SUPPLEMENTARY FILE 2: Extended Summary of Theories Useful for Power Analysis in Health Policy and Systems Research

Theories useful for power analysis	Key constructs/brief description	Commonly used to study power in HPSR/HPA? - / + / ++	Examples of application
1. Theories on power from the social sciences			
Steven Lukes' three faces or dimensions of power	Influenced by Marx and Durkheim, the social theorist Steven Lukes, in his book *Power: A Radical View*, claims power is exercised in three ways: 1) the power to decide, 2) the power not to decide (i.e. to set the agenda, circumscribe the limits of debate), 3) the power to influence people's wishes and thoughts, even against their self-interest. The third face of power was partly inspired by Gramsci's notion of cultural hegemony (see below).	++	(Lukes, 2004); (Buse and Hawkes, 2014); (Reynolds, 2019)
Max Weber's three sources of authority and description of bureaucracy	The German sociologist Max Weber described political authority as legitimate domination, distinct from concepts of coercion, force, and power. He defined three sources of political authority: traditional (derived from established customs and social structures), charismatic (derived from the individual leader's characteristics), and rational-legal authority (derived from the formal rules and laws of the state). Weber's conceptualization of bureaucracy is also applied to the study of bureaucratic power.	-	(Weber, 1948); (Sriram et al., 2020)
Pierre Bourdieu's fields	The French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu proposed the concepts of fields. Fields are social domains characterized by specific logics and norms, and they are peopled by actors with varying levels of power. Global health might be considered a field. Actors in fields use forms of capital (economic, cultural, social, or symbolic) to advance their self-interest and preferences, such as professional prestige, saving lives, and funding successful programs.	+	(Bourdieu, 1990); (Shiffman, 2015); (Behague et al., 2008); (Hanefeld and Walt, 2015)
Foucault	Foucault's work on power evolved over his lifetime. His influential concept of "power/knowledge" holds that rather than being an instrument of power, knowledge is constitutive and inseparable from it. In "Discipline and Punish," Foucault discusses how modern institutions and techniques of control created systems of disciplinary power. In his work on external and internal controls on sexuality, Foucault claims that power is productive and built from the ground up (the 'microphysics' of power in a society), via a network of practices. He also contrasted older forms of "sovereign" power, founded on violence, with modern "biopower," which influences life by administration, optimization, and regulation, etc.	+	(Foucault, 1978); (Dalglish et al., 2017), (Sen et al., 2020); (Scott et al., 2017)
Haugaard	Haugaard's framework of seven ways of creating power and exercise of power in the policy systems is founded on the question of – 'what creates power in the society' and draws from multiple power theories. The first among	-	(Haugaard, 2012)

	the seven interrelated categories is the establishment of societal rule (power created by social order). These rules create legitimacies in the system (power created by system biases). Compatibility or conflict with these system biases then creates power differences (power created by systems of thought). Knowledge of actors about social orders, rules and thoughts makes them empowered or powerless (power created by tacit knowledge). A reification of some knowledge and creation of arbitrary social constructs can lead to new power dynamics in the society (power created by reification). Many routines in the systems prevent knowledge from becoming discursive, and these reinforce the existing order (power created by discipline). To maintain or change the exercise of power there could be incidences of violence, threats and coercion (power created by coercion).		
Taxonomy of power (Barnett and Duvall)	Barnett and Duvall, scholars of global governance, propose a framework to understand how states negotiate policy processes in the international sphere. They differentiate between direct forms of power (*compulsory* power between actors, and *structural* relationships) and more diffuse forms (*institutional* power that favors some actors, and *productive* power over possession and distribution of resources).	+	(Barnett and Duval, 2004); (Marten, 2019); (Moon, 2019)
PowerCube	John Gaventa's PowerCube framework, drawing from multiple theories, brings together an operational model for the analysis of power. It depicts an intersectional and dynamic relationship of three aspects of power. Three dimensions of the cube represent – 1. Forms of power (based on Luke's three faces of power) – visible, invisible and hidden power; 2. Spaces of power based on the participation of various actors, operationalized at open, closed and claimed spaces; and 3. Levels of power – global, national or local, based on where power is emanating from and where it is being exercised. The dimensions and elements of the PowerCube interact with each other (like the Rubik's cube) and analysts can approach the problem starting from any plane/dimension.	+	(Gaventa et al., 2011); (Nisbett et al., 2014); (McCollum et al., 2018).
Expressions of power	VeneKlasen et al's 'expressions of power' concept furthered the discourse of understanding power by departing from seeing power as an ability to influence others by domination or coercion or 'power over'. This categorization suggests that power could have positive meanings, and power could be exercised in more collaborative and constructive ways. The four categories of power in this framework include power over (authority over others), power to (individual powers to act upon something), power with (to act with others or collaborations) and power within (the ability of a person to recognize their self-knowledge, abilities or a sense of self-worth).	+	(Veneklasen and Miller, 2002); (McCollum et al., 2018).
2. General social science theories			
Gramsci	A Marxist political theorist, Gramsci's work on power centres on the concept of cultural hegemony, by which the state and the ruling classes use ideology, rather than violence, force, or economic modalities, to control and maintain capitalist power. Under this framework, the norms and ideas of the bourgeoisie become 'common sense,' and the working class identifies as good that which in fact benefits the state and the ruling class. Gramsci's work partly inspired Lukes' "third face" of power (see above).	-	(Gramsci, 1999); (Worth, 2002).

Feminist theories / domination	There are many tensions and debates among feminist theories. Nonetheless, broadly, feminist-informed theories, including phenomenological feminist, radical feminist, socialist feminism, intersectional feminism, post-structuralism, and analytic feminist approaches raise important issues that theorists believe were previously under-addressed, most notably including the ways that gender hierarchies shape health status, health policies, the care available, the care received, and, relationships among and between health sector employees and patients. In addition to exposing structures and manifestations of domination, feminist approaches may endeavour to identify and foster empowerment and solidarity, both through research processes and results.	++	(Young, 2014); (Morgan et al., 2016); (Theobald et al., 2017); (Parikh, 2012)
Gender transformative/ socialist feminist evaluations	Gender-transformative/socialist feminist evaluations are based on an understanding of how gender and social relations of class, sexuality, caste, abilities, religion, etc., define the exercise of power in different institutional contexts. These evaluation frameworks help to study the contribution of a policy (or interventions), for changing such power relations in favor of the marginalized groups, in the context of the larger neoliberal paradigms. Such evaluations also explore changes, if any, in gendered and social norms of implementing organizations. The evaluation process ideally reflects a gender, rights and equity lens. These frameworks can be used to examine the political nature of evaluations, by breaking down the hierarchy and power relations between- who is evaluating, who is being evaluated and how are the results communicated (whose language and for whom).	+	(Chigateri and Saha, 2016)
Intersectionality	Initially a critique of hegemonic (white) feminism in the United States, intersectionality assesses the ways that gender hierarchies interact with other hierarchies, such as those related to race, caste, and ability. Both quantitative and qualitative approaches to exposing intersectionality surface the ways in which different hierarchies interact in different contexts.	+	(Crenshaw, 1991); (Cho et al., 2013); (Larson et al., 2016)
Critical race theory	Critical race theory originated in U.S. law schools in the 1980s and as a way to understand how the law has been used to maintain racial power (white supremacy), and the possibility of using the law to work towards racial emancipation. It has since been expanded for use in many other social science fields, and has been used particularly in the US-American public health literature to describe and understand racial disparities in health determinants, outcomes, and access to care.	+	(Borrell, 2018); (Hardeman et al., 2020).
Necropolitics	'Necropolitics' builds on Foucault's idea of 'biopower' or 'biopolitics' as the state's ability to control and shape life, in contrast to the more traditional power of life and death over citizens. Necropolitics is the use of social and political power to control (differentially) how citizens live and die, with some (subjugated) bodies suspended between life and death, and has been used to understand inequities in health and the shortcomings of current global health governance and the pluralistic (i.e. market-infused or market-dominated) sphere of 'public' health.	+	(Mbembe, 2019); (Lee, 2020).

Subaltern studies / postcolonialism / decolonization	Building in part on Gramscian theory and growing attention to social history (as opposed to state centered history) subaltern studies developed as a field in the 1980s; many of the initial key thinkers wrote about India. Subaltern people are those who are subordinated for reasons of class, caste, gender, race, language and culture; subaltern studies centers these people and the structures of subordination. Postcolonialism was initially developed in literary theory; it is concerned with narrative and representation and how this perpetuates hegemonic forms of knowledge and power. Decolonization refers to the social science study of the process of decolonization, as well as to a newer movement to "decolonize global health" by questioning dominant paradigms and institutions from the Global North and, proposing an equitable, if not Southern based framework that engenders local innovation and diffusion, values and elevates theories stemming from the Global South, and ensures proportionate representation from people from the Global South.	+	(Spivak and Said, 1988); (Guha, 1997); (Caxaj, 2015); (Kingori and Gerrets, 2019); (McPhail-Bell et al., 2013); (Mignolo and Walsh, 2018).
3. Operational public policy theories with potential for power analysis			
Political systems	Political systems can be interrogated for how they distribute power among certain actors / groups both in terms of policy-making processes and in terms of the likely beneficiaries of valued goods. Buse et al (2012) list 5 political systems: 1) liberal-democratic, 2) egalitarian-authoritarian, 3) traditional-inegalitarian, 4) populist, 5) authoritarian-inegalitarian. Dahl (1957), in describing pluralistic systems, holds the state as a neutral referee adjudicating between competing demands. Analyses can focus on how health policy issues are shaped or determined given the specific characteristics of the political system in question.	+	(Dahl, 1957); (Buse et al., 2012); (Dalglish et al., 2015)
Models of decision making in public policy	A number of models of public policy decision-making are available, in which analyses of power can be incorporated in various ways. Buse et al list rational and incremental models of decision-making, a mixed-scanning approach to decision-making, and the punctuated equilibrium model. Some of these are more or less ripe for power analysis (e.g. the rational model considers that decisions are made primarily on evidence), though they can also be combined with other frameworks that interrogate power more specifically.	++	(Etzioni, 1967); (Cairney et al., 2011, Buse et al., 2012); (Dalglish et al., 2019)
Political-economic determinants	Two frameworks address the political-economic determinants of health, highlighting the power imbalances that emerge from the interplay between macroeconomic structures, ideas and policy. • Kentikelenis & Rochford – Power asymmetries in global governance for health: a conceptual framework for analyzing the political-economic determinants of health inequities • Rushton and Williams – Frames, paradigms and power: global health policy-making under neoliberalism.		(Rushton and Williams, 2012), (Kentikelenis and Rochford, 2019), (Battams and Townsend, 2019).
Health and Human Rights	The right to adequate standard of living and to medical services were included in the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights; the right to health was included in the 1966 International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights. In the late 1980s and early 1990s lawyers, physicians, and activists coalesced the field of "health	++	(Mann, 1996); (Gruskin, 2004); (Freedman, 2007);

	and human rights," as they sought to address the human rights drivers and impacts of the HIV pandemic. While the law has been criticized as a manifestation and tool of those in power, health and human rights researchers argue that human rights law outlines obligations and points to steps governments could take to realize those obligations. In this way, human rights provides a diagnostic or descriptive framework for research, as well as solutions for how the health sector and governments more broadly should react to that research.		(Yamin and Norheim, 2014); (Forman, 2009).
Policy transfer and other international relations theories of policy diffusion	There are several strands in the policy diffusion literature. Policy transfer refers to the transfer of policies from what setting to another; this field of research focuses on the decision-making, motivation, and other mechanisms of transfer. Policy convergence is concerned with the role of structures – such as institutions and globalization processes – in the spread of policies. Policy translation looks at the ways that policies are modified or subverted when they are adopted. Power is integrated insofar as the actors in each of these paradigms have different degrees of power, potentially including donors, normative agencies (e.g. WHO), private sector actors, Ministries of Health, Ministries of Finance, and actors tasked with implementation.		(Brown et al., 2014); (Shiffman and Smith, 2007); (Parston et al., 2015); (Omachonu and Einspruch, 2010); (Moon, 2019).
Institutional processes and health policy agenda setting	Understanding how an issue ends up on the policy agenda is also explored through the lens of power. Walt (1994) described health policy as being about process and power, the process being driven by who are regarded as influencers and how these actors make the process happen. The role of policy actors was discussed by Walt and Gilson (1994) particularly how they influence the process from agenda setting to evaluation, and how they react to policies. The work of Shiffman and Smith (2007) articulated the role of actor power, ideas, political contexts, and issue characteristics in setting policy agenda as well as priority setting activities. This proposes the use of institutional framework to understand how an agenda is set according to institutional rules, norms, and behaviours about ideas that are regarded as important (i.e. policy agenda). This social constructivism (Shiffman 2009) can be considered when studying health policy agenda setting. Later on, the work by Walt and Gilson (2014) added that the role of the media should be emphasized due to their power in framing issues. The work by Grindle and Thomas (1989) on the role of policy elites in agenda setting is also be informative.	+	(Walt and Gilson, 1994); (Shiffman and Smith, 2007); (Shiffman, 2009); (Grindle and Thomas, 1989).
Street Level Bureaucracy	Initially developed by American political scientist Michael Lipsky, the theory of street level bureaucracy is concerned with the government employees who interact with citizens in the everyday conduct of their tasks, such as police officers, local government officials, and health providers. These bureaucrats have some degree of discretion. From the perspective of community members, the cumulation of decisions and actions taken by street level bureaucrats constitute governmental policy. Research using this theory can draw out the realities of everyday practice, including the ways in which frontline providers and officials implement or subvert policy and reinforce (or not) social and professional hierarchies.	+	(Lipsky, 1980); (Erasmus, 2014); (Walker and Gilson, 2004)

Supplemental material

BMJ Publishing Group Limited (BMJ) disclaims all liability and responsibility arising from any reliance placed on this supplemental material which has been supplied by the author(s)

BMJ Global Health

REFERENCES

BARNETT, M. & DUVAL, R. 2004. *Power in global governance,* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

BATTAMS, S. & TOWNSEND, B. 2019. Power asymmetries, policy incoherence and noncommunicable disease control-a qualitative study of policy actor views. *Critical Public Health,* 29**,** 596-609.

BEHAGUE, D. P., KANHONOU, L. G., FILIPPI, V., LEGONOU, S. & RONSMANS, C. 2008. Pierre Bourdieu and transformative agency: a study of how patients in Benin negotiate blame and accountability in the context of severe obstetric events. *Sociol Health Illn,* 30**,** 489-510.

BORRELL, L. N. 2018. Editorial: Critical Race Theory: Why Should We Care about Applying It in our Research? *Ethn Dis,* 28**,** 215-218.

BOURDIEU, P. 1990. *The logic of practice*, Stanford University Press.

BROWN, G. W., YAMEY, G. & WAMALA, S. (eds.) 2014. *The handbook of global health policy*: John Wiley & Sons.

BUSE, K. & HAWKES, S. 2014. Health post-2015: evidence and power. *Lancet,* 383**,** 678-9.

BUSE, K., MAYS, N. B. & WALT, G. (eds.) 2012. *Making Health Policy*: Open University Press.

CAIRNEY, P., STUDLAR, D. & MAMUDU, H. 2011. *Global tobacco control: power, policy, governance and transfer*, Springer.

CAXAJ, C. S. 2015. Indigenous Storytelling and Participatory Action Research: Allies Toward Decolonization? Reflections From the Peoples' International Health Tribunal. *Glob Qual Nurs Res,* 2**,** 2333393615580764.

CHIGATERI, S. & SAHA, S. 2016. A Resource Pack on Gender Transformative Evaluations. India.

CHO, S., CRENSHAW, K., XE, WILLIAMS & MCCALL, L. 2013. Toward a Field of Intersectionality Studies: Theory, Applications, and Praxis. *Signs,* 38**,** 785-810.

CRENSHAW, K. 1991. Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color. *Stanford Law Review,* 43**,** 1241-1299.

DAHL, R. A. 1957. The concept of power. *Behavioral Science,* 2**,** 201-215.

DALGLISH, S. L., RODRIGUEZ, D. C., HAROUNA, A. & SURKAN, P. J. 2017. Knowledge and power in policy-making for child survival in Niger. *Soc Sci Med,* 177**,** 150-157.

DALGLISH, S. L., SRIRAM, V., SCOTT, K. & RODRIGUEZ, D. C. 2019. A framework for medical power in two case studies of health policymaking in India and Niger. *Glob Public Health,* 14**,** 542-554.

DALGLISH, S. L., SURKAN, P. J., DIARRA, A., HAROUNA, A. & BENNETT, S. 2015. Power and pro-poor policies: the case of iCCM in Niger. *Health Policy and Planning,* 30**,** ii84-ii94.

ERASMUS, E. 2014. The use of street-level bureaucracy theory in health policy analysis in low- and middle-income countries: a meta-ethnographic synthesis. *Health Policy Plan,* 29 Suppl 3**,** iii70-8.

ETZIONI, A. 1967. Mixed-scanning: A" third" approach to decision-making. *Public administration review***,** 385-392.

FORMAN, L. 2009. What future for the minimum core? Contextualizing the implications of South African socioeconomic rights jurisprudence for the international human right to health. *In:* HARRINGTON, J. & STUTTAFORD, M. (eds.) *Global Health and Human Rights: Legal and Philosophical Perspectives.* Routledge.

FOUCAULT, M. 1978. *History of Sexuality, Volume 1: An Introdcution,* New York, Random House.

FREEDMAN, L. P. 2007. Health system strengthening: new potential for public health and human rights collaboration. *Reprod Health Matters,* 15**,** 219-20.

GAVENTA, J., PETTIT, J. & CORNISH, L. 2011. *Power pack, understanding power for social change,* Sussex, UK, Institute for Developmental Studies.

GRAMSCI, A. 1999. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks,* London, UK., The Electric Book Company.

GRINDLE, M. S. & THOMAS, J. W. 1989. Policy makers, policy choices, and policy outcomes: The political economy of reform in developing countries. *Policy Sciences,* 22**,** 213-248.

GRUSKIN, S. 2004. What are health and human rights? *Lancet,* 363**,** 329.

GUHA, R. (ed.) 1997. *A subaltern studies reader, 1986-1995*: University of Minnesota Press.

HANEFELD, J. & WALT, G. 2015. Knowledge and networks - key sources of power in global health: Comment on "Knowledge, moral claims and the exercise of power in global health". *Int J Health Policy Manag,* 4**,** 119-21.

HARDEMAN, R. R., KARBEAH, J. & KOZHIMANNIL, K. B. 2020. Applying a critical race lens to relationship-centered care in pregnancy and childbirth: An antidote to structural racism. *Birth,* 47**,** 3-7.

HAUGAARD, M. 2012. Power and truth. *European Journal of Social Theory,* 15**,** 73-92.

KENTIKELENIS, A. & ROCHFORD, C. 2019. Power asymmetries in global governance for health: a conceptual framework for analyzing the political-economic determinants of health inequities. *Global Health,* 15**,** 70.

KINGORI, P. & GERRETS, R. 2019. The masking and making of fieldworkers and data in postcolonial Global Health research contexts. *Crit Public Health,* 29**,** 494-507.

LARSON, E., GEORGE, A., MORGAN, R. & POTEAT, T. 2016. 10 Best resources on… intersectionality with an emphasis on low- and middle-income countries. *Health Policy Plan,* 31**,** 964-9.

LEE, C. J. 2020. The necropolitics of COVID-19. *Africa is a Country* [Online]. [Accessed 4 June 2021].

LIPSKY, M. 1980. *Street-Level Bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the Individual in Public Services,* New York, Russell Sage Foundation.

LUKES, S. 2004. *Power: A radical view*, Macmillan International Higher Education.

MANN, J. 1996. Health and human rights: broadening the agenda for health professionals. *Health Hum Rights,* 2**,** 1-5.

MARTEN, R. 2019. How states exerted power to create the Millennium Development Goals and how this shaped the global health agenda: Lessons for the sustainable development goals and the future of global health. *Glob Public Health,* 14**,** 584-599.

MBEMBE, A. 2019. *Necropolitics,* Durham, NC., Duke University Press.

MCCOLLUM, R., TAEGTMEYER, M., OTISO, L., MUTURI, N., BARASA, E., MOLYNEUX, S., MARTINEAU, T. & THEOBALD, S. 2018. "Sometimes it is difficult for us to stand up and change this": an analysis of power within priority-setting for health following devolution in Kenya. *BMC Health Serv Res,* 18**,** 906.

MCPHAIL-BELL, K., FREDERICKS, B. & BROUGH, M. 2013. Beyond the accolades: a postcolonial critique of the foundations of the Ottawa Charter. *Glob Health Promot,* 20**,** 22-9.

MIGNOLO, W. D. & WALSH, C. E. 2018. *On decoloniality: Concepts, analytics, praxis,* Durham, NC., Duke University Press.

MOON, S. 2019. Power in global governance: an expanded typology from global health. *Global Health,* 15**,** 74.

MORGAN, R., GEORGE, A., SSALI, S., HAWKINS, K., MOLYNEUX, S. & THEOBALD, S. 2016. How to do (or not to do)... gender analysis in health systems research. *Health Policy Plan,* 31**,** 1069-78.

NISBETT, N., GILLESPIE, S., HADDAD, L. & HARRIS, J. 2014. Why worry about the politics of childhood undernutrition? *World Development,* 64**,** 420-433.

OMACHONU, V. K. & EINSPRUCH, N. G. 2010. Innovation in Healthcare Delivery Systems: A Conceptual Framework. *The Public Sector Innovation Journal*.

PARIKH, S. A. 2012. "They arrested me for loving a schoolgirl": ethnography, HIV, and a feminist assessment of the age of consent law as a gender-based structural intervention in Uganda. *Soc Sci Med,* 74**,** 1774-82.

PARSTON, G., MCQUEEN, J., PATEL, H., KEOWN, O. P., FONTANA, G., AL KUWARI, H. & DARZI, A. 2015. The Science And Art Of Delivery: Accelerating The Diffusion Of Health Care Innovation. *Health Aff (Millwood),* 34**,** 2160-6.

REYNOLDS, L. 2019. Not Up for Discussion: Applying Lukes' Power Model to the Study of Health System Corruption Comment on "We Need to Talk About Corruption in Health Systems". *Int J Health Policy Manag,* 8**,** 723-726.

RUSHTON, S. & WILLIAMS, O. D. 2012. Frames, paradigms and power: global health policy-making under neoliberalism. *Global Society,* 26**,** 147-167.

SCOTT, K., GEORGE, A. S., HARVEY, S. A., MONDAL, S., PATEL, G. & SHEIKH, K. 2017. Negotiating power relations, gender equality, and collective agency: are village health committees transformative social spaces in northern India? *Int J Equity Health,* 16**,** 84.

SEN, G., IYER, A., CHATTOPADHYAY, S. & KHOSLA, R. 2020. When accountability meets power: realizing sexual and reproductive health and rights. *Int J Equity Health,* 19**,** 111.

SHIFFMAN, J. 2009. A social explanation for the rise and fall of global health issues. *Bull World Health Organ,* 87**,** 608-13.

SHIFFMAN, J. 2015. Global Health as a Field of Power Relations: A Response to Recent Commentaries. *Int J Health Policy Manag,* 4**,** 497-9.

SHIFFMAN, J. & SMITH, S. 2007. Generation of political priority for global health initiatives: a framework and case study of maternal mortality. *Lancet,* 370**,** 1370-9.

SPIVAK, R. G. G. C. & SAID, E. 1988. *Selected subaltern studies*, Oxford University Press.

SRIRAM, V., BARU, R., HYDER, A. A. & BENNETT, S. 2020. Bureaucracies and power: Examining the Medical Council of India and the development of emergency medicine in India. *Soc Sci Med,* 256**,** 113038.

THEOBALD, S., MORGAN, R., HAWKINS, K., SSALI, S., GEORGE, A. & MOLYNEUX, S. 2017. The importance of gender analysis in research for health systems strengthening. *Health Policy Plan,* 32**,** v1-v3.

VENEKLASEN, L. & MILLER, V. 2002. *A New Weave of Power, People & Politics: The Action Guide for Advocacy and Citizen Participation,* Oklahoma City, OK, World Neighbors.

WALKER, L. & GILSON, L. 2004. 'We are bitter but we are satisfied': nurses as street-level bureaucrats in South Africa. *Soc Sci Med,* 59**,** 1251-61.

WALT, G. & GILSON, L. 1994. Reforming the health sector in developing countries: the central role of policy analysis. *Health Policy Plan,* 9**,** 353-70.

WEBER, M. 1948. The meaning of discipline. *Max Weber: Essays in Sociology.* Imprint Routledge.

WORTH, O. 2002. Health for All? Towards a neo-Gramscian Critique of the WHO. *In: Critical Perspectives on International Political Economy* London: Palgrave Macmillan.

YAMIN, A. E. & NORHEIM, O. F. 2014. Taking equality seriously: applying human rights frameworks to priority setting in health *Human Rights Quarterly* 36**,** 296.

YOUNG, S. 2014. *Changing the wor(l)d: Discourse, politics and the feminist movement*, Routledge.