion that can be drawn from the examples of Asian female political leaders is that the family background provides a great asset for the women in the beginning of their political career. Their recognition factor is many times higher than that of a rather unknown person. Once they have assumed a position, though, the family background does not help much when they lack the critical mass of supporters. This latter condition is likely to lead a woman politician to making compromises and looking out for coalition partners who might otherwise not have been her first choice. Instead of evaluating what the female politician *has* achieved under such circumstances, the public eye rests more often than not on what she *has not* achieved, that is on the policy areas where she failed. The same applies to her leadership style. As a woman she is expected to act somehow modest (displaying 'feminine' features), but the very definition of leadership rejects 'feminine' features and labels them as weakness. It is these dilemmas which many women leaders have to face. An alternative view on female leadership can be developed when the conception that "women lead different" is modified to the question "why do women have to behave different when they lead?". The question of political change as a category to classify a certain leadership type is misleading as long as the actual conditions for introducing change are neglected in the analysis. The social and cultural context of conditions, opportunities, and restraints of female leadership should form an expanded set of criteria for the evaluation of leadership and performance. That is why the theoretical discussion of leadership should be enhanced by including more gender-sensitive aspects and approaches.

Endnotes:

- 1) The description of the project, the research team, and several discussion papers can be looked up on the project website <http://www.uni-duisburg.de/Institute/OAWISS/institut/mitarbeiter/Dynasties/index.htm>. We are happy to receive further comments or suggestions.
- 2) See Jahan, R., "Women in South Asian Politics," in *Third World Quarterly* 9 (1987) 3, 848–71.
- 3) There are female leaders in four South Asian countries: Bangladesh, India, Pakistan, and Sri Lanka.
- 4) See Jahan, "Women in South Asian Politics," 850.
- 5) Burns, James MacGregor, *Leadership*, (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1978), parts III. And IV, here quoted from the Prologue, 4.
- 6) For a detailed description of the Vision 2020 see Hng, Hung Yong, *CEO Malaysia. Strategy in Nation-Building*, Subang Jaya: Pendaluk, 1998.
- 7) See Klenke, Karin, "Women leaders and managers in the global community," in *Career Development International* 4 (1999) 3, 134–39.
- 8) "A minister is as strong as his wife allows him to be," says the title of an article on the phenomenon of the women behind the men in top political positions. See Kröncke, Gerd, "Alles zu ihrer Zeit," in *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, Dec. 13/14, 2003, 3.
- 9) See Butt, M T, "From Abbaji's Direct Rule to the Soft reign of Ammaji," an article circulated on the internet in July 2004 — unfortunately with bibliographical data attached to it. The exertion of "soft reign" by Musharraf's mother was confirmed, however, in several interviews with Pakistani politicians and journalists in July 2004. An interview with Begum Zarrin Musharrafuddin from February 2003 appeared in the international magazine *Motherhood*. Unfortunately I have not yet got access to any issue of this magazine up to now.
- 10) See Blondel, Jean, *Political Leadership. Towards a General Analysis*, (London et al.: Sage, 1987).
- 11) Ahmed Rashid's article "A Vote Is Cast Against the Warlords," in *Far Eastern Economic Review*, August 5, 2004, 12–14, gives an idea of how difficult the task of an interim leader is (in the case of

- Afghanistan's Karzai).
- 12) Anwar Ibrahim was surprisingly released from prison on September 2, 2004. Nonetheless, his wife keeps on campaigning for justice.
 - 13) On Arroyo's victory and the doubts concerning the cleanliness of the election campaign see Cohen, Margot, "The Six-Year Plan," in *Far Eastern Economic Review*, June 3, 2004, 14–16.
 - 14) Carli, Linda L., as quoted in Lips, Hillary M., "Power. Social and interpersonal aspects," in Worwell, Judith (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Women and Gender. Sex similarities and differences and the impact of society on gender*, (San Diego/ London, 2001), 853.
 - 15) Blondel, Jean, *Political Leadership. Towards a General Analysis*, London et al., 1987, 2–3. Blondel's concept of the relationship between leadership and power draws from Max Weber's definition of power.
 - 16) Lips, Hillary M., "Power. Social and interpersonal aspects," in Worwell, Judith (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Women and Gender. Sex similarities and differences and the impact of society on gender*, (San Diego/ London, 2001), 852.
 - 17) Influence styles were discussed by Hillary M. Lips, 853 (see endnote 16).
 - 18) Carli, Linda L., as quoted in Lips, Hillary M., "Power. Social and interpersonal aspects," in Worwell, Judith (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Women and Gender. Sex similarities and differences and the impact of society on gender*, (San Diego/ London), 2001, 853.