



EUROPEAN POLICY BRIEF



Policy Brief 1: Inclusive Gender Equality from an Intersectional Perspective

September 2023

INTRODUCTION AND POLICY BACKGROUND

The EU Horizon Europe project INSPIRE has been funded to create the European Centre of Excellence on Inclusive Gender Equality in Research & Innovation to provide thought leadership as well as build up a solid evidence base on inclusive gender equality plans (IGEPs). This responds to the “need for expert policy and knowledge support for inclusive GEP implementation, in research and innovation (R&I) organisations ... across EU Member States in order to adapt to different national and local situations, and help foster effective transformation”¹. Four main challenges have been identified in the shift from “Gender Equality Plans” to “Inclusive Gender Equality Plans”: 1) how to sustain and deepen the momentum of change processes 2) the need to take a contextually sensitive, tailored approach to inclusive GEPs building on local knowledge, expertise and activism 3) the lack of know-how on how to integrate an intersectional perspective through GEPs 4) the lack of research and competences for inclusive gendered innovations. INSPIRE answers to these challenges by taking a distributed and collaborative approach to knowledge production and practice. Knowledge and Support Hubs (KSH) will be created to develop academic work and practice in four thematic areas: Sustaining Change, Widening Participation, Intersectionality and Innovation.

A scientific literature review has been carried out for each of these thematic areas complemented by one report on data monitoring. This policy brief builds on the scoping reviews, as well as on a collaborative process started during the second project meeting in Ljubljana in June 2023 among Consortium members and the INSPIRE Advisory Board. It aims to:

- Provide conceptual clarity in this field by making an explicit distinction between an “inclusive” approach and an “intersectional” approach to gender equality policies and plans.
- Provide a brief summary of what is known about inclusive gender equality policies and plans in the four thematic areas: sustaining change, widening participation, intersectionality and innovation in order to build up the knowledge gap.
- Distil some key policy recommendations derived from this knowledge base

¹ https://cordis.europa.eu/programme/id/HORIZON_HORIZON-WIDERA-2021-ERA-01-80/en

This Policy Brief incorporates and builds upon previous policy developments in R&I in Europe. The 2012 European Research Area (ERA) Communication set out gender equality and gender mainstreaming in research as a key priority. Since then, organisations have been invited to enact institutional change through gender equality plans (GEPs) (EC, 2012). This approach has targeted three main substantive areas (i) promoting gender equality in careers, (ii) ensuring gender balance in decision-making and (iii) integrating the gender dimension in research and innovation (R&I) content and programmes. This focus on three main substantive areas has provided a useful framework to operationalise, classify, implement and evaluate policies and action plans that aim to foster greater gender equality in R&I and integrate the gender dimension in teaching and research content.

Institutional change through GEPs has been subsequently reinforced through further policy documents (ECC, 2015) while dedicated funding has been provided to over 200 research performing and research funding organisations, through over 30 EC funded projects, with consortia numbering on average 6 or 7 organisations working together for institutional change through GEPs. The overall budget for these initiatives has been over EU 72 million Euro in total throughout the FP7 (2007-2013) and Horizon 2020 (2014-2020) research funding programmes (EC, 2021).

From 2022 onwards, Horizon Europe took this one step further by requiring that public bodies, higher education establishments and research organisations have a GEP in place to be eligible for funding². Not only did GEPs become mandatory in order to receive funding, but crucially they have been recognised as a key policy instrument in tackling other forms of inequalities. The Commission's Communication *A new ERA for Research and Innovation* of the 30th of September 2020, envisions a shift in focus from "gender equality plans" to "inclusive gender equality plans" (EC, 2020). The Council Recommendations for a Pact for R&I in Europe similarly sets *gender equality, equal opportunities* and *inclusiveness* as one priority area for joint action.

There is however little known on what "inclusive gender equality" means or what an "inclusive gender equality plan" should look like, or how it should be designed, implemented, monitored, and evaluated.

EVIDENCE AND ANALYSIS

Inclusiveness as an organisational participatory process

INSPIRE understands "inclusion" primarily as a participatory, transformatory process guided by non-negotiable core values such as feminism, care, social and epistemic justice, fairness, equality, solidarity, decolonialism, and democratic participation. This understanding runs throughout the INSPIRE project, shaping activities, methodologies as well as how we understand key concepts. An inclusive, participatory process is not an end in itself but serves a purpose of change: it targets the systemic nature of social injustice. Core values guide the process and prevent it from being hijacked by anti-democratic, authoritarian agendas. Anchoring the understanding of "inclusion" in specific features of a participatory process builds upon the usage of the concept in the social-psychology literature on inclusive work cultures (Mor-Barak et al, 1998). This understanding counters the tokenist use of employees from marginalised groups. Rather, "inclusion" captures the *quality* of the interpersonal relations involved: to what degree do individuals feel valued in their uniqueness while being part of critical organisational processes such as access to information and resources,

² https://ec.europa.eu/info/funding-tenders/opportunities/docs/2021-2027/horizon/wp-call/2021-2022/wp-13-general-annexes_horizon-2021-2022_en.pdf

involvement in work groups and/ or ability to influence decision-making processes. While much of the social psychology literature focuses on “inclusion” as an “outcome” – to feel valued and included – we suggest defining “inclusion” primarily via the concrete features of the underlying participatory process.

This process-oriented understanding of inclusion is also mirrored in terms of how inclusion is different from equality and diversity. While diversity captures the similarities and differences that exist between people linked to personal characteristics, equality and equity approaches recognise the historical and structural relations of inequality that are built upon and indeed structure these differences. Inclusion then suggests that these social justice concerns are not resolved by guaranteeing equal opportunities and equal numerical representation but require an organisational effort to facilitate belonging and value uniqueness, for example in decision-making. Participatory processes that go beyond tokenistic participation –such as participatory action research methods, as well as Communities of Practice (CoPs)–and are key in sustaining organisational change processes, whilst ensuring that policies developed are locally relevant, and can provide an effective way to integrating an intersectional perspective.

Sustaining Change for Inclusive Gender Equality

Despite the policy approach of structural change for gender equality in R&I organisations, progress in achieving gender balance and equity mirrors organisations in other sectors, and can be described as slow at best (Benschop and Verloo, 2011). Despite the slow pace of change, there is an increasing amount of research that charts the change process through GEPs. Whilst ‘inclusive’ gender equality can be seen as relatively ‘novel’, there is an increasing evidence base on how GEPs are a crucial instrument to enact institutional change. Schneider and Somers, (2006) identify how change in organisations and institutions must be seen as dynamic and multi-directional, so organisational change requires the rewiring of institutional practices (Nicolini, 2019) both from the bottom up and from top down. This means that issues such as leadership, diversity in representation and participation, types and results of interventions, policy design and implementation and any other forms or strategies for change become key (Chaves & Benschop, 2023).

The findings from the scoping review identify key barriers for change, including limited and inconclusive research on the impact of interventions on gender and diversity, which has led to minimal progress (Risman, Froyum, and Scarborough, 2018). The scoping review identifies the neoliberal system as a main barrier to change: academic structures are an obstacle for inclusive gender equality through the use of market principles and discourses of individualisation, thereby rendering asymmetric gender relations invisible, whilst privileging masculine epistemologies (Crimmins, 2022). It identifies how neoliberal systems favour discourses such as choice, a revitalized biological essentialism, gender neutrality, this implicitly and explicitly portrays the status quo as appropriate, reasonable and fair, eventually hindering efforts to encourage gender equality (O’Connor and White, 2021). Other topics flagged in the scoping review include how parenthood, care and work-life balance are managed – which can either deepen or impede the change process. Perhaps one of the greatest barriers to change is institutional resistance, which manifests in different ways, for example, “articulated defence” is when individuals seek to protect their privilege in response to threatened gendered organizational norms, beliefs and values – this is an explicit form of resistance, hampering the change process (Bleijenbergh, 2018). Much less easy to identify and call out is “non-performative commitment” – this is when in theory equality is supported but clear actions are not taken (Steirncreutz and Tienari 2023; Schmidt, Petursdottir, and Einarsdottir, 2021). This is perhaps one of the most insidious forms of resistance. The role of privilege in resisting change constitutes a gap in our current knowledge. Privilege is reproduced in part through silence which plays a role in both reproducing and maintaining it at different levels: individuals, in terms of personal identities and interpersonal behaviours; organizationally, within the structures and practices of institutions; and societally, in boarder cultural and societal contexts (Chaves & Benschop, 2023).

The scoping review identified literature examining a range of interventions, programs and activities addressing issues of equality. A powerful intervention highlighted in the review is gender budgeting, i.e. the application of gender mainstreaming in the budgetary process (Steinþórsdóttir et al. 2019). This is an effective instrument to address unequal and unfair budgeting policies and processes (Steinþórsdóttir, Heijstra, and Einarsdóttir, 2017). The review also highlights the key role that ‘Change agents’ play in enacting ‘change practices’. Interestingly the scoping review highlights how leadership, particularly women in leadership can be linked to how effectively organisations deal with sexual harassment (Chaves & Benschop, 2023).

Geographically context-sensitive equality policies

Geographic inclusiveness as conceived by INSPIRE consists of a comprehensive approach to build inclusive gender equality policies considering specificities of social and political contexts and building on past experiences and practices, including those situated outside Western and Eurocentric genealogies of knowledge. This is important to recognise in order to pre-empt the discourse of ‘gender equality’ as a ‘colonial’ imposition. We therefore emphasise a decolonial approach to knowledge production and make it an explicit goal in INSPIRE to take into account multiple histories, to understand possible alternatives to IGEPs, to include different European experiences, as well as gain inspiration from Latin America. By adopting a decolonial approach to knowledge production, practice and policy design we aim to develop and legitimise knowledge, practice and policy systems that are sensitive to differences of political, economic, social and cultural contexts. By insisting on reflexive, inclusive and transformative knowledge production, as well as practice and policy design, we aim to counterbalance epistemic domination of Western and North European experiences, through knowledge and practice.

There is no universal policy recipe for achieving greater equality in R&I across Europe. Although the EU has made significant efforts to promote gender equality, the progress has been quite slow with profound disparities remaining in terms of policy implementation as well as the representation of women in R&I across Member States (MS), research organizations and scientific disciplines. As the development of National Action Plans to promote gender equality in R&I as part of the ERA Roadmap made clear, MS built their actions on different understandings of gender equality in R&I and showed different commitments to implement these actions (Wroblewski, 2018). In addition, countries with higher representation of women in R&I such as many Central and Eastern European countries show often less commitment to gender equality policies than countries where a comprehensive approach to gender equality has been in place for years but progress in terms of women representation in R&I remains slow, is stagnating or even reversed (e.g., some Northern and Central West countries). The scoping literature review identified the following supportive factors developing and implementing gender equality measures in R&I in the Widening countries: top-management support, involving a range of stakeholders from the organisation in a participatory GEP process, encouraging a broad mobilisation of stakeholders, communities of practice to enhance gender competence and the strategic framing of gender (Krzaklewska et al, 2023). Barriers to change processes include: lack of institutional level strategic commitment and engagement, lack of access to institutional data on gender equality, difficulties in mobilizing gender expertise in institutions, resistance within institutions as well as the limited scope of gender equality policies (ibid).

What’s more, recent developments such as political backlash and opposition against gender equality and/or feminist movements occur across the spectrum of MS including gender equality “champions” as well as countries with less or alternative GE policies in place. The overarching campaigns against ‘gender ideology’ have demonised the word “gender” and ultimately gender equality and raised resistance towards gender equality also in R&I, contesting the need to address the existing power relations and gender inequalities in academia. While the ties between anti-gender discourses and politics are clear (Graff and Korolczuk, 2022) the modalities through which the policy impacts R&I sector and their effects differ between countries. For example, the opposition to gender may lead to

the attacks on gender studies (as in Hungary or Italy), discrediting and intimidating scholars using critical perspectives and conducting research on gender (e.g., in France, UK) or not proposing legislative change encouraging to advance gender equality in academia. In this context, East-West inequalities within the EU play an important role, revealing anti-gender discourse as “a right-wing language of resistance against existing material and symbolic East-West inequalities in Europe” (Kováts, 2021; Korolczuk and Graff, 2018).

Broadening geographic scope to learn from Latin America (Nuñez 2017; Burman 2016) - means that relevant experiences on ‘inclusion’ – beyond gender yet relevant for inclusive gender equality, can be learnt from. For example, grappling with the issue of curricular Eurocentrism within teacher training programs in Chile or activists’ alternative ways of educating indigenous communities in Bolivia, we aim to stimulate debates regarding possible ways to preserve and value specificities of geographical and/or regional experiences of institutionalisation of gender equality policies and plans. This means giving the wider recognition to GEP alternatives but also making space for lessons learnt outside the Western and North European academia. Decolonial approaches are essential for opening up new ways for intercultural, interregional and inclusive knowledge production, practice and policy design and exchange of alternative experiences and meanings.

Geographic inclusiveness will therefore establish the necessary conditions to critically re-examine existing policies largely based on Western and Northern European experiences and their presumed universal value. It will also enable examination of how different gender equality issues are understood, how objectives and priorities are defined and addressed, and how a commitment to gender equality is set out. Developing approaches based on geographical inclusiveness will also question simple one-directional transferability of gender equality policies from one context to another within ERA. In the development of such approaches, we build upon the specific experience of the ACT project of facilitating and supporting the GEinCEE, Alt+G and LAC communities of practice as well as the SPEAR-projects processual approaches to community of practice interactions, which have provided INSPIRE project partners with insights into the challenges of transferring and adapting the GEP model in Central and Eastern European countries. It provides the building blocks of how participatory, bottom-up processes at the level of EU policy making can be conceived and implemented.

Integrating an intersectional perspective

Integrating an intersectional perspective into gender equality policies and plans remains perhaps one of the greatest challenges facing R&I organisations in their efforts to tackle inequalities. Intersectional policies in R&I organisations aim to address inequalities and discrimination that occur on multiple, intersecting axes including but not limited to gender, race, ethnicity, ability, age and sexual orientation and that operate on different levels. Intersectionality has gained ground in legislative approaches and academic circles and there is an increasing recognition of intersecting inequalities in research organisations, yet there is little known on how an intersectional approach can be operationalised into policies, practices and plans (Christoffersen, 2021). What does a GEP with an intersectional perspective look like? What data needs to be collected? What types of actions need to be developed? Who needs to be included in the design, implementation and evaluation of such a plan? What indicators should be used to measure change?

Key findings of the scoping review include how diversity policy is not interchangeable with intersectional policy. Although both notions focus on differences and multiple strands of discrimination, an intersectional policy recognises and addresses the unique needs that result from the intersection of multiple forms of discrimination (Beeckmans et al., 2023). Much of the existing insights regarding intersectionality are based on individual experiences and subjectivities, i.e. most empirical studies included in our scoping review “give voice to the lived experiences of minoritized students and staff in research organisations on intersecting inequalities and formulate policy recommendations based on these narratives” (ibid). Findings of the scoping review highlighted: the lack of recruiting and hiring minoritised staff, a lack of role models, curricula that do not reflect minoritized students’ cultures and life experiences, a lack of accountability of perpetrators of sexual

harassment and aggressions, high levels of microaggressions and a lack of support mechanisms (such as financial support for community building and safe spaces) (Beeckmans et al., 2023).

It is important to note that intersectionality is *not* simply about multiple identities, although often used in such a way (Verloo, 2006). More fundamental than adding (+) and addressing several social categories, an intersectional perspective identifies and challenges the “specific regimes of inequalities and asymmetries of power” that are attached to the simultaneity of these categories (Acker, 2006). The focus is on exposing the interlocking systems of oppression and privilege that exist not only on the individual and interpersonal level but also on the level of systemic processes and social structures a focus on how classism, ableism, racism (not race), heterosexism, and cisgenderism are interlocked and how these and other systems of sameness and difference relate to power, and mutually reinforce each other (Cho et al, 2013).

There is an absence of data collection on how multiple discriminations intersect for staff and students and become reproduced in institutional processes and procedures. This lack of data makes it harder to acknowledge different experiences, design intersectional policies and translate this into effective policy measures. There is a need for more research that goes beyond gender and that includes the experiences and intersectional needs of minoritised staff and students in the policymaking processes of R&I organisations. More research is needed to deepen our understanding of the interpersonal and structural levels of intersectional oppressions and how they mutually reinforce each other in the policy making processes –to envision the policy design and implementation processes and make them more constructive, collaborative and inclusive (Beeckmans et al, 2023)

Inclusive gendered innovations (IGI)

Gendered Innovations are those innovations in which the gender dimension is integrated into all aspects of the R&D process. These go beyond women’s representation in terms of ‘fixing the numbers’ and attempt to ‘fix the knowledge’ whilst making innovations more inclusive. Recently, gendered innovations have received considerable academic interest in the contemporary innovation discourse. Whilst significant advances have been made in recent years, the literature on gendered innovations is still fragmented, inconsistent and limited. In the private sector, gendered innovations tend to be established only to a limited degree, given the relative inactivity in equality-oriented innovation policies which are not subject to binding legislation in many countries (Karaulova et al, 2023).

There is a real need for research and action to foreground inclusive gender aspects into the innovation process itself. Despite the great strides that gendered innovations have made in terms of integrating the sex- and gender-based analysis in research content, academic innovation research still leans very heavily on male perspectives (Henry et al 2016) whilst it tends to address men’s rather than women’s needs.

Gender mainstreaming in research and innovation has been a priority of the European Commission in the European Research Area. One must recognise the important milestones that have been achieved, such as the Gendered Innovations guidelines (EC 2020). However the majority of research and policy action in the area still focuses on strategies for gendering research. Taking this one step further through the innovation cycle, gendered innovations in the private sector still have remained on the periphery of these efforts. Of the three ERA objectives, integrating the gender dimension into research content and innovations in comparison to careers or decision-making is perhaps the area where least progress has been made (de Cheveigné, 2017). Whilst research on gendered innovations is at a relatively early stage –how gendered innovations can be made more ‘inclusive’ with an ‘intersectional’ perspective has not been sufficiently addressed in the literature (Karaulova et al, 2023).

One of the main findings from the scoping review was that despite the great deal of academic interest in gendered innovations and the dynamic developments that are happening in a range of different fields- the current knowledge base is fragmented and inconsistent. The scoping review revealed the need to consolidate this work on all conceptual levels: from theory development to applied research in developing an approach to integrate sex and gender analysis in innovation development in BES.

More research is needed that examines the process of gendered innovations, how it is affected by gendered relations in the workplace and by gendered institutions. There is a need for “a model that integrate(s) fragmented understanding of prerequisites, favouring factors and barriers to gendered innovation” (Karaulova et al, 2023). Finally, there is little research on the effects: how do gendered innovations perform financially? How do they actually advance gender equality in the long term? How can policy support gendered innovation most effectively (ibid).

Additionally, we need further knowledge about the systematic integration of gender aspects – in particular from an intersectional perspective – whilst complex this needs to span across the different stages of innovation processes, i.e. from theory / discovery over (technical / product) design, innovation, diffusion up to imitation / improvement / exploitation. We need to develop an understanding on how gendered innovations unfold across various types of innovations (technical, process, product, service, frugal, social) and across geographic contexts. Whilst it is widely recognised that taking an intersectional approach to gendered innovations is necessary – much less is known of how this should be well done. There is a real need “to develop methods to examine what people [actually] do, rather than how they talk about it” (Alsos et al, 2013).

POLICY IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- Policy makers must make a clear distinction between taking an “inclusive” and “intersectional” approach – these concepts are not synonymous with ‘diversity’ – although they are often used in this way. Policy makers should use the following concepts with care: equality, equity, diversity, inclusion, and intersectionality – and be aware of the different types of data collection and analysis activities and types of interventions linked to obtaining each of these objectives.

Sustaining Change

- IGEPs need to be based on data (quantitative where possible, as well as qualitative) and include clear actions, timeframe, naming who bears responsibility for these actions, as well as defining the consequences if these actions are not carried out. These should be developed by participatory processes involving different organisational stakeholders, including both decision-makers, those responsible for implementing the actions as well as key target groups. These should be based on data that monitors:
 - the career progression of researchers using validated measures of gender, race, ethnicity, ability, age and sexual orientation as well as other relevant markers of discrimination
 - decision-making bodies and leadership positions using validated measures of gender, race, ethnicity, ability, age and sexual orientation as well as other relevant markers of discrimination
 - research projects and teaching content that tackles multiple inequalities
- Feminist leadership needs to be supported in tandem with building gender competence to drive change. Changes are slow. To achieve inclusive gender equality, executive leadership need to have gender competences and remove structural and cultural barriers for inclusion, while actively promoting a culture for inclusivity (Rowlands, Blackmore, and Gallant, 2020).

(Chaves and Benschop, 2023).

Widening Participation

- For inclusive gender equality policies to be effective there is a need to understand the local and contextual mechanisms of gender equality interventions and programmes, encouraging innovative solutions that are context sensitive and rooted in specific local histories and contexts (Krzaklewska et al, 2023).
- There is a need for resources to be allocated both financial and human resources –for the development and implementation of inclusive gender equality policies and plans. This could include resources for training, competence building, networks and communities of practice for collective action amongst other actions.

Intersectionality

- The absence of data collection on multiple discrimination grounds (and how these intersect) for students and staff makes it harder to acknowledge different experiences, and to design an intersectional policy that ensures true inclusivity and translates this into effective policy measures (Beeckmans et al, 2023). Whilst efforts should aim to establish robust data collection systems, the lack of current data should not impede the design and implementation of organisational interventions aiming for a greater inclusion. Including representatives of different minority groups in qualitative research processes in order to define relevant indicators, robust data collection systems as well as relevant interventions is a crucial step forward in this process.
- Main recommendations for this strand of work include “increasing the organisation’s accountability and argue in favour of a dialogue between different stakeholders of diverse backgrounds and in dissimilar power positions. Policymaking processes should invite students, researchers professors, specialized councillors, (HR) management, diversity workers, etc. from (non)- minority backgrounds in order to tilt the accountability to the oppressive structures rather than rather than adding extra burden to (the often minoritised) individuals. This forces to approach intersectional equality as a shared responsibility” (Beeckmans et al, 2023).

Inclusive Gendered Innovations

- There is a need to use clear terms for sex, gender and other protected characteristics. Guidelines set through national legislation can be used as drivers for updating definitions (Lee and Pollitzer, 2016). More comparative work needs to be done along the line of Schiebinger and Hunt (2021) on how funding agencies are encouraging inclusive gendered innovations, i.e. whether or not they provide definitions on sex and gender and other characteristics and including gender experts in evaluation panels. Promising practices being employed by funding agencies need to be widely shared.
- Despite a good understanding of the barriers and challenges for inclusive gendered innovation reflected in the literature, more research could be done on prerequisites, success factors and contextual conditions of gendered innovation development in BES (Karaulova et al, 2023).

Communities of Practice

- Communities of practice are suitable platforms for the for the exchange of context dependent and practice based knowledge as they engage actors that have a good knowledge from their practice in their particular locality (Sekula et al, 2023). CoPs support change agents in promoting GE initiatives in their organizations and allow them to build legitimacy around

gender equality work) whilst having a supportive community to drive institutional change forward is key (Thomson et al, 2022).

Data Monitoring

- There is a continued need for equality practitioners to receive training and support in the use of high quality data monitoring tools and standards. This includes the use of validated measurement scales for different social-/psychological constructs such as job satisfaction, work climate or micro-aggressions among many others. But it also includes the provision of resources and training of more sophisticated analytical strategies taking into account longitudinal effects or hierarchical/multi-site research.
- There is also a clear need to provide a solid foundation for the measurement of different social categories and dimensions of discrimination, including but not limited to gender, race, ethnicity, ability, age and sexual orientation.

REFERENCES

Acker, Joan. 2006. "Inequality Regimes: Gender, Class, and Race in Organizations." *Gender & Society* 20, (4): 441–64.

Alsos, Gry Agnette, Elisabet Ljunggren, and Ulla Hytti. 2013. "Gender and Innovation: State of the Art and a Research Agenda". *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship*, 5, (3): 236-56.

Beeckmans, Joanna, Patrizia Zanoni and Koen Van Laer, 2023, Intersectional policies in Higher Education and Research: a scoping literature review, D2.1 INSPIRE.

Benschop, Yvonne, and Mieke Verloo. 2011. 'Gender Change, Organizational Change, and Gender Equality Strategies'. In *Handbook of Gender, Work and Organization*, edited by Emma Jeanes, David Knights, and Patricia Yancey-Martin, 277–90.

Bleijenbergh, Inge. 2018. 'Transformational Change towards Gender Equality: An Autobiographical Reflection on Resistance during Participatory Action Research.' *Organization* 25 (1): 131–38.

Bonder, Gloria, and Lucía Martelotte, 2023. Literature report: Gender Equality Plans, Policies and Measures in Research and Higher Education Institutions of Latin America, D2.1 INSPIRE.

Burman, Anders. (2016). *Indigeneity and Decolonization in the Bolivian Andes: Ritual Practice and Activism*. Lanham: Lexington Books.

Chaves, Paola & Yvonne Benschop, 2023 Deepening and Sustaining Change, D2.1 INSPIRE.

Cho, Sumi, Kimberlé Williams Crenshaw, and Leslie McCall. 2013. "Toward a Field of Intersectionality Studies: Theory, Applications, and Praxis." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 38(4):785–810. doi: 10.1086/669608.

Christoffersen, Ashlee. 2021. "The Politics of Intersectional Practice: Competing Concepts of Intersectionality." *Policy and Politics* 49 (4): 573–93.
<https://doi.org/10.1332/030557321X16194316141034>.

Crimmins, Gail. 2022. 'Engaging Feminist Pedagogies to Support Equality Bargaining in Academia'. *Gender and Education* 34 (3): 313–28.

Dahmen-Adkins, Jennifer, and Helen Peterson. 2021. 'Micro Change Agents for Gender Equality: Transforming European Research Performing Organizations'. *Frontiers in Sociology* 6.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fsoc.2021.741886>.

De Cheveigné, Suzanne, Bente Knoll, Maria Bustelo, Eivind Engebretsen, Ulf Sandström. Interim Evaluation: Gender equality as a crosscutting issue in Horizon 2020: Report of the Expert Group. [Research Report] European Commission. 2017, pp.71. fihal-02948895

European Commission, 2012. Communication From The Commission To The European Parliament, The Council, The European Economic And Social Committee And The Committee Of The Regions A Reinforced European Research Area Partnership For Excellence And Growth /* COM/2012/0392 final, <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=celex%3A52012DC0392>

European Council Conclusions, 2015. Council Conclusions On Advancing Gender Equality in the European Research Area, <https://data.consilium.europa.eu/doc/document/ST-14846-2015-INIT/en/pdf>

Communication From The Commission To The European Parliament, The Council, The European Economic And Social Committee And The Committee Of The Regions A New Era For Research And Innovation Com/2020/628 Final,
<https://eurlex.europa.eu/legalcontent/EN/TXT/?uri=COM%3A2020%3A628%3AFIN>

European Commission, Directorate-General for Research and Innovation, Gendered innovations 2 – How inclusive analysis contributes to research and innovation – Policy review, Publications Office of the European Union, 2020, <https://data.europa.eu/doi/10.2777/316197>

European Commission, 2021. https://research-and-innovation.ec.europa.eu/strategy/strategy-2020-2024/democracy-and-rights/gender-equality-research-and-innovation_en

Fritch, Rochelle. 2021. Advancing the Sex and Gender Dimension in the Research and Innovation Funding Process'. Report from the FORGEN CoP Workshop.

Fusulier, Bernard, Pascal Barbier, and Farah Dubois-Shaik. 2017. "Navigating" through a Scientific Career: A Question of Private and Professional Configurational Supports'. *European Educational Research Journal* 16 (2): 352–72.

Graff, Agnieszka. Korolczuk, Elzbieta. 2022. *Anti-Gender Politics in the Populist Movement*. Routledge: New York.

Henry, Colette, Lene Foss, & Helene Ahl. 2016. Gender and Entrepreneurship Research: A Review of Methodological Approaches. *International Small Business Journal*, 34, 217-241.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0266242614549779>

Lee, Heisook, and Elizabeth Pollitzer. 2016. 'Gender in Science and Innovation as Component of

Inclusive Socioeconomic Growth' https://gender-summit.com/images/Gender_and_inclusive_innovation_Gender_Summit_report.pdf

Karaulova, Maria, and Carolina Wienand, David Walker, Susanne Bühler, Sybille Reidl and Merve Yorulmaz, 2023 Gendered Innovation, D2.1 INSPIRE.

Korolczuk, Elżbieta, and Graff, Agnieszka. 2018. "Gender as 'Ebola from Brussels': The Anti-colonial Frame and the Rise of Illiberal Populism." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 43 (4): 798–821.

Kováts, Eszter. 2021. "Anti-gender politics in East-Central Europe: Right-wing defiance to West-Eurocentrism," *GENDER – Zeitschrift für Geschlecht, Kultur und Gesellschaft*, 1-2021: 76-90. <https://doi.org/10.3224/gender.v13i1.06>.

Krzaklewska, Ewa, Marta Warat, Paulina Sekuła, Anna Ratecka, Ewelina Ciaputa, Iva Kosmos, Jovana Mihajlović Trbovc, Tjaša Cankar. 2023. Initiating Change beyond the Center. A literature review on gender equality plans in research. D2.1 INSPIRE.

Mor-Barak, Michal E., and David A. Cherin. 1998. "A Tool to Expand Organizational Understanding of Workforce Diversity." *Administration in Social Work* 22(1):47–64. doi: 10.1300/J147v22n01_04.

Nicolini, Davide. 2019. *Practice Theory, Work & Organization*. Oxford UK: Oxford University Press.

Niemistö, Charlotta, Jeff Hearn, Mira Karjalainen, and Annamari Tuori. 2020. 'Interrogating Silent Privileges across the Work–Life Boundaries and Careers of High-Intensity Knowledge Professionals'. *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal* 15 (4): 503–22. <https://doi.org/10.1108/QROM-06-2019-1775>.

Núñez, D. 2017. Reflexiones en torno a la interculturalidad y la Educación Superior en Chile. *Polyphonia. Revista de Educación Inclusiva*, 1:72-94.

O'Connor, Pat, (Ed), and Kate White (Ed). 2021. 'Gender, Power and Higher Education in a Globalised World. *Palgrave Studies in Gender and Education*'. Palgrave Macmillan.

Risman, Barbara J., Carissa M. Froyum, and William J. Scarborough, eds. 2018. *Handbook of the Sociology of Gender. Handbooks of Sociology and Social Research*. Cham: Springer International Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-76333-0>.

Rowlands, Julie, Jill Blackmore, and Andrea Gallant. 2020. 'Enacting Leadership Professional Development and the Impediments to Organizational and Industry Change in Rural and Regional Australia'. *Gender Work and Organization* 27 (6): 1269–84. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12480>.

Schneider, Marguerite, and Mark Somers. 2006. 'Organizations as Complex Adaptive Systems: Implications of Complexity Theory for Leadership Research'. *Leadership Quarterly* 17 (4): 351–65. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2006.04.006>.

Schiebinger, Londa and Lilian Hunt. 2022. A Framework for Sex, Gender, and Diversity Analysis in Research', <https://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/science.abp9775>

Sekuła Paulina, Ewelina Ciaputa, Marta Warat, Ewa Krzaklewska, Sarah Baranek and Sybille Reidl. 2023 'Communities of Practice and Gender Equality Fostering Structural Change in Research and Academia in Central and Eastern Europe', in "A Community of Practice Approach to Improving

Gender Equality in Research” edited by Rachel Palmén and Jörg Müller
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003225546>

Smidt, Thomas Brorsen, Gya Margret Petursdottir, and Þorgerður Einarsdottir. 2021. ‘When Discourse Is Hijacked: An Implicit and Performative Resistance Strategy to Gender Equality in Higher Education’. *Journal of Women and Gender in Higher Education* 14 (2): 143–65.

Stierncreutz, Micaela, and Janne Tienari. 2023. ‘Shaped by Resistance: Discursive Politics in Gender Equality Work’. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 30 (4): 1178-1198.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12960>.

Steinþórsdóttir, Finnborg S., Þorgerður Einarsdóttir, Thamar M. Heijstra, Gyða M. Pétursdóttir, and T Brorsen Smidt. 2019. ‘Follow the Money: A Gender Budgeting Approach to Exposing Inequalities in Academia’. In *Gender and Precarious Research Careers*, edited by Annalisa Murgia and Barbara Poggio. New York, London: Routledge. Taylor & Francis Group.
<https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/e/9781351781428>.

Steinþórsdóttir, Finnborg Salome, Thamar Melanie Heijstra, and Þorgerður Jennýjardóttir Einarsdóttir. 2017. ‘The Making of the “Excellent” University: A Drawback for Gender Equality’. *Ephemera: Theory & Politics in Organization* 17 (3): 557–82.

Thomson, Aleksandra, Rachel Palmén, Sybille Reidl, Sarah Barnard, Sarah Beranek, Andrew Dainty, and Tarek Hassan. 2022. ‘Fostering Collaborative Approaches to Gender Equality Interventions in Higher Education and Research: The Case of Transnational and Multi-Institutional Communities of Practice’, *Journal of Gender Studies*, 31, 1: 36-54.

Verloo, Mieke. 2006. “Multiple Inequalities, Intersectionality and the European Union.” *European Journal of Women’s Studies* 13 (3): 211–28. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350506806065753>.

Wroblewski, Angela. 2018. “Report on National Roadmaps and Mechanisms in ERA Priority 4.” Deliverable D3.1. GENDERACTION. <https://h2020.genderaction.eu/policy-advice/gender-equality-in-era/>.

PROJECT IDENTITY – INSPIRE

PROJECT NAME INSPIRE: European Centre of Excellence on Inclusive Gender Equality in Research & Innovation: Creating Knowledge & Engaging in Collaborative Action

COORDINATOR Rachel Palmén, Fundació (FUOC), Barcelona, Spain, rpalmen@uoc.edu.

CONSORTIUM

FUOC	Fundació per a la Universitat Oberta de Catalunya, Spain
JR	Joanneum Research Forschungsgesellschaft Mbh, Austria
SDU	Syddansk Universitet, Denmark
UJ	Uniwersytet Jagiellonski, Poland
Notus	Notus, Spain
FLACSO	Facultad Latinoamericana De Ciencias Sociales, Argentina
EM	Europa Media Szolgaltato Non Profitkozhasznu Kft, Hungary
Portia	Portia gGmbH, Germany
SRU	Stichting Radboud Universiteit
Fraunhofer ISI	Fraunhofer ISI, Germany
UH	Universiteit Hasselt, Belgium
ZRC SAZU	Znanstvenoraziskovalni Center Slovenske Akademije Znanosti In Umetr
GESIS	GESIS-Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften EV, Germany
INNO	Innosystems Symvouleutikes Ypiresies Kai Efarmoges Pliorforikis Ypsili Monoprosopi Idiotiki Kefalaioushiki Etaireia, Greece

FUNDING SCHEME

Call: HORIZON-WIDERA-2021-ERA-01

Topic: HORIZON-WIDERA-2021-ERA-01-80 - Centre of excellence on inclusive gender equality in Research & Innovation

DURATION

October 2022 – September 2026 (48 months).

BUDGET

EU contribution: € 4 996 758, 00

WEBSITE

<https://www.inspirequality.eu/>

MORE INFO.

Contact: Rachel Palmén, rpalmen@uoc.edu

