

María López Belloso /
Sara Clavero / Sofia Strid (eds.)

**Resisting the pandemic.
Better stories and innovation
in times of crisis**



PETER LANG

María López Belloso / Sara Clavero / Sofia Strid (eds.)

Resisting the pandemic. Better stories and innovation in times of crisis

In an era marked by profound disparities, this book explores the significant ways the pandemic has deepened gender inequalities in the labor, education, and health sectors. Through a rigorous analysis within the RESISTIRÉ EU funded project framework, it highlights innovative scientific and social methodologies that have emerged to challenge these inequalities. Structured into nine chapters, the work synthesizes insights gained from extensive evaluations of public policies and grassroots initiatives across Europe, offering 'better stories' and practices that encapsulate transformative potentials in crisis response.

The Editors

María López Belloso (PhD) is a lecturer and researcher at the Faculty of Social and Human Sciences at the University of Deusto. She holds a degree in Law from the University of Deusto, an MA in Humanitarian Action (NOHA), and a PhD in Human Rights from the same university. Her thesis on truth, justice and reparation processes for victims of forced disappearance in Western Sahara received the Brunet Award in 2017.

Sara Clavero (PhD) is a Research Fellow and Deputy Director of the AIB Research Centre in Inclusive and Equitable Cultures (RINCE) at TU Dublin, Ireland. She has over 23 years of professional experience as a researcher on gender equality within the disciplines of Philosophy, Sociology, Politics and Law and a strong commitment to interdisciplinarity in research.

Sofia Strid (PhD) is an Associate Professor of Gender Studies and Senior Lecturer in Sociology at the University of Gothenburg, Sweden. She works interdisciplinarily and has held positions in Gender Studies, Policy Studies, Political Science, and Sociology in Austria, Belgium, Sweden, and the UK. She is the Scientific Coordinator of the EU-funded RESISTIRÉ, UniSAFE, ACCTING and SUPPORTER projects, and the PI of GenderSAFE and ST4TE.

Resisting the pandemic. Better stories and innovation in times of crisis

María López Belloso / Sara Clavero / Sofia Strid (eds.)

**Resisting the pandemic.
Better stories and innovation
in times of crisis**



PETER LANG

Berlin - Bruxelles - Chennai - Lausanne - New York - Oxford

Bibliographic Information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data is available online at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A CIP catalog record for this book has been applied for at the Library of Congress.

RESISTIRÉ project has received funding from the EU Horizon2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement no. 101015990

ISBN 978-3-631-91230-0 (Print)
E-ISBN 978-3-631-91741-1 (E-PDF)
E-ISBN 978-3-631-91742-8 (E-PUB)
DOI 10.3726/b22121

© María López Belloso / Sara Clavero / Sofia Strid (eds.), 2024
Published by Peter Lang GmbH, Berlin, Deutschland
info@peterlang.com - www.peterlang.com

PETER LANG
 open



Open Access: This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution CC-BY 4.0 license. To view a copy of this license, visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

This publication has been peer reviewed.
www.peterlang.com

María López Bellosó, Elena Ghidoni and Dolores Morondo
Taramundi

Assessing the gender+ perspective in the COVID-19 recovery and resilience plans

Introduction

The COVID-19 outbreak has led policymakers across the world to an unprecedented effort in policy responses to address the health crisis and its socio-economic impacts. As many parts of Europe witnessed the initial wave of COVID-19 cases and fatalities, the urgency of devising strategies for sustainable, inclusive, and socially responsible recovery became increasingly apparent. The pandemic prompted the implementation of national policies and measures across various domains to curb infections and save lives. Many of the measures taken significantly altered our way of life, especially quarantining, self-isolation and social distancing becoming the new norm. These changes redefined societal structures, leading to increased remote work, home-schooling, and a heightened online presence, each with its unique and sometimes unintended consequences (Bonaccorsi et al., 2020). Furthermore, the pandemic brought about furloughs and job losses, resulting in economic hardship and mental health challenges. Vulnerable groups, in particular, faced heightened risks and inequalities, including increased exposure to domestic violence, reduced personal assistance for people with disabilities, hate speech targeting minorities, and reported surges in xenophobia and racism towards those perceived as Asian. Unjust dismissals of individuals with caregiving responsibilities were also reported (EQUINET, 2021). Moreover, the pandemic posed significant risks to healthcare workers, educators, and other contact professionals, as well as service industries, due to the necessity for physical contact (WHO, 2020). Some EU governments entered bilateral agreements to lift travel restrictions, allowing certain essential workers such as nurses and crop gatherers to compensate for labour shortages. However, this placed workers from economically disadvantaged countries at increased risk, highlighting ongoing economic disparities within the EU and the reliance on migrant labour in wealthier nations, which often strained under-resourced healthcare systems in less affluent countries (Rogozanu & Gabor, 2020). Furthermore, the path to recovery was fraught with uncertainty, as the duration of

the pandemic remained unpredictable, with the possibility of future cycles and peaks, and its unequal impact on diverse segments of the population.

In 2021, in the post-pandemic phase, EU Member States reached a consensus on the establishment of the Next Generation EU (NGEU), a temporary recovery instrument in response to the social and economic crises precipitated by the COVID-19 pandemic with a total budget of €806.9 billion, financed through EU borrowing on financial markets (Sapala, 2021; Crescenzi et al., 2021). Central to this initiative was the EU Recovery and Resilience Facility, serving as the primary mechanism for allocating a substantial portion (89,7%) of the NGEU funds to Member States. This allocation was contingent upon the adoption of a National Recovery and Resilience Plan (NRRP) by each Member State, provided a positive assessment from the European Commission and approval by the Council.

The Regulation establishing the Recovery and Resilience Facility set gender equality as a cross-cutting priority for the recovery plans (EC, 2021b; EU, 2021). From very early on, it was noticed that the crisis precipitated by the COVID-19 pandemic, similarly to previous crises, was influenced both by gender and by other factors such as sex, ethnicity/race, social class, age, disability, migration status, and religion, as well as the intersections between these inequalities (Lokot & Avakyan, 2020). The impact of the crisis was characterised by unevenness and inequality, with disproportional consequences for various groups, whose long-term effects remained uncertain (Cumming et al., 2020). The inclusion of gender as a cross-cutting issue in the Recovery Plans has created the opportunity to compare how different countries translated gender-related issues into their policy agenda in a crisis context. The analysis of the quality of these policy responses and their impact on pre-existing gender inequalities has been at the core of the RESISTIRÉ's research endeavour.

Drawing from the gender+ approach, RESISTIRÉ understood gender inequalities as always intersecting with and being shaped by other inequalities (Verloo, 2013; Walby et al., 2012). Applying this framework, national researchers working on the project were asked to analyse from a 'gender+ perspective' 'the policy process, the content of the plan, and the reactions from civil society organisations to these measures'. The chapter builds on those analyses and provides a reflection on how the national recovery and resilience plans (NRRPs) address gender+ issues in the different policy domains of the project (gender-based violence; work and labour market; economy; gender pay and pension gaps; gender care gap; decision-making and politics; environmental justice; health and education), what kind of policy solutions are presented as ways to forward gender

equality, and where gender-sensitive measures are still missing among various policy areas.

This chapter first assesses the difficulties that scholars have identified in the incorporation of intersectionality to policymaking. Second, the specific intersectional framework developed by the RESISTIRÉ project, the gender+ perspective, is explained regarding both its theoretical basis and its methodological deployment. The third main section contains the findings of the project resulting from the application of RESISTIRÉ gender+ perspective to the national recovery and resilience plans. The final section looks ahead and identifies the challenges and lessons learned to incorporate intersectionality in policy-making in times of crisis. Despite the fact that Europe has a solid formulation of equality policies, the conclusions reached at the end of this chapter highlight the inconsistency between the political discourse and the practical implementation of equality policies, and even more so of intersectional approaches in the recovery-related policies put in place in the aftermath of the COVID-19 pandemic.

Difficulties in incorporating intersectionality in policymaking: A review

Intersectionality can be broadly defined as the interaction of different axes of power (gender, race, class, etc.) which create differentiated positions of relative privilege or oppression. The inclusion of an intersectional perspective or an intersectional analysis has become a requirement for credible research in various areas of social sciences, especially when researching inequality or equality policies. Notwithstanding this success, the lingering controversies over its meaning, scope, and strength point out the complexity of this notion. The term ‘intersectionality’ coined by Kimberlé Crenshaw in 1989, captured a problem that has accompanied the feminist movement almost since its inception: the differences between women resulting from other axes of inequality. For example, already in 1891 or 1892, faced with the refusal of liberal feminists to accept legal protections for working women, Eleanor Marx replied that Mrs. Fawcett (leader of the most conservative of the liberal suffragist organisations, the NUWSS) and a washerwoman had no more in common than Rothschild and one of his employees (Draper & Lipow, 1976, p. 225).

The problem of intersectionality posed by Crenshaw at the end of the 1980s picked up some difficulties that had emerged within the feminist movements in the USA, especially in the elaboration of Black feminist groups. Some authors have shown how understandings of intersectionality varied geographically, especially between the more systemic approach that characterised the US approach,

and a UK or European approach, which attributed a key role to subjectivity (Prins, 2006; Bilge, 2010). In Europe, intersectionality is mostly understood as a form of conceptualising identity and experiences of oppression (Nash, 2008; Morondo, 2016). This conceptualisation resonates with what Crenshaw termed ‘political intersectionality’ (Crenshaw, 1991, p. 1252ff), that is, the relevance of inequalities and their interaction in the political strategies of social groups, and the realisation that strategies related to one axis are rarely neutral in relation to other axes of inequality. For example, the persisting gender roles in care work have traditionally intersected with class, and currently also with migrant status, shifting the burden of gendered care duties from European women to migrant women, who often must leave their own families behind. The need to pay attention to this intersection of power hierarchies has become increasingly present in feminist vindications, denouncing the shift of the care duties from wealthier European women to poorer migrant women as a false solution to the gender care gap.

On the other hand, ‘structural intersectionality’, that is, how the interaction of axes of oppression makes experiences of discrimination or violence different (Crenshaw, 1991, p. 1245ff) has been accorded little space. Already in 2009, Lombardo and Verloo pointed to the institutionalisation of political intersectionality in the EU, and the intersectional dynamics between civil society and institutions as the two main developing fields in intersectional studies (Lombardo & Verloo, 2009). Another reason for the preference given to ‘political intersectionality’ is the indeterminacy of the meaning of intersectionality. Whereas conceptual difficulties with the term do not prevent the study of the interaction or alliances between different groups (feminist, migrants, LGBTIQI+, etc.), the ever-changing content of intersectionality – both diversity and inequality, life experiences and discrimination, power relations and circumstances – makes it much more difficult to study its structural or systemic aspects (Barrère & Morondo, 2016).

The success of the notion of intersectionality has been uneven. From a theoretical perspective, the notion started to be criticised on different accounts in the late 2000s. Some authors (Phoenix & Pattynama, 2006; Nash, 2008; Conaghan, 2009) did not appreciate the inconsistency and ambiguity that others had considered the reason for its scientific success (Davis, 2008). And – while very few advocated the abandonment of the notion – many suggested a thorough reconsideration. Furthermore, there were serious doubts about its application outside the Academia. Legally, there was no prohibition of intersectional discrimination and various reports commissioned by the European institutions warned of the difficulties in operationalising such a prohibition (Burri & Schiek, 2009). A good part of the work on intersectionality was carried out in the fields of political

sciences and sociology, particularly in the analysis of public policies. Since the mid-2000s, the European Commission started to fund projects which studied the application and scope of intersectionality with a European and comparative vocation, primarily in the context of gender equality policies through methodologies for the assessment of policy formulation (Lombardo & Verloo, 2009; Lombardo & Rolandsen, 2012; Krizsán et al., 2012).

The research pointed out some limitations both regarding the space accorded to intersectionality in European policies, and in relation to the effects of the application of this notion. To begin with, the approach adopted by the European Union was that of 'multiple inequality' (different inequalities were just added one to another) rather than intersectionality. This meant that, in the formulation of policies, the intersection of different axes was not well articulated and its relations with other instruments of equality policies, in particular gender mainstreaming, were ambivalent (Lombardo & Rolandsen, 2012). Research findings pointed to a 'degendering' effect in public policy and a 'watering down' of gender equality policies as a result of the 'multiple equality' approach (Lombardo & Verloo, 2010; Lombardo & Rolandsen, 2012; Barrère, 2010), which in turn created resistances both in the feminist movement as well as in other subordinated groups. Although in Crenshaw's original formulation intersectionality was intended to improve identity politics and antidiscrimination law, its application in the European Union was fuelling competition among discriminated groups, through a differentiated and fragmented patchwork of protection where categories instead of being overcome were reinforced: the question of which categories one belongs to (or is considered to belong to) is increasingly relevant, when only some categories are protected, and the protection that is offered to different categories is unequal (Verloo, 2013, p. 899). The competition fuelled by the multiplication of grounds of discrimination/marginalisation and the fragmentation produced by policy of multiply discriminated groups does not only affect political intersectionality (that is, potential alliances among groups which are now competing for attention or limited resources), but it also makes it difficult to identify and address common structures or dynamics of discrimination and violence, since the identity of the group is established by reinforcing differences with other groups and downplaying differences within the group.

This has led to repeated calls to 'rethink' how intersectionality was done. On the one hand, it is necessary to prevent 'degendering' effects without essentialising the role of sex or gender in policy formulation or policy analysis. On the other hand, it is necessary to try to catch up with structural issues of inequality and disempowerment, which transcend the individual or even collective experiences of those 'multiply burdened'.

The gender+ framework in RESISTIRÉ

Building on existing debates around the application of intersectionality in public policy and the academic literature (Hankivsky et al., 2014), RESISTIRÉ has embraced a specific approach to intersectionality, called ‘gender+’, which draws on the contributions of Verloo (2013) and Walby and colleagues (2012). The gender+ approach recognises gender as an organising principle and analyses it as always intersecting with other inequalities of race/ethnicity, class, age, disability, and sexuality. This approach is considered as particularly significant in the analysis of the impact on inequalities of policy responses to COVID-19. The research approach adopted is rooted in the principles of Feminist (New) Institutionalism, as articulated by Mackay and colleagues (2010). This perspective views institutions as a pivotal factor in shaping political dynamics and informs our policy-making process. It also addresses the conventional dichotomy between structure and agency by recognising them as mutually constitutive elements within the realm of political analysis, influencing societal change. Within this framework, change is conceptualised as ‘bounded agency’, as explained by Mackay and colleagues (2010, p. 583), where strategic actors initiate transformations while operating within a framework of opportunities and constraints (Cibin & Linkova, 2023). Furthermore, this approach underscores the gendered nature of relations and institutions. It emphasises that both formal and informal institutions carry gendered aspects that warrant examination through a feminist lens.

With this approach, RESISTIRÉ developed an analysis of 26 NRRPs, including the EU27 minus Malta (hereinafter EU26). Four countries that are not part of the EU27 group and therefore do not participate in the allocation of funds linked to the Recovery and Resilience Facility were also analysed (Iceland, Serbia, Türkiye and the UK). In these cases, policies (and a project, in the case of Türkiye) dealing with post-pandemic recovery and resilience were considered, instead of the NRRPs.

Analytically, RESISTIRÉ drew on an intersectionality-based policy analysis framework (Hankivsky et al., 2014), which had emerged to advance understanding of the differential impacts of health policies in producing inclusive and socially just health outcomes. Empirically, RESISTIRÉ used the policy domains outlined in the European Commission’s Gender Equality Strategy 2020–2025 (EC, 2020a), namely ending gender-based violence; challenging gender stereotypes; closing gender gaps in the labour market; achieving equal participation across different sectors of the economy; addressing the gender pay and pension gaps; closing the gender care gap and achieving gender balance in decision-making and in politics. Additionally, drawing from the Beijing Platform for

Action (1995), the domains of fundamental human rights, and environmental justice were included, because of their relevance on health inequalities. While the previous dimensions fall under the definition of human rights, the project analytically separated the latter, and eventually focused on two specific rights: the right to health and the right to education (Cibin et al., 2022, p. 12).

From a methodological perspective, the analysis implied that, firstly, national researchers (NRs) were tasked with examining the most recent versions of NRRPs or equivalent policies selected for the non-EU group, whether they were in draft or final form, using a gender+ approach. During the analysis period, the majority of these plans had already received approval from the European Commission, except for Hungary, Poland, and Sweden, which were still undergoing evaluation. Bulgaria's plan, on the other hand, had been returned for revisions. In the case of the Netherlands, due to issues surrounding the formation of a new government, no plan was available for analysis. Therefore, the analysis was based on a draft plan prepared by the outgoing government, with the expectation that it would undergo minimal changes under the new government since it comprised the same political parties. For countries outside the EU, NRs were tasked with identifying policies with objectives similar to those of NRRPs, specifically aimed at socioeconomic recovery from the pandemic's impact. These policies were proposed by NRs and selected through consultation with the main author of the report and other consortium partners³.

Using a specific questionnaire, NRs were asked to address: the content of the plans, the policy process, and the reactions of civil society organisations (CSOs) to the plans. For the purposes of this chapter, the analysis is focused on the content of the plans (for further elaboration, see Cibin et al., 2022).

In relation to the content of the plans, the questionnaire asked first about the projects, actions, or measures that addressed sex-gender inequalities in the domains of the project (e.g., gender-based violence, work and labour market, economy, etc.), putting an emphasis on any explicit mention of intersecting grounds. Then, the questionnaire inquired about the measures that mitigated inequalities for other vulnerable groups, defined by the inequality grounds of race/ethnicity, class, age, disability, nationality, religion or belief, sexual orientation, gender identity, or other grounds the researcher might identify. Again, the researcher was asked to mention explicit references to intersections among these grounds. A summary of the researcher's assessment was also included, where

3 The list of the policies analysed in the non-EU27 countries is in Cibin et al. (2022, p. 14).

the overall orientation of the NRRP from a gender+ perspective was described, highlighting, when possible, the explicit reference of any measures introduced to address the needs made evident during the pandemic.

For the analysis of the plan's content, NRs were not required to read and analyse the document in its entirety. Instead, they were instructed to search for relevant information within the plan itself and any attached documentation. This could be accomplished by referring to the plan's index, reviewing introductory sections, and conducting keyword searches (e.g., gender, inequalities, minorities, etc.). The data collection and analysis took place between December 2021 and January 2022.

A recovery without gender+: Insights from RESISTIRÉ

As indicated above, this section presents the findings of the analysis carried out on the content of the recovery plans (and equivalent policies in non-EU countries). It first sets out the limitations inherent to the Recovery and Resilience Facility, the normative framework that underpins the drafting of the plans, as a preliminary step to the subsequent analysis of the national plans. The section then illustrates the core findings from the analysis of the national recovery and resilience plans, examining to what extent the plans introduce measures to tackle gender+ inequalities, and how are these inequalities understood.

The struggles over gender in the recovery and resilience facility

According to the Regulation establishing the Recovery and Resilience Facility (EU, 2021), the national recovery plans should address a broad set of challenges, identified in six pillars: green transition; digital transformation; smart, sustainable and inclusive growth; social and territorial cohesion; health, economic, social and institutional resilience (with a focus on crisis responsiveness); and policies for the next generation. The European Commission mandated that 37% of the planned expenditures should contribute to climate transition, with a minimum of 20% allocated to digital transition (Cibin et al., 2022). Conversely, gender equality was not included as a pillar, thus it was not allocated a specific budget.

Instead, gender equality was mentioned in the preamble as a cross-cutting priority, acknowledging *women* as one of the social groups most severely impacted by the COVID-19 crisis. The Recovery and Resilience Facility identified the mitigation of the pandemic's social and economic consequences, particularly on *women*, as a central objective. It emphasised that Member States should

incorporate gender equality objectives throughout the planning and implementation stages of their recovery and resilience plans, therefore mentioning gender mainstreaming. Furthermore, it underscored the significance of investing in robust care infrastructure to promote gender equality and women's economic empowerment, enabling greater female participation in paid work and, consequently, positively affecting GDP (EU, 2021). However, this mention of the significance of care infrastructure had no legal implications for the use of the funding (Elomäki & Kantola, 2023, p. 343).

In the guidance document for preparing the recovery plans, elaborated by the European Commission on the basis of the Recovery and Resilience Facility Regulation (EC, 2021), it was clarified that Member States were expected to substantiate how the measures identify significant national gender equality challenges, especially those exacerbated by the pandemic, elucidate how their proposed reforms and investments will address these issues, ensure that gender equality objectives are integrated across all six pillars, and present gender-disaggregated data whenever feasible (EU, 2021). The guidance document also underscored the relevance of aligning plans with the European Pillar of Social Rights, the UN Sustainable Development Goal 5 on gender equality, national gender equality strategies, and the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and the rights of other vulnerable populations.

Despite these references to gender equality and gender mainstreaming, it is argued that the Recovery and Resilience Facility did not create the conditions to properly mainstream gender equality in the recovery plans, nor it mentioned intersectionality, despite it being a cross-cutting principle of the EU Gender Equality Strategy (EIGE, 2023, p. 49). Among the main shortcomings of the Recovery and Resilience Facility, gender equality did not receive a dedicated budget, and didn't appear among the eleven primary criteria used by the European Commission to assess the plans (Sapala, 2021). Additionally, no reference was made to the care sector, which has been disproportionately affected by the pandemic and is often associated with women's responsibilities (Barry & Jennings, 2021, p. 73).

These shortcomings can be explained by the political struggles that surrounded the earlier debates on the recovery fund at the European institutional level. While the European Commission's proposal only mentioned gender equality cursorily, without establishing objectives or requirements for the recovery fund (EC, 2020b), the European Parliament achieved to integrate gender equality at least to some extent. Despite urgent procedures set up during the crisis, and restrictions on parliamentary work, a coordinated effort of feminist members of the economic and budgetary committees from different political

parties succeeded to include gender in the recovery fund (Elomäki & Kantola, 2023). In the struggle, however, 'gender-related' issues were diluted into the concern for 'women', and care economy and the care deal were side-lined.

Overall, advocacy efforts and pressures from civil society (Sapala, 2021; Klatzer & Rinaldi, 2020), along with the intervention of the European Parliament proved to be crucial. According to Elomäki and Kantola (2023), gender mainstreaming seemed to work in the context of the pandemic crisis policymaking, despite the hostility characterising the field of economic policy, and opposition by some political parties.

As argued in Cibin and colleagues (2022, p. 18), existing discussions and literature on gender equality in the national recovery plans have highlighted the underrepresentation of women's perspective, implementation difficulties concerning gender equality objectives, and the potential risk of job creation primarily benefiting men, who are disproportionately represented in the sectors of the green and digital transitions (Sapala, 2021). Moreover, a cross-country comparative study noted how gender equality is side-lined in most of the plans, with substantial differences across countries, which reflect their pre-pandemic performance on gender equality (Zarra & Ceron, 2021). Both Zapala and Ceron (2021), and EIGE (2023) identified the Spanish plan as one of the best performers, and the only one explicitly mentioning intersectionality as a cross-cutting approach to the plan. Yet, despite the plan's professed dedication to intersectionality, it fails to address the specific inequalities experienced by lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, and intersex (LGBTQI+) individuals, and include measures to address them (EIGE, 2023, p. 52).

The analysis of the national recovery and resilience plans

The primary objective of RESISTIRÉ analysis was to determine whether the recovery plans and similar policies adequately addressed gender inequalities and related disparities within the context of the project's approach, especially those exacerbated during the pandemic.

As noted above, previous analyses of recovery plans raised concerns about the insufficient level of gender mainstreaming in the plans. The primary finding of our analysis indicates that the documents under scrutiny often addressed gender-related issues and vulnerable groups in a vague and generalised manner or as secondary outcomes of measures aimed at achieving other objectives (Cibin et al., 2022, p. 19).

The central focus of attention in the plans was the domain of work and the labour market, mentioned in 81% of the plans (21 plans), followed by education,

with 77% (20 plans), and the gender care gap, acknowledged in 73% (19 plans). Despite the increased attention to gender-based violence during the pandemic, the majority of plans neglected this issue, with only 31% of the plans (8 in total) including measures in this regard. Similarly, the domains of environmental justice and decision-making and politics received relatively less attention, with 46% (12 plans) and 42% (11 plans) respectively (Cibin et al., 2022, p. 19).

As to the inequality grounds, age is the most present inequality addressed in the plans (25 plans), followed by social class/socioeconomic background (24 plans), and disability (81% of the plans). Nationality and ethnicity appear in nearly half of the plans. NRs stressed the presence of factors such as geography (e.g., urban vs rural) and employment status, which can be associated to intersecting inequalities of race and class, but also inequalities related to digital access, the consequences of being prisoners, and health status (Cibin et al., 2022, p. 22). Remarkable absences are religion and belief, gender identity, and sexual orientation, which are almost completely neglected in the plans.

Several points of concern were identified regarding the way the NRRPs deal with gender+ issues, ranging from the complete lack of measures to the presence of mere general statements and a lack of concrete actions. After exploring those shortcomings, the following paragraphs will review those measures that have been identified as positive examples in terms of attention to gender+ issues, based on the assessment of national researchers.

As mentioned above, the analysis indicates a general absence of the use of a gender+ approach among the various plans and policies observed (e.g., in Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, France, Greece, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Sweden), showing how intersectionality is still relegated to academic research and far from being explicitly acknowledged in policymaking. The only plan explicitly mentioning intersectionality is the Spanish one, although as mentioned above, EIGE raised some concerns as to the absence of measures addressing LGBTIQ+ inequalities. The absence of gender+ reflects a general resistance to acknowledging gender equality at all. Indeed, NRs pointed out that in some of the recovery plans, there is a struggle over the use of terms like 'gender equality' (e.g., Türkiye), and intersecting inequalities are not specifically named. This was the case for the French plan which used the term 'inequality of opportunity' (and sometimes of 'destiny'), concerning 'vulnerable groups' in general, a category used to point at socioeconomic and ethnicity grounds, as the French NR pointed out. Yet, words like 'migrant', 'refugee', 'nationality', 'religion', and 'sexual orientation' do not appear in the text.

As the German NR put it, the + perspective was missing, because 'there is no relation made to e.g., women with migratory background or women with

disabilities. All the additional perspectives on gender (refugees, social inequality, etc.) are mentioned separately but without referring in particular to gender' (DE_NR).⁴ Following a similar line, the Hungarian NR derives the lack of gender+ approach from the 'lack of reforms and measures planned for the various target groups of women particularly affected by the epidemic' (HU_NR) (see also the Bulgarian one). These two assessments represent a generalised view among NRs about gender+ as the presence of measures targeting specific subgroups of women, what has been called political intersectionality, or an understanding of intersectionality in terms of 'identity politics'.

In most cases when gender+ issues surfaced in the texts, this occurred through general statements that acknowledged their existence in a specific national context and the importance of addressing them. Yet declarations remain superficial and do not lead to the development of concrete solutions to gender+ inequalities. For example, the NR from Iceland found a lack of concrete measures to mitigate gender+ inequalities and in particular notes that '[...] the government needs to more firmly address gender+ inequalities in relation to, e.g., unpaid care work, GBV, poverty, and health issues' (IS_NR).

Some NRs frame this issue as a rhetorical use of gender equality as an empty vessel: on paper, some plans are even well-written texts that refer to gender+ inequalities (Finland) and claim to adopt measures with a positive impact in curbing them. Yet, measures are so vague that it is not possible to assess their impact on reducing gender gaps (e.g., Austria, Bulgaria, Lithuania). In relation to the Spanish plan, CSOs spoke of a 'pink washing' operation, since the claims made in the plan are not followed by concrete measures and investments (Cibin et al., 2022, p. 104).

Another criticism regards insufficient or absent funding allocation to gender-sensitive measures, which makes the measures ineffective from the start. The NR from the UK notes that the funding available to finance hubs that support disadvantaged families does not fully compensate for the cuts made before the pandemic. Funds to address female genital mutilation are also scarce and temporary, as their availability is not guaranteed after 2022. There is no discussion of the long-term sustainability of these actions. Similarly, in Spain, it is observed that

4 The quotations in this section are taken from the questionnaires completed by national researchers. To identify the author of the quotation, reference is made to the country code, followed by the acronym used for national researchers (NRs), as in Cibin et al. (2022, p. 15).

limited funding allocation to the pillar on social policies, as opposed to green and digital transition, is unsuited to the objectives allegedly pursued.

Sectorial treatment of gender+ issues is also observed. When dealt with, gender+ is mostly addressed in the field of social policies, but neglected in the domains of economy, energy efficiency/environment. Gender impacts are more clearly developed and connected to concrete measures when it comes to housing and the labour market domains (e.g., Portugal, Estonia).

A 'silos' approach persisted across some of the plans, with measures tackling specific vulnerable groups, but overlooking intersectional aspects. As the Portuguese NR put it, 'inequalities are addressed by items, forgetting that often they accumulate in the same person' (PT_NR). In the Bulgarian plan, for example, the NR identified measures addressing social class, age, and disability as inequality grounds, without addressing any intersection with gender. In this line, the Greek NR pointed out that training measures aimed at increasing digital skills among the elderly, training for the integration of refugees and Greek Roma, as well as training for STEM among high school children, with a gender quota established for girls, prioritised or focused on specific vulnerable groups.

There are exceptions, nonetheless. Some plans tried to acknowledge the relevance of intersecting inequalities and illustrate the positive impact that some measures would have on those inequalities. This is the case, particularly with measures that tackle gender and social class, through investments in public transportation, energetic poverty, fuel poverty, social services, and social housing. Improving public transportation and affordable access to it would support women and low-income people, who travel less by car or don't have one (Austrian plan); female-headed households would specifically benefit from measures against energetic poverty and fuel poverty (respectively, the Spanish and French plans). The Austrian plan finds that energy poverty initiatives (modernisation of heating systems through renewable energies, and incentives to social housing providers to invest in modernisation) are beneficial for elderly poor women who cannot afford to pay heating bills. Similarly, the Italian plan describes actions improving social services and social housing as a way to empower women and fight against gender discrimination and gender-based violence 'in the area of material poverty and housing hardship' (IT_NR). Similarly, the Croatian NR indicated as a gender+ measure the allocation of 50% of the Guaranteed Minimum Income Benefit (GMIB) for 'homeless people, survivors of violence, and victims of crisis who are accommodated in shelters during the crisis' (HR_NR).

Other measures in which the NRs found an intersectional dimension are those regarding the labour market. These are generally measures targeting specific groups (e.g., single mothers, victims of violence, long-term unemployed)

and improving their access to the labour market (Croatia). The Greek plan foresaw a series of measures to increase diversity in the labour market, such as strengthening the body that collects data on diversity in the labour market, introducing incentives for companies that hire more workers from diverse groups, to enhance intersectional diversity, and developing a horizontal training program to promote diversity in the labour market. Mainstreaming gender in active employment policies is also flagged as a sector with potential intersectional impacts, as the policy expressly tackles ageism and discrimination against long-term unemployed adults, and youth unemployment (Spain). Additionally, the Spanish plan foresaw measures to foster the employability of women in rural areas, and of victims of violence.

Initiatives to improve childcare services, thus addressing the gender care gap and supporting the integration of women with children in the labour market are also found in Greece under the measures with an intersectional lens. The Greek plan aimed to create new child-care units (especially for children under the age of two), including day care centres in private companies, and a special program of care for children with disability. In the Slovakian plan, it is argued that measures for improving care services (particularly early development care, and early childhood education) target both children and their mothers, potentially improving the Roma women's position in their communities and in the labour market. Moreover, initiatives to prevent early school dropouts consider girls' vulnerability to domestic violence or early pregnancy. Conversely, some measures to improve childcare services are regarded as insufficient to tackle intersecting inequalities. For example, while pursuing equal opportunities 'regardless of background', the UK policy 'Recovery Premium and Schools COVID-19 Operational Guidance' only allocates specific funds and extra support for those with disabilities and special educational needs, neglecting the 'specific issues of children and young people in regard to gender, sexual orientation, gender identity, race and ethnicity, religion or nationality' (UK_NR). The German plan foresees measures to extend childcare for children who need to strengthen their competences, and the creation of childcare spaces open beyond the traditional working hours. Yet, gender-sensitive measures are limited to 'broader child-care', and the '+ perspective' is missing, as the NR argued. Instead, the 'New Care Economy' policy, foreseen in the Spanish plan, does not seem to address patterns of gender+ inequalities at the intersection with racialisation, particularly concerning the informal care sector.

In the domain of health, the only plan that specifically foresaw the improvement of working conditions and salaries of workers in the health system, the majority of whom are women, was the French one. Other interventions in this

field mainly focused on incorporating digital technologies as a solution to allow 'vulnerable groups to receive medical consultations during the pandemic' (Denmark). Some intersections between sex/gender, ethnicity, and social class are found in the Romanian plan, which foresaw the introduction of ten mobile medical units to screen for breast and cervical cancer, which will be used in disadvantaged areas with a focus on Roma communities.

Intersections without gender are also found in measures directed at fighting energy poverty in households where people with disability live (Cyprus), and in statements acknowledging the risk of discrimination in the labour market and unemployment for young adults and people with a migratory background (Germany). The concern for youth and employment is found also in the Estonian plan, which mentions the importance of focusing on young people without higher education degrees. Instead, the Dutch draft is concerned with young people with lower socioeconomic backgrounds, but measures addressing this are mentioned only once in the plan. In the domain of education, the Spanish plan foresaw investments in centres for unaccompanied migrant children and children with special needs. Additional pedagogical support for vulnerable children between 0 and 5 years old is found in the Danish plan.

While neither gender nor the '+' are explicitly addressed in most plans, NRs found actions that could have an indirect positive impact on these issues. Changes in the healthcare system, and particularly long-term care, and working conditions, are found to have an impact on women, due to the structure of the labour market (Poland, Slovenia). As the Estonian NR argued, 'at present care of the elderly is largely shouldered by families and falls on women; thus, this reform has a strong gender+ impact, even if it is not highlighted in the text explicitly' (EE_NR). The NR from Iceland noticed that some actions that relate to economic protection and financing of health and elderly care services could have a positive impact on gender+ equality. It is found that general social cohesion measures are also supposed to produce indirect benefits for unidentified social groups (Italy). Other aspects are highlighted as positive, such as having gender equality and attention to youth as cross-cutting strategies (Italy), or strengthening digital competencies (Slovenia). In some cases, the use of the term 'gender equality' instead of equal opportunities is regarded as a positive step forward (Romania), and even though gender mainstreaming was not fully implemented across all areas, 'the very presence of many gender+ dimensions' is a positive development (Estonia).

Looking ahead: Challenges and lessons learned to incorporate intersectionality in policy-making in times of crisis

The lessons learned from the analysis performed by RESISTIRÉ offer valuable insights that can inspire a more inclusive approach to crisis management, placing intersectionality at the forefront. RESISTIRÉ's analysis shows that a siloed approach is still prevalent in policymaking, although highly unsuited to tackle structures and mechanisms that mutually reinforce each other.

Looking at the framework designed by Hankivsky and colleagues (2014), there are several shortcomings that prevent a thorough intersectionality-based analysis. In particular, most of the plans dismiss gender equality in few lines with cursory assessments of the problem and limited (if any) data to support the statements made on gender impacts. This makes it difficult to ask the first 'descriptive questions' about the plans under analysis, namely what is the problem represented to be in the plan, how has this representation come about, how are groups differentially affected by such understanding of the problem, and what are the current policy solutions in place to address it (Hankivsky et al., 2014).

This is a first telling indication that gender mainstreaming was not carried out, starting from its absence in the Recovery and Resilience Facility. The absence of gender mainstreaming negatively affected the possibility to incorporate intersectionality, understood as a gender+ approach to intersecting inequalities. For gender mainstreaming to be effectively implemented, it is crucial to build the support structure, with allocated resources, and create and sustain the competencies among people, to enable and sustain transformation of practices and institutions (EIGE, 2016), even or especially in times of crisis. Future crisis management plans should adopt a mainstream approach to intersectionality, recognising and addressing the challenges faced by individuals and groups at the intersections of various inequalities. This involves considering diverse expertise in policy formulation. Moreover, thorough gender mainstreaming would avoid the sectorial integration of gender+ to specific fields, which leaves unquestioned the domains where gendered inequalities are more entrenched (e.g., economy).

A key aspect for effective gender mainstreaming is the funding allocation. Inadequate funding undermines the effectiveness of measures. As highlighted in the previous section, gender equality was not included as one of the pillars of the RRF, nor was it allocated specific funding. Policymakers should commit to sufficient and sustained funding for gender-sensitive, intersectional and inclusive measures. Fostering the long-term impact of such funding is crucial for building resilient societies. In Linková and colleagues (2022), it was recommended that

rules to distribute funds under the recovery scheme ‘tie concrete mechanisms and criteria of gender mainstreaming to concrete actions, measures, and responsibilities, beyond general rhetoric and contextual information.’ This approach would compel governments to develop concrete actions and carry out thorough gender impact assessments of the policy outcomes proposed.

Despite these shortcomings, NRs have identified measures that address gender+ inequalities. When assessing a policy in terms of gender+ or intersectional approach, a tendency to look for measures targeting specific subgroups of women or vulnerable groups was observed, among the NRs. This approach exemplifies one of the different understandings of intersectionality, namely intersection of identities, or intersection of strands, as understood in policy analysis (Christoffersen, 2021). Oftentimes, NRs mapped the presence of measures addressing separate inequality grounds, thus looking into another understanding of intersectionality (multiple, additive approach, or multi strand). Conversely, in the case of the recovery plans, it was difficult to carry out a broader analysis of the impact of the measures in terms of their ability to change the intersecting structures of power, thus addressing the structural understanding of intersectionality.

As it appears from the section above, most of the measures NRs identified as intersectional or potentially addressing gender+ inequalities focused on gender and social class, with an emphasis on the domains of the labour market, the gender care gap, and access to social services. However, some of the proposed solutions, namely digitalisation, and training, which appear to be magic wands able to solve long-term structural issues, are problematic and reveal stereotyped assumptions underpinning the problem representation. For example, presenting measures such as training for women, migrants or the youth as an effective action to overcome inequalities in the labour market conveys the idea that inequalities stem from the lack of competencies of these groups. Besides lacking empirical support, this argument overshadows the structural mechanisms that prevent women and other vulnerable groups from accessing the labour market or remaining in it.

An in-depth analysis of problem representation and its outcomes often requires time to be fully articulated and this wasn’t possible for several reasons. First, the plans themselves lacked in-depth information on the concrete measures proposed, and they usually did not use gender mainstreaming tools to gather data and properly assess the gender impacts of the foreseen actions. As a result, NRs were confronted with limited information to carry out a thorough analysis and focused their attention on those measures that explicitly targeted subgroups of women or specific intersectional identities.

Lack of information was also coupled with limited time allocated to analyse the plans themselves, which were usually extremely long documents. To facilitate NRs' task, it was suggested to look for specific keywords in the document, to have a general overview of the content and grasp explicit mentions of gender and intersectional issues. This approach necessarily limited the depth of the analysis that could be carried out in terms of the non-explicit impacts of policies on gender+ issues. Moreover, the questionnaire sought to collect a large amount of information on relevant measures in the nine domains of the project, looking at gender and its intersection with nine inequality grounds. Thus, a words limit was set for the replies in each section of the questionnaire, to ensure the feasibility of the subsequent data analysis. Due to these elements, the resulting assessments could be partial or rather focused on the key (or more visible) aspects of the plan. A recommendation for future research projects that address intersectionality-based policy analysis is the need for more time and space, to thoroughly articulate the structural aspects and impacts of the policies under analysis. Indeed, the complexity of intersectionality-based policy analysis indicates that time and resources are needed to gather meaningful results.

In terms of policymaking, RESISTIRÉ has shed light on the importance to embed intersectionality in policy language. However, this wouldn't be enough, without an explicit acknowledgement of intersecting inequalities and their impact in practice. Policy solutions should be aimed at addressing these inequalities, both in their design and implementation phase. This aspect is all the more essential in the crisis context, to avoid policy responses that exacerbate existing inequalities and ensure that they redress them instead. In RESISTIRÉ, a specific approach to intersectionality was suggested, with gender as the fixed axis that intersect with other inequalities of class, race, age, disability, etc. Such understanding allows avoiding the risk of diluting attention to gender issues, while incorporating intersectionality (Barrère, 2010). Indeed, when incorporating intersectional concerns, the analysis often risks losing sight of gender as the primary inequality, or anchor, and shifts the attention onto general vulnerable groups, identified by one or more intersecting inequality grounds. The category of 'vulnerable group' then tends to polarise the attention on the individual's or the group's unique experiences, rather than the mechanisms or structures that placed them at disadvantage, which should be the target of policy action.

Furthermore, while attention to certain subgroups of women, placed at the intersection of several axes of inequality (e.g., rural women, elderly women, racialised women), is an important step towards recognising the complex reality of inequality, the risk of atomising experiences should be taken into account (McCrudden, 2011).

COVID-19 was a public health crisis, and showed that health policies often lack gender-sensitive components. Future health crisis management plans should explicitly address gender disparities, considering the unique healthcare needs of diverse groups. This includes recognising the intersection of gender with race/ethnicity, class, and other inequality grounds and getting inspiration from successful measures identified in the analysis. Other initiatives addressing public transportation, energy efficiency, childcare services, and labour market diversity can also serve as models for future crisis management plans.

Moving beyond policy design, a key issue for the assessment of the plans will be the implementation phase, and the extent to which a gender+ approach will be integrated into the process of monitoring and evaluation (Linková et al., 2022, p. 3). Policy actors should commit to ongoing evaluation of crisis management plans, adapting strategies based on feedback and changing circumstances. This iterative process ensures responsiveness to evolving intersectional challenges. It is crucial that the monitoring and evaluation process foreseen by the European Commission take into account a gender+ approach (Linková et al., 2022).

If the RESISTIRÉ analysis has made one thing clear, it is that civil society plays a crucial role in holding policymakers accountable. Future crisis management plans should actively involve civil society organisations, ensuring diverse voices are heard, and intersectional coalitions are built, in order to guarantee the adoption of equitable solutions.

References

- Barrère, M. A. (2010). La interseccionalidad como desafío al mainstreaming de género en las políticas públicas. *Revista Vasca de Administración Pública*, 87–88, 225252. <https://doi.org/10.47623/ivap-rvap.87.88.2010.07>.
- Barrère, M. A., & Morondo, D. (2016). Introducing intersectionality into antidiscrimination law and equality policies in Spain. Competing frameworks and differentiated prospects. *Sociologia del Diritto*, 2, 169–190. <https://doi.org/10.3280/sd2016-002010>.
- Barry, U., & Jennings, C. (2021). *Gender equality: Economic value of care from the perspective of the applicable EU funds: An exploration of an EU strategy towards valuing the care economy*. European Parliament.
- Bilge, S. (2010). Recent feminist outlooks on intersectionality. *Diogenes*, 225, 58–72. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0392192110374245>.
- Bonaccorsi, G., Pierri, F., Cinelli, M., Flori, A., Galeazzi, A., Porcelli, F., Schmidt, A. L., Valensise, C. M., Scala, A., Quattrociochi, W., & Pammolli, F. (2020). Economic and social consequences of human mobility restrictions under

- COVID-19. In *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 117(27), 15530–15535. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2007658117>.
- Burri, S., & Schiek, D. (2009). *Multiple discrimination in EU law. Opportunities for legal responses to intersectional gender discrimination*. European Commission. <https://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=3808&langId=en>.
- Christoffersen, A. (2021). The politics of intersectional practice: Competing concepts of intersectionality. *Policy & Politics*, 49(4), 573–593. <https://doi.org/10.1332/030557321X16194316141034>.
- Cibin, R., Ghidoni, E., Aristegui-Fradua, I. E., Marañón, U. B., Stöckelová, T., & Linková, M. (2022). *Summary report on mapping cycle 2. RESISTIRÉ D2.2*. Zenodo. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6536060>.
- Cibin, R., & Linková, M. (2023). *Overall reporting on WP2. RESISTIRÉ D2.4*. Zenodo. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.8390404>.
- Conaghan, J. (2009). Intersectionality and the feminist project. In E. Grabham, D. Cooper, J. Krishnadas & D. Herman (Eds.), *Intersectionality and beyond. Law, power and the politics of location* (pp. 21–48). Routledge-Cavendish.
- Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review*, 43(6), 1241–1299. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1229039>.
- Crescenzi, R., Guia, M., & Sonzogno, G. V. (2021). Mind the covid-19 crisis: An evidence-based implementation of next generation EU. *Journal of Policy Modelling*, 43(2), 278–97. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpolmod.2021.03.002>.
- Cumming, C., Wood, L., & Davies, A. (2020). People experiencing homelessness urgently need to be recognised as a high-risk group for COVID-19. *Health Promotion Journal of Australia*, 32, 359–360. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hpja.355>.
- Davis, K. (2008). Intersectionality as buzzword: A sociology of science perspective on what makes a feminist theory successful. *Feminist Theory*, 9(1), 67–85. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1464700108086364>.
- Draper, H., & Lipow, A. (1976). Marxist women versus bourgeois feminism. *The Socialist Register*, 13, 179–226. <https://socialistregister.com/index.php/srv/article/view/5399>.
- Elomäki, A., & Kantola, J. (2023). Feminist governance in the European Parliament: The political struggle over the inclusion of gender in the EU's COVID-19 response. *Politics & Gender*, 19(2), 327–348. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1743923X21000544>.
- European Commission. (2020a). Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions. A union of equality: Gender

- equality strategy 2020–2025. COM(2020) 152 final. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52020DC0152>.
- European Commission. (2020b). Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing a Recovery and Resilience Facility. COM(2020) 408 final. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/resource.html?uri=cellar:1813ea3d-a0be-11ea-9d2d-01aa75ed71a1.0001.02/DOC_1&format=PDF.
- European Commission. (2021). European Commission staff working document guidance to Member States recovery and resilience plans (SWD) (2021) 12 Final, 21 January 2021. <https://data.consilium.europa.eu/doc/document/ST-5538-2021-INIT/en/pdf>
- European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE). (2016). *Institutional transformation: Gender mainstreaming toolkit*. Publications Office of the European Union. <https://doi.org/10.2839/559119>
- European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE). (2023). *Evidence to action: Gender equality and gender mainstreaming in the COVID-19 recovery*. Publications Office of the European Union. <https://doi.org/10.2839/05678>
- European Network of Equality Bodies (EQUINET). (2021). *The role of equality bodies during the COVID-19 pandemic*. https://equineteurope.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/equinet_covid19-factsheet-A4_DEF.pdf
- EU. (2021). Article 18(4)(o), Regulation (EU) 2021/241 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 February 2021 Establishing the Recovery and Resilience Facility [2021] OJ L 57/17. <http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2021/241/oj/eng>.
- Hankivsky, O., Grace, D., Hunting, G., Giesbrecht, M., Fridkin, A., Rudrum, S., Ferlatte, O., & Clark, N. (2014). An intersectionality-based policy analysis framework: Critical reflections on a methodology for advancing equity. *International Journal for Equity in Health*, 13(119), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12939-014-0119-x>.
- Klatzer, E., & Rinaldi, A. (2020). *Next generation EU leaves women behind. Gender impact assessment on the EC proposal for The# NextGenerationEU*. Study commissioned by the Greens/EFA Group in the European Parliament. https://alexandrageese.eu/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/Gender-Impact-Assessment-NextGenerationEU_Klatzer_Rinaldi_2020.pdf.
- Krizsán, A., Skjeie, H., & Squire, J. (Eds.) (2012). *Institutionalizing intersectionality: The changing nature of European equality regimes*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Linková, M., Kolasinska, A., Cibin, R., Wuiame, N., & Clavero, S. (2022). *RESISTIRÉ Factsheet: The missing perspectives of women in the national recovery and resilience plans*. Zenodo. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7043342>.

- Lombardo, E., & Verloo, M. (2009). Institutionalising intersectionality in the European Union? Policy developments and contestations. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 11(4), 478–495. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616740903237442>.
- Lombardo, E., & Verloo, M. (2010). La ‘interseccionalidad’ del género con otras desigualdades en la política de la Unión Europea. *Revista Española de Ciencia Política*, 23, 11–30. <https://recyt.fecyt.es/index.php/recp/article/view/37496>
- Lombardo, E., & Rolandsen, L. (2012). Framing gender intersections in the European Union: What implications for the quality of intersectionality in policies? *Social Politics*, 19(4), 482–512. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sp/jxr001>.
- Lokot, M., & Avakyan, Y. (2020). Intersectionality as a lens to the COVID-19 pandemic: Implications for sexual and reproductive health in development and humanitarian contexts. *Sexual and Reproductive Health Matters*, 28(1), 1764748. <https://doi.org/10.1080/26410397.2020.1764748>.
- Mackay, F., Kenny, M., & Chappell, L. (2010). New institutionalism through a gender lens: Towards a feminist institutionalism? *International Political Science Review*, 31(5), 573–588. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192512110388788>.
- McCrudden, C. (2011). Introduction. Thinking the unthinkable? *European Gender Equality Law Review*, 1, 3–5. <https://www.equalitylaw.eu/downloads/2796-european-gender-equality-law-review-1-2011>
- Morondo, D. (2016). La interseccionalidad entre teoría del sujeto y perspectiva de análisis: algunos apuntes desde la teoría del derecho antidiscriminatorio. In M. C. La Barbera & M. Cruells López (Eds.), *Igualdad de género y no discriminación en España: evolución, problemas y perspectivas* (pp. 481–500). Centro de Estudios Políticos y Constitucionales.
- Nash, J. (2008). Re-thinking intersectionality. *Feminist Review*, 89, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1057/fr.2008.4>
- Phoenix, A., & Pattynama, P. (2006). Intersectionality. *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 13(3), 187–192. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350506806065751>.
- Prins, B. (2006). Narrative accounts of origins: A blind spot in the intersectional approach? *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 13(3), 277–290. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350506806065757>.
- Rogozanu, C., & Gabor, D. (2020, April 16). Are Western Europe's food supplies worth more than East European's workers health? *The Guardian*. <https://www.theguardian.com/world/commentisfree/2020/apr/16/western-europe-food-east-european-workers-coronavirus>.
- Sapala, M. (2021). *Gender equality in the recovery and resilience facility*. EPRS: European Parliamentary Research Service. <https://policycommons.net/artifacts/1860837/gender-equality-in-the-recovery-and-resilience-facility/2609286/>.

- Verloo, M. (2013). Intersectional and cross-movement politics and policies. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 38(4), 893–915. <https://doi.org/10.1086/669572>.
- Walby, S., Armstrong, J., & Strid, S. (2012). Intersectionality. Multiple tensions in social theory. *Sociology*, 46(2), 224–240. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038511416164>.
- World Health Organisation (WHO). (2020). *Gender and Covid-19. Advocacy brief*. https://iris.who.int/bitstream/handle/10665/332080/WHO-2019-nCoV-Advocacy_brief-Gender-2020.1-eng.pdf?sequence=1.
- Zarra, A., & Ceron, M. (2021). Covid-19: The place for women in pandemic response in the EU. *APSA Preprints*. <https://preprints.apsanet.org/engage/apsa/article-details/6162c6e1fb8619f038f380b8>.

