

## *Intersectionality from Regional Perspectives: Its Understandings and Applications*

Authors: Marta Warat (Jagiellonian University), Ewelina Ciaputa (Jagiellonian University), Ewa Krzaklewska (Jagiellonian University), Paulina Sekuła (Jagiellonian University), Karolina Sikora (Jagiellonian University), Gloria Bonder (Latin American Faculty of Social Sciences, FLACSO), Gabriela Langhammerová (Czech Academy of Sciences), Graciela Morgade (University of Buenos Aires).

Contributors: Jovana Mihajlović Trbovc (ZRC SAZU), Anna Knapińska, Karolina Lendák-Kabók and participants of the First Knowledge Exchange Event of INSPIRE KSH2 Widening Participation held on 12 March 2024 from WIGE, UNIGEM and Latin America Communities of Practice.

### *Working paper 1*

#### *KSH2 Widening Participation*

*This document is aimed at staff of research institutes and higher education institutions who apply or are planning to apply an intersectional perspective at policy level, especially when working on gender equality plans.*

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Intersectionality is a concept describing how various forms of social stratification, such as gender, class, ethnicity, race and others, interconnect and create overlapping systems of discrimination or disadvantage. While the foundational ideas of intersectionality originate from the experiences of Black women in the United States, the concept has since been applied and adapted to various regional contexts around the world, each with its unique social, cultural, and political nuances. In Latin American countries intersectionality is often discussed in the context of race (particularly Afro-Latin and Indigenous populations), gender, and class. Movements emphasize the historical impacts of colonialism, economic exploitation, and the ongoing struggles for indigenous rights and recognition of Afro-descendant populations. In Central and Eastern Europe, alongside gender and socioeconomic status, the focus may be more on ethnic and national identities as well as disabilities.

By recognizing and addressing the multiple and intersecting identities that individuals hold, strategies for social change can more effectively promote inclusion. While this is increasingly recognised by research organisations and higher education institutions, at the same time implementing intersectionality in their gender equality plans (GEPs) comes with several recognized challenges. These problems stem from both systemic, institutional, and broader societal factors, as well as the complexity inherent in addressing multiple, intersecting forms of discrimination and inequality. An essential factor for designing and implementing inclusive GEPs is collecting disaggregated data with a context-sensitive intersectional lens. Gathering and analysing this data helps to identify specific barriers and disparities that



different groups may face, enabling targeted interventions, assessment of their effectivity and their improvement over time.

## Introduction

The aim of this paper is to **reflect on the intersectional perspective in the development of gender equality policies** and, in particular, gender equality plans (GEPs). As INSPIRE's Knowledge & Support Hub (KSH) on Widening Participation, which gathers Communities of Practice involving institutions from different countries in Central and Eastern Europe (CEE) and Latin America (LA), we want to contribute to the debate on inclusive gender equality by drawing on the experiences from our respective contexts. In this way, we aim to highlight the contextual factors that influence the understanding and practice of intersectionality in higher education institutions and other research performing organisations.

Building on the insights already gained in the INSPIRE project concerning the development of GEPs, this paper presents the reflections and experiences in relation to the following questions:

- Is there an ongoing debate on inclusive GEPs in our countries/regions?
- How is intersectionality understood in policies at organisational and national level?
- Which dimensions of intersecting inequalities are considered within GEPs, and which are overlooked?
- What good practices are employed in the development and implementation of inclusive GEPs?
- What dilemmas and challenges are encountered in these processes?

## Main Concepts

Incorporation of inclusion and intersectionality into a GEP sends a clear message that the organisation is dedicated to addressing the multifaceted aspects of inequality. A GEP recognises that gender equality is not a standalone issue, but that **gender intersects with other dimensions of discrimination or privilege** based on race, ethnicity, age, sexual orientation, ability and more. Inclusive gender equality in Research and Innovation (R&I) is about recognising and valuing the diversity of perspectives, backgrounds, and experiences that individuals of different genders and with different backgrounds and experiences bring to the research and innovation landscape.

### Key terms

**Inclusion:** INSPIRE understands 'inclusion' primarily as a participatory and transformatory process guided by non-negotiable core values such as feminism, care, social and epistemic justice, fairness, equality, solidarity, decolonialism and democratic participation. (...) An inclusive, participatory process is not an end in itself but serves a purpose of change: it targets the systemic nature of social injustice. ([INSPIRE Policy Brief](#))

**Intersectionality** is a paradigm, theory, methodology, analytic or critical tool that focuses on the interlocking systems of oppression and privilege, power relations, and social inequalities that occur on multiple axes including but not limited to gender, ethnicity and race, social and economic status, sexual orientation, disability, and age (Beeckmans et al., 2023).



**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. (...) 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, 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 (Palmen et al., 2023).

## INSPIRE Project Insights to Date

Intersectionality has been recognised as an important and central concept in academic research. It has been broadly applied, providing **new dimensions of analysis focused on multiple axes of discrimination**. While the term was coined by Kimberlé Crenshaw (1989, 1991) to illustrate how gender, race/ethnicity and social class interact to produce a new form of discrimination, nowadays it is used to describe even more complex social positionings created by the simultaneous and inseparable combination of such factors as gender, race, ethnicity, nationality, social class, age, sexual orientation, ability, religion, immigrant status, marital status, etc. The intersectional approach goes beyond the discussion of individual experiences and identities by pointing out the differences not only between groups but also within groups, thus identifying the power relationships underpinning social inequalities.

Intersectionality is an attractive and popular concept that has become a feminist “buzzword” used to understand various forms of discrimination and oppression. However, **there is no consensus on how to define intersectionality**. Quite the contrary, there are a variety of theories, methods, and practices applied in different geographical contexts and across a wide range of disciplines. This flexibility and open-endedness are a great advantage for academics and practitioners, allowing to engage this perspective within research and applying it in an analysis of diverse topics. Unsurprisingly, intersectionality has also been addressed in research on higher education institutions (HEIs) and research performing organizations (RPOs). There is a growing body of literature that addresses the intersecting inequalities, particularly the experiences of minority students and staff ([INSPIRE D2.1 Intersectionality scoping review](#), p. 4). It shows that the organizational culture needs to be changed by developing and implementing more inclusive policies that support and empower minorities.

The **application of intersectionality in public policies** has proven difficult (Christofferesen 2021). On the one hand, it has been recognised as an inspiring and needed approach, but on the other hand, the institutions fail to develop policies recognising the intersecting dimensions of discrimination due to insufficient policy frameworks and incentives, resistance, lack of data and underdeveloped practical guidelines. Although the analysis of available literature and policy documents illustrates an increasing number of policies addressing inequalities, in many cases they focus on a single dimension of inequality (e.g. gender, disability, age, migration status) or provide a broader framework of diversity, but in both cases, however, fail to recognise the intersection of multiple inequalities ([INSPIRE D2.1](#).



Intersectionality scoping review). While both approaches can be important channels for initiating change, it is argued that intersectionality is not clearly articulated in current policies in HEIs and RPOs, and is rather at an early stage of development, recognising that more theoretical and practical knowledge is needed. Mainstreaming an intersectional approach would enable a paradigm shift: from a well-developed and widespread policy that addresses a single ground of discrimination to one that addresses inequalities on multiple grounds. It is therefore necessary to reflect further on how the intersectional approach can inform policies and interventions to approach oppression and discrimination that would otherwise go under the radar.

**Mainstreaming intersectionality into institutional policies** encounters various obstacles and challenges, which became even more vocal and evident in the case of designing and implementing GEPs in CEE (INSPIRE D2.1b KSH2 scoping review; INSPIRE D2.2b East Europe Report). As already mentioned, there is an increasing research and knowledge on marginalised and minority groups, but it is not properly translated into policy. This lack of commitment should be seen in the context of rising right-wing politics and conservative backlash at the national level in CEE. The 'gender wars', 'anti-gender ideology' and unfavourable political climate have led to the lack of political support for gender equality at the national level in terms of policy regulations, resources, or top-down pressure, as well as increasing resistance among leaders, managers, administration, and academic staff in HEIs and RPOs. At the institutional level, the intersectional interventions and measures are considered to be difficult to design and implement, not only because of the lack of political will and leadership commitment to the intersectional approach, but because of insufficient awareness, knowledge, and experience at applying such an approach. Even the term 'intersectionality', as pointed out by experts involved in the INSPIRE project (INSPIRE D2.2b East Europe Report), can become an obstacle, as in some countries (such as Romania) terminology for describing intersectional approach in local language is not yet standardised while in other countries there are resistances to the use of gender-sensitive language that goes hand in hand with applying intersectional approach. Engagement in partnership with activists and experts, which could also be seen as a factor facilitating knowledge transfer, is not sufficient. As a result, there is no systematic support in the form of institutional instruments, protocols, procedures, (financial and human) resources or examples of good practices for applying an intersectional perspective in HEIs and RPOs, especially for new-comer countries.

The intersectional policies are also difficult to design due to the **absence of data collection on multiple discrimination grounds**. Limited statistical data focusing on single dimensions of inequalities and lack of awareness of the intersection of gender inequality with other traditionally recognised axes of inequalities and oppressions prove to be an important barrier for institutions to recognise multiple discrimination grounds. The design of intersectional policies can also be hindered by the myth of meritocracy, a discourse built on the assumption that HEIs and RPOs are grounded in the principles of merit and fairness, offering the same opportunities for all regardless of their personal characteristics. Along these lines, the intersectional approach is not needed as there are no structural inequalities which should be tackled. **To sum up, the insufficient awareness, knowledge, commitment to and data on intersectionality leads to a policy-practice gap (Tauber 2022), restricting the use of intersectional approach mainly to the diagnosis phase or at the very best to legitimise gender equality measures, but no longer including it in the activities planned in**

**GEPs.** In this context, what appears to be a challenge is – as experts involved in the INSPIRE project argue – a lack of explicit facilitating factors which could lead to institutional change (INSPIRE D2.2b East Europe Report).

As the opinions of gender experts from different European regions show, virtually in all countries, the current **national legal and political frameworks are insufficient or highly insufficient for adopting intersectional approach to gender equality** policies in HEIs and RPOs. In the region of CEE, the evaluation of “highly insufficient” is most widespread.

Table 1. Assessment of national legal and political framework, by topic.

**National experts' assessment of the current legal and political framework in the country, by topic: is it adequate to foster or sustain significant advances in the field of (inclusive) gender equality in R&I organisations?**

Cluster	Country	Initiating change	Sustaining and deepening change	Adopting an intersectional approach	Implementing gendered innovations	Monitoring inclusive gender equality
Northern West	Denmark	Insufficient	Insufficient	Insufficient	Insufficient	Insufficient
	Finland	Insufficient	Adequate	Insufficient	Adequate	Adequate
	Ireland	Highly adequate	Highly adequate	Insufficient	Adequate	Highly adequate
	Sweden	Adequate	Adequate	Insufficient	Insufficient	Insufficient
	Austria	Adequate	Adequate	Insufficient	Adequate	Adequate
Central West	Belgium	Adequate	Insufficient	Highly insufficient	Highly insufficient	Highly insufficient
	France	Adequate	Insufficient	Highly insufficient	Insufficient	Adequate
	Germany	Adequate	Adequate	Adequate	Adequate	Insufficient
	Luxembourg	Adequate	Adequate	Highly insufficient	Highly insufficient	Highly insufficient
	Netherlands	Adequate	Insufficient	Highly insufficient	Insufficient	Insufficient
Southern	Cyprus	Insufficient	Highly insufficient	Highly insufficient	Highly insufficient	Highly insufficient
	Greece	Adequate	Highly insufficient	Highly insufficient	Highly insufficient	Insufficient
	Italy	Insufficient	Insufficient	Highly insufficient	Highly insufficient	Highly insufficient
	Malta	Adequate	Adequate	Insufficient	Insufficient	Adequate
	Portugal	Highly adequate	Adequate	Insufficient	Insufficient	Insufficient
	Spain	Highly adequate	Adequate	Highly insufficient	Insufficient	Insufficient
Central East & Eastern	<b>Bulgaria</b>	Insufficient	Highly insufficient	<b>Highly insufficient</b>	Highly insufficient	Highly insufficient
	<b>Croatia</b>	Insufficient	Highly insufficient	<b>Highly insufficient</b>	Insufficient	Highly insufficient
	<b>Czechia</b>	Adequate	Insufficient	<b>Highly insufficient</b>	Adequate	Insufficient
	<b>Estonia</b>	Adequate	Adequate	<b>Insufficient</b>	Insufficient	Adequate
	<b>Hungary</b>	n.a.	Insufficient	<b>Highly insufficient</b>	n.a.	n.a.
	<b>Latvia</b>	Insufficient	Insufficient	<b>Highly insufficient</b>	Insufficient	Highly insufficient
	<b>Lithuania</b>	Adequate	Insufficient	<b>Highly insufficient</b>	Insufficient	Highly insufficient
	<b>Poland</b>	Insufficient	Insufficient	<b>Highly insufficient</b>	Highly insufficient	Insufficient
	<b>Romania</b>	Adequate	Highly insufficient	<b>Highly insufficient</b>	Highly insufficient	Highly insufficient
	<b>Slovakia</b>	Highly insufficient	Highly insufficient	<b>Highly insufficient</b>	Highly insufficient	Highly insufficient
<b>Slovenia</b>	Adequate	Insufficient	<b>Insufficient</b>	Highly insufficient	Adequate	

Source: Own compilation of data from: [INSPIRE D2.2b North West Country Cluster Report](#), [D2.2c Central West Country Cluster Report](#), [D2.2d Southern country cluster report](#), [D2.2e Central & East Europe Country Cluster Report](#).

In terms of knowledge shared by practitioners on the ground, it is in most CEE countries highly insufficient for pursuing an intersectional approach to gender equality measures in local HEIs and RPOs. The national **experts from CEE reported to a greater extent the lack of adequate knowledge base in organisations** when compared to Northern and Western European country clusters.



Table 2. Assessment of current knowledge in the country, by topic.

**National experts' assessment of the current knowledge base on structural change in R&I organisations in the country, by topic: is it adequate to support significant, evidence-based advances in the field of inclusive gender equality in R&I organisations?**

Cluster	Country	Initiating change	Sustaining and deepening change	Adopting an intersectional approach	Implementing gendered innovations	Monitoring inclusive gender equality
Northern West	Denmark	Insufficient	Insufficient	Insufficient	Insufficient	Insufficient
	Finland	Insufficient	Insufficient	Highly insufficient	Highly insufficient	Highly insufficient
	Ireland	Highly adequate	Highly adequate	Insufficient	Highly adequate	Highly adequate
	Sweden	Highly adequate	Highly adequate	Insufficient	Insufficient	Highly adequate
	Austria	Highly adequate	Highly adequate	Insufficient	Highly adequate	Highly adequate
Central West	Belgium	Highly adequate	Highly insufficient	Highly insufficient	Insufficient	Highly adequate
	France	Highly adequate	Highly adequate	Insufficient	Insufficient	Highly adequate
	Germany	Highly adequate	Highly adequate	Highly adequate	Highly adequate	Insufficient
	Luxembourg	Highly adequate	Highly adequate	Highly insufficient	Insufficient	Highly adequate
	Netherlands	Highly adequate	Highly adequate	Highly insufficient	Insufficient	Insufficient
Southern	Cyprus	Insufficient	Highly insufficient	Highly insufficient	Highly insufficient	Highly insufficient
	Greece	Highly adequate	Highly insufficient	Insufficient	Highly insufficient	Insufficient
	Italy	Insufficient	Highly insufficient	Highly insufficient	Highly insufficient	Highly insufficient
	Malta	Insufficient	Highly insufficient	Highly insufficient	Highly insufficient	Highly insufficient
	Portugal	Highly adequate	Insufficient	Insufficient	Insufficient	Insufficient
Central East & Eastern	Spain	Adequate	Insufficient	Highly insufficient	Insufficient	Insufficient
	<b>Bulgaria</b>	Insufficient	Highly insufficient	<b>Highly insufficient</b>	Highly insufficient	Highly insufficient
	<b>Croatia</b>	Insufficient	Insufficient	<b>Highly insufficient</b>	Highly insufficient	Insufficient
	<b>Czechia</b>	Highly adequate	Insufficient	<b>Highly insufficient</b>	Insufficient	Insufficient
	<b>Estonia</b>	Highly adequate	Insufficient	<b>Insufficient</b>	Insufficient	Insufficient
	<b>Hungary</b>	n.a.	Highly adequate	<b>Highly insufficient</b>	Highly adequate	Insufficient
	<b>Latvia</b>	Insufficient	Insufficient	<b>Highly insufficient</b>	Insufficient	Highly insufficient
	<b>Lithuania</b>	Insufficient	Insufficient	<b>Insufficient</b>	Insufficient	Insufficient
	<b>Poland</b>	Insufficient	Highly insufficient	<b>Highly insufficient</b>	Insufficient	Insufficient
	<b>Romania</b>	Insufficient	Highly insufficient	<b>Highly insufficient</b>	Highly insufficient	Insufficient
	<b>Slovakia</b>	Insufficient	Highly insufficient	<b>Highly insufficient</b>	Highly insufficient	Highly insufficient
<b>Slovenia</b>	Highly adequate	Insufficient	<b>Insufficient</b>	Highly insufficient	Highly insufficient	

Source: Own compilation of data from: [INSPIRE D2.2b North West Country Cluster Report](#), [D2.2c Central West Country Cluster Report](#), [D2.2d Southern country cluster report](#), [D2.2e Central & East Europe Country Cluster Report](#).



## Insights from gender experts participating in the First Knowledge Exchange Event of INSPIRE KSH2 Widening Participation

### Contribution by Gloria Bonder (FLACSO, Argentina):

- Intersectionality refers to the fact that gender is never “alone”, separated from other categories, but is always **intertwined with other axes of identity** such as: age, educational level, sexual orientation, ethnicity, nationality, place and area of residence, occupation, among many other possible.
- The recommendation from the intersectionality perspective is to **look beyond gender to reveal the network of inequalities**. However, instead of establishing a “check list” of all possible variables of discrimination that should necessarily be considered in each case, it is advisable to recognise that this network of inequalities occurs in a context and therefore **the discrimination variables to be considered should be meaningful in a particular context** (as e.g. the decolonial approach in the case of LA). In other words, intersectionality is an appeal to look at the framework; not to stipulate a menu of additional variables per se, but to contextualize.
- The concept of intersectionality brings us closer to social reality, by proposing to go beyond an analysis of inter-gender relations (between men and women) and by **illuminating the power relations, differences and inequalities that exist within genders** (among different categories of women and men).
- ⊄ Both gender and intersectionality are transversal approaches with a transformative potential to the extent that they can be effectively “translated” or “operationalized” both in the status quo assessment and policy design.
- The inclusion of the intersectional approach to gender equality policies in higher education institutions should also aim to **problematize and transform the ways in which knowledge is produced**, validated and transmitted.

### Reflections on intersectionality: the case of Latin America

At the outset, it is necessary to highlight the heterogeneity of Latin America in historical, economic, cultural and political terms. It is a region where, despite the predominance of Spanish, there are approximately 420 different languages spoken by 522 native populations. Similarly, the number and influence of the black population varies greatly depending on the country and the historical processes of colonisation. Talking about intersectionality therefore necessarily means taking into account the heterogeneity within each of the "sections" included in this concept and their different cultural, economic and political influences. For example, it is not the same to recognise and analyse the influence of the black population in Brazil as in Argentina, or of the indigenous peoples in Mexico as in Uruguay. In short, what we call intersectionality implies particular "sections" that should be recognised in their singularity and mutual influence within a general equality policy.

However, the recognition and subsequent integration of the specific characteristics of each "section" is a complex process.

Take education, for example. An intersectional approach cannot be reduced to knowledge of the historical processes of each "section", nor to the inclusion of different languages and/or their traditions or beliefs in the mainstream. Intersectionality requires the recognition and, above all, the valorisation of the contributions that each "section" has made throughout history, as well as those it is making in the present and towards the future. In this sense, it is necessary to distinguish between inclusion and integration. One thing is to include information on the history of the different "sections" and quite another to bring into dialogue and eventually into debate the benefits and disadvantages that each "section" has contributed and is contributing to the development of society. In other words, the implementation of an intersectional perspective implies a great challenge and ongoing debates: it requires a critical epistemological, political and social review of the developments that each social group has carried out and is carrying out, and their benefits for human, egalitarian and sustainable development.

The experiences, expectations and values of all genders, sexual orientations, ages, functional abilities and other dimensions that would broaden the vision and interpretation of the problems, and their solutions must be included in the formulation and implementation of policies.

## **Contribution by Graciela Morgade (FLACSO, Argentina)**

### **Situated and broadening meaning**

Although "intersectionality" as a theoretical tool always emphasises convergent systems of inequality, in Latin America it is nowadays referring to specific and situated expressions. Firstly, let's remember that the subcontinent is basically defined and organized through a colonial power: its' subjectivities - among others - are shaped by the language we speak, and it is worth remembering that Spanish and Portuguese have been official languages in our countries because two European nations arrived, conquered the lands, imposed religion and imprisoned and killed previous inhabitants. So, in Latin America, the first "class" perspective that feminism (especially socialfeminism) proposed as the dual system of subordination, must be read through colonial and racist glasses. Therefore, the most important meaning of intersectionality comes from indigenous or native perspectives. Colonialism and racism are the systems that, mainly in Mexico, Peru and Bolivia intersect with feminist struggles. The case of Brazil (and Caribbean countries) also includes "black" perspectives as African American slavery was widespread when colonial power was established. Secondly, if we think about other and more recent visibilization processes, I will add the LGBT perspective. It is strongly accepted in our countries, as we believe politics of "bodies" and "desire" are also knitted to the sexual contract. A third line of theoretical and political development is that this politics of "material sexualities" has opened through the growing visibilization of other systems of inequality, being "functional diversity" or "disability" the most powerful. I could also point out that "old or elderly people" are increasingly visible.



These different systems that we can analytically distinguish, have a synchronical expression in the “real world”. More recently, we have been calling 'popular feminism' the diverse expressions that emerge from various struggles or demands, such as the control of basic resources (for example, water), the fight against pollution or the demand for food by poor, indigenous, African American women.

### **Operational definitions**

We think of intersectionality as the crossroad, simultaneous and not added with a “comma”, of inequalities. As we have suggested above, while in research and theory we need to analyze and sometimes oversimplify – just to be able to say something about something - experience is situated and complex. Intersectionality allows a deeper approach to real lives, needs and voices. Thus, we propose to understand intersectionality from a situational and relational perspective, implying that practices of domination emerge in concrete contexts.

### **Tips to improve policy**

Intersectionality is rarely included as a reference at the policy level. Neither is it covered in gender equality plans at universities. However, we can identify some initiatives in LA that could be thought of as a way to approach intersectionality, however without naming it with this term. I would like to mention three initiatives that I think are interesting to discuss:

- Quota policies for vulnerable students or faculty, e.g. for Afro-Americans in Brazil.
- Exceptions or scholarship policies, e.g. specific standards of evaluation in Colombia.
- Language policies, e.g. bi- or multilingual policies (including sign language for hearing loss) in Argentinian universities.

I think these are not named as intersectional, because the concept is being constructed at the same time: knowledge, policy, practice are moving elements... not a river but rather like a swirl, or a dialectics dynamic.

Anyway, I think one of the main difficulties is the way we construct the information that we use in decision making. If we only have male/female data, we will imagine male/female policies. If we do not ask about ethnicity or functional abilities, there are some dimensions of inequalities invisible for research and even more at policy level.

### **Contribution by Gabriela Langhammerová (Centre for Gender and Science, Czech Academy of Sciences)**

In the case of the Czech Republic, the current situation corresponds to the description and to the mechanisms mentioned at the Knowledge Exchange Event, including the persistent problem of acknowledging that inequalities of any kind exist at all, let alone that they are structural in nature, and that they therefore need to be systematically addressed at the institutional and other systemic levels.

The axes of inequality that can be observed within the emerging GEPs that are considered and acknowledged are age, caring responsibilities and language/ethnicity. Some GEPs in the

country consider these axes in intersection, i.e. they develop measures in terms of the combination/intersection of these axes of inequality.

Examples of good practice:

- return grants for early career female scientists to restart their careers after a parental break (IOCB, MendelU, MUNI) - combination of gender, age, caring responsibilities
- boot camps for international researchers, school assistant for children with different mother tongue language (IMG CAS) - combination of gender, age, caring responsibilities and ethnicity/language
- consideration of caring breaks in the attestation procedure and in the grant process.

### **Contribution by Karolina Sikora (Jagiellonian University in Krakow, Poland)**

An exemplification of insufficient adoption of an intersectional approach in organisational gender equality measures in CEE is illustrated by the results of the INSPIRE project's quantitative analysis of Gender Equality Plans (GEPs) implemented across Polish universities and research institutes from 2020 to 2023 (Sikora et al., 2024). Among the 82 GEPs reviewed, only three explicitly acknowledged the value of intersectionality in both the implementation and evaluation phases. These plans highlighted the significance of intersectionality in defining the concept of gender, as seen in the AGH University of Cracow's Gender Equality Plan, and in recognizing the complex interplay of contextual factors that yield unique experiences, as noted in the University of Łódź's Gender Equality Plan. Furthermore, 12 out of the 82 GEPs analysed incorporated concepts akin to intersectionality, albeit without directly mentioning the term. Examples include the call for creating an inclusive environment for the entire academic community in the Research Institute of New Chemical Syntheses' Gender Equality Plan and the acknowledgment of additional dimensions of disadvantage beyond gender inequality in the University of Warsaw's Gender Equality Plan. Furthermore, 12 out of the 82 GEPs analysed incorporated concepts akin to intersectionality, albeit without directly mentioning the term. Examples include the call for creating an inclusive environment for the entire academic community in the Research Institute of New Chemical Syntheses' Gender Equality Plan and the acknowledgment of additional dimensions of disadvantage beyond gender inequality in the University of Warsaw's Gender Equality Plan.

This analysis indicates a notable underrepresentation of the intersectionality perspective in the GEPs of Polish higher education and research institutions. Such findings underscore previous assessments derived from literature reviews and expert evaluations, particularly concerning the Central and Eastern European (CEE) context, suggesting that the integration of intersectionality in GEPs remains insufficient.

## Literature

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

Beeckmans, J., Zaroni, P., & van Laer, K. 2023. Intersectional policies in Higher Education and Research: a scoping literature review, D2.1 INSPIRE.

Crenshaw, K. 1991. Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review* 43(6),1241–1299. doi:10.2307/1229039.

Crenshaw, K. 1989. “Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics.” *University of Chicago Legal Forum* 1989, 139-167.

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

Sikora, K., Krzaklewska, E., Sekuła, P., & Warat, M. (2024, August 27-30). *Towards Equality in Research and Innovation: Quantitative Analysis of Gender Equality Plans in Polish Universities and Polish Research Institutes*. [Conference presentation]. ESA Conference, Porto, Portugal.

Täuber, S. 2022. Women academics’ intersectional experiences of policy ineffectiveness in the European context. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 810-569.

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

