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Introduction

Whereas the European Union (EU) in the past two decades has promoted institutions and policies to address multiple inequalities in the member states, through the adoption of an article in the treaty and two directives, and the establishment or reform of equality institutions, the application of a more intersectional approach to its own equality policymaking in the first decade of the 2000s has been considered embryonic (Krizsan, Skjeie and Squires 2012; Kantola and Nousiainen 2012; Lombardo and Verloo 2009). Is this still the case in the second decade of the 2000s?

This paper aims at scrutinizing the way in which intersectionality is framed in EU policies, to understand what intersections are addressed in EU policy documents, how articulated is the interaction between inequalities, and how EU institutions apply intersectionality in their policymaking. The field selected for analysis is that of gender based violence (GBV), a policy issue that in former research on EU gender policies appeared to be one of the most promising for the application of intersectionality (Lombardo and Rolandsen 2012). The main questions we pose are thus: to what extent are EU gender based violence policies intersectional? And how is intersectionality articulated in EU GBV policies?

Empirically the paper is based on a selection of EU policy documents on GBV from two different periods -2000-2008, analyzed under the European QUING1 research project, and 2009-2014, that we analyzed more recently- in both cases applying a frame analysis methodology. Selected texts concern issues such as domestic violence, trafficking, sexual harassment, and violent crimes, and include EU directives, policy programmes, parliamentary reports, resolutions and debates. Former frame analysis of GBV documents from the first period (2000-2008) showed that the main intersecting inequalities included were gender-age, gender-class, gender-citizenship-ethnicity-regional belonging-marital status; and that the relation between inequalities was little articulated, in the sense that, for example, texts did little to explain how gender inequalities interacted with class or ethnicity inequalities in the experience of migrant women (analyzed in Rolandsen 2013; Lombardo and Rolandsen 2012). Have there been

1 Quality in Gender Equality Policies, European Commission FP6, www.quing.eu
any policy shifts in the framing of intersectionality in EU policy documents on GBV in the past two decades? What are the changes in the included and excluded intersections? Is intersectionality more articulated in more recent EU GBV policies? To what extent does the European economic crisis context matter for the politics of intersectionality in the EU? The analysis of two different policy periods will allow us to address these questions and shed some light on the developments in the articulation of intersectionality in EU policymaking.

The structure of the paper is the following. The next section introduces analytical approaches on intersectionality in policymaking that this paper draws on. Subsequently, we clarify a few methodological issues on the framing of intersectionality in our analysis. Then follow a section of empirical analysis of the articulation of intersectionality in EU documents on GBV, and some concluding remarks.

1. Intersectionality in policymaking: analytical approaches

Although the practice of intersectionality in European policymaking is still at an initial stage (Kantola and Nousiainen 2012; Lombardo and Verloo 2009), scholarly debates on intersectionality in equality policies continue to develop. While some of them have researched the institutional structures that could promote or constrain intersectional policies in Europe (Krizsan, Skjeie and Squires 2012; Walby and Verloo 2012), others have specifically analysed the different ways in which intersectionality can be done in policymaking (Bassel and Lepinard 2014; Verloo 2013; Rolandsen 2013). Verloo (2013) has distinguished different forms of applying intersectionality in policies, namely: exposing forms of stigmatizing particular people in policymaking (e.g. Muslim women); adopting pragmatic approaches to intersect policies, for instance by crossing existing legislation (e.g. employment and migration policies to address problem of migrant carers), or crossing different policy domains; mainstreaming equality in all policy processes, mechanisms and structures that fix inequalities; and establishing mechanisms of participatory democracy, which make clear ‘who’ should have a voice and who is actually participating in policy processes.

Verloo’s analysis shows that intersectionality can be applied in policies in many different ways, though not everything is to be treated as intersectionality, because policy practices that stigmatize unprivileged individuals and groups are not considered as signs of intersectionality. An intersectional approach in her analysis appears to be one that is empowering for groups at the point of intersections. Other scholarly works, by contrast, distinguish inclusionary and exclusionary forms of doing intersectionality in policies. Exclusionary intersectionality would, for example, be represented by racializing policy discourses, following Ferree’s argument that: ‘Racializing and problematizing the immigrant family is an intersectional gender-and-race-based discursive strategy that builds a transnational European identity, but at the expense of non-Europeans, especially migrant women’ (2012: 217). Similarly, Montoya and Rolandsen (2011) consider examples of exclusionary intersectionality those policy practices of culturalization that stigmatize migrant women. Exclusionary intersectionality could,
thus, be defined as emphasizing ‘one inequality at the expense of or accentuation of other inequalities’ (Montoya and Rolandsen Agustín 2013: 538).

We agree with former analyses to the extent that policies can indeed be considered, in line with Bacchi (forthcoming), as ‘gendering practices’ that need to be scrutinized for their constitutive effects on subjects, by asking how they are potentially gendering, racializing, heteronorming, classing, disabling, and third-worldizing them. In this paper, however, our positioning in the debate on how normative is intersectionality, does not support the inclusionary-exclusionary distinction. We consider that, while exclusionary dynamics are forms of inequality and discrimination and should be named as such, applying an intersectional approach in policymaking should be inclusive rather than discriminatory (see below our conceptualization of quality criteria for intersectionality). Different is the fact that the adoption of an analytical approach that is aware of intersectionality might enable analysts to spot processes of culturalization of particular people.

In relation to the latter, Rolandsen’s (2013) study of EU GBV policies, by adopting an intersectional approach, is able to identify processes of culturalization, gendering, and degendering that are at play in EU policymaking. It shows that when EU policies on GBV are framed in cultural ways, because particular types of GBV (e.g. ‘honour crimes’) are treated as specific of certain ethnic groups such as Muslims, there is a risk of stigmatizing some ethnic minority groups, which does not contribute to solve the problem of violence for women. Rolandsen’s findings, based on the frame analysis of EU documents on GBV in the period 1995-2008, show that the EU policy focus on ethnic minority and migrant women emphasizes certain categories of inequality, such as gender-and-ethnicity and gender-and-citizenship status, while it silences other inequalities that are also important in GBV policies, as, for example, class and sexuality. This is interesting for our paper because the comparison of these findings with more recent framings of intersectionality in GBV might allow us to identify shifts in the inequalities that are included or excluded in EU policymaking. The study also reveals that in EU policy documents in which other inequalities than gender are discussed, gender tends to disappear, moving us to reflect on the limitations in the EU’s policy approach to address multiple inequalities (Lombardo and Rolandsen 2012).

Context matters for the intersections included in policy documents. Ferree’s (2009) account on the relevance of race in the US and class in Germany shows that, due to the specificities of different contexts, particular inequalities have received greater institutional and social attention than others. In the last two decades, in a European context of increased migration, according to Lepinard (2014: 125), the politics of intersectionality has revealed the forming of ‘a distinctive nexus articulating immigration, ethnicity, religion, and class’, that reflects processes of racialization of Muslim identities often through the adoption of policies concerning types of GBV that are considered specific of Muslim migrant women, such as female genital mutilation, forced marriages, and veiling. Siim (2014: 123) also shows that ‘the tension between gender equality and the diversity represented by Muslim minorities and migrants’ has become ‘a contested political issue’ in European countries, which places the intersection between gender and migration at the forefront of European policymaking.
The context of economic crisis that has hit Europe from 2008 has also brought back a renewed interest in class inequalities. Walby (2009) has theorized the interaction between systems of inequalities of gender, class, and race or ethnicity, and domains, including the economy and violence, among others. Changes in each domain will affect systems of inequalities and have implications for other domains. In this respect, developments in the economy domain such as the economic crisis and policy responses to it, can affect intersectionality in the violence domain too, for example due to cuts in GBV policies promoted by the so-called ‘austerity’ measures or a strengthened focus on the relation between GBV and poverty. Following the 2007 financial crisis, the shift in focus to a fiscal crisis has led to EU institutions and member states pursuing an economic regime of austerity and deregulation (Klatzer and Schlager 2014). This has marginalised gender equality in the EU macroeconomic policies, with negative consequences on gender equality policies, including GBV policies, in the member states (Karamessini and Rubery 2014; Walby 2013; Bettio et al 2012). By asking the question of how intersectionality in the violence domain is affected by developments in the economy domain, such as those triggered by the economic crisis, class is brought back in the discussion of EU gender equality policies. The analysis of EU policy documents on GBV during the crisis period will shed light on the extent to which class is taken into account in intersection with gender and other inequalities in EU GBV policies, and with what implications for the articulation of intersectionality in EU policymaking.

Finally, the analytical approach to intersectionality that we take in this paper is normative to the extent that it draws on works that have discussed criteria for defining what is intersectional, and how can we define the quality of intersectionality in policymaking (Walby, Armstrong, and Strid 2012; Krizsan and Lombardo 2013). In former works (Lombardo and Rolandsen 2012) we have discussed a number of quality criteria for ‘good intersectionality’ in policy-making to assess what the quality of intersectionality in EU policies was. These are the following: explicitness and visibility of certain inequalities as well as inclusiveness of a wide range of inequality categories; extent of articulation of intersectionality; gendering of policy issues and intersecting inequalities; transformative approach to intersectionality; structural understanding of inequality; awareness/challenging of privileges of more advantaged groups; avoiding the stigmatization of specific groups; and consultation of civil society in the policy-making process.

In the frame analysis of intersectionality conducted in this paper we will consider in particular the criteria of inclusiveness\(^2\) of a comprehensive list of inequality categories, articulation\(^3\) of intersectionality, that concerns the way in which the relations between the intersecting categories are understood and the extent to which these relations are explained in an articulated way in the texts, structural\(^4\) understanding of

\(^2\) Inclusiveness of intersections is considered a quality criterion because it opens up possibilities for discussing the problem and finding solutions to it.

\(^3\) Articulation is considered a quality criterion because, by providing accurate and elaborated accounts of the role of intersectional relations in policies, it increases the chances that the latter will address the concerns of subjects at the point of intersection between inequalities.

\(^4\) The structural understanding of inequalities is considered a quality criterion in terms of the depth of the understanding of the problem and the transformative potential this understanding has for changing unequal structures.
inequality, explicit mentioning of intersectionality (which shows some awareness of the problem on the part of policymakers), and avoiding the stigmatization of specific groups.\footnote{Avoiding the stigmatization of people and challenging privileges of dominant groups are quality criteria that have been among the main motives behind the development of intersectionality theory, with the argument that empowering groups at the point of intersection between different inequalities and questioning existing privileges and power hierarchies can potentially promote greater equality in society.}

2. Methodological notes on the framing of intersectionality

Some methodological notes are needed to understand the argument we develop in the paper and the way we proceeded to analyse the framing of intersectionality in EU GBV policies. GBV includes any form of violence rooted in gender inequalities, such as domestic violence, sexual harassment, trafficking and so-called ‘honour crimes’ (Dombos, Krizsan, and Zentai 2008). The sample of documents to analyse includes EU directives, policy plans or programmes, parliamentary debates, parliamentary reports and resolutions, and, for the period 2000-2008 also civil society texts, in order to include some of the most relevant institutional and civil society voices speaking on GBV.

In the framework of the QUING research project, three main rules were followed in the selection of the documents (Krizsan and Verloo 2007): the list of selected texts had to capture the most important documents and the frames articulated in these; the sample should include texts giving voice to the main actors participating in the debates; and the texts to analyse should capture major changes within the chosen period, privileging the most recent policy documents to increase chances to find some attention to intersectionality. While documents selected for the 2000-2008 period are all specifically on GBV, texts chosen for the 2009-2014 period include not only texts that are explicitly on GBV, ten in total (e.g. reports on trafficking or on the Daphne programme), but also six texts that are not specifically on violence but that have potential to present intersectional elements and include parts on violence. These are, for example, reports on migration, on Roma, on poverty, or on the impact of the economic crisis on gender equality. While these texts cannot be directly compared with GBV texts from the 2000-2008 period, they can be compared with documents from the same period 2009-2014 which are explicitly focused on GBV, to detect differences in the articulation of intersectionality. In the documents of the most recent period that are not specifically on GBV we have selected for coding only the sections on GBV, when these were present and showed intersectional elements, while we have selected for analysis the whole document, when references to GBV were spread around the document. To detect potential differences in the presence and articulation of intersectionality between texts...
that are focused on GBV and texts that are not specifically on violence, we have decided to code all references to intersectionality that we found, and not only those that were related to GBV. Finally, since we are focusing on the analysis of gender equality policies, in texts of both periods we have only coded parts where gender intersected with other inequalities (leaving out parts where, for example, age intersected with migration, but not with gender). Overall we coded 23 texts for the 2000-2008 period and 16 texts for 2009-2014 (see Appendix 1 for tables with code occurrences and Appendix 2 for a list of coded texts).

The sampled documents were analysed through frame analysis, a methodology that explores the dimensions in which a policy problem can be represented (Verloo 2007). According to this methodology, policy problems usually include a diagnosis (‘what is/are the problem/s?’) and a prognosis (‘what is/are the solution/s?’) of the issue at stake. To identify the ways in which the problem is represented, the sampled documents were coded on the basis of a set of standardised questions (Krizsan and Verloo 2006). In this paper we focused only on the questions related to intersectionality and gender, both in the diagnosis and prognosis of the problem. The questions explore, firstly, whether gender and any other inequality (class, ethnicity/race, sexual orientation, disability, age, religion/belief, marital/family status, nationality/migrant status or regional belonging) are addressed in a given document. Secondly, they address the relationship between the inequality categories that appears in the text, distinguishing whether it was additive, competing, separate, intersecting or hierarchical, and whether intersectionality was clearly articulated. This analysis is aimed at detecting the extent to which gender was seen to intersect in the policy measures considered, and if so, how, and with which other inequalities (see Tables 1 and 2 in the Appendix for an overview of codes).

Our findings on intersectionality in EU gender equality policy documents are based on the references to inequality dimensions coded in the texts, which reveal the occurrence of intersectional ideas. We consider there to be different degrees of intersectionality: intersectional ideas may be present in a text without there being reference as to how the relation between the inequality dimensions is articulated. We call this inarticulate intersectionality. We may also find texts, which articulate the intersectional dimensions as additive or mutually constitutive. We consider that these are more elaborated notions of intersectionality. While we count occurrences of mutually constitutive and additive intersectional codes, this is not, in itself, sufficient to be able to say that intersectionality is articulated: occurrences need to be cross-checked in the context of the document where they appear. Evidence of articulation of intersectionality is greater when intersectional codes: can be detected; can be found in more than one document; show traces of greater articulation concerning relations between inequalities (that is, not just inarticulate, but also mutually constituted).

3. Framing and articulation of intersectionality in EU GBV policies

The general picture, across the two periods (2000-2008 and 2009-2014), shows mostly inarticulate uses of intersectionality (see tables 1 and 2 in Appendix 1). This means that
different inequality categories are mentioned together but the relation between them is not explicitly articulated to be mutually constitutive, separate, or additive. Gender, age, disability and class are the most recurrent categories used along with ethnicity in the last of the two periods. Age, gender, class and marital status are the most recurrent inequalities in the first period. Interestingly class is more present as an inequality category in the diagnoses across the two periods than in the prognosis, i.e., class is articulated as part of the problem but less attended to in the solution. An exception are the texts of the most recent period that are not specifically focused on GBV, where class is also present in the prognosis, though still less than in the diagnosis of the problem. Generally, prognosis refers, in the first period, to marital status, and, in the last period, to disability, ethnicity, and class; in both cases combined with the prominent categories of gender and age. Texts of the 2009-2014 period that are specifically focused on GBV also mention sexuality as a recurrent inequality category in both the diagnosis and prognosis of the problem.

At a first sight there are more intersectional occurrences in 2009-2014, thus suggesting an increasing attention to intersectionality in EU policies on GBV across time. However, this finding needs to be explored more in depth as it relates to the nature and topic of the documents analyzed. Thus, the most intersectional documents both in terms of quantity of intersectional dimensions mentioned as well as quality, i.e., the depth and complexity with which these dimensions are treated in the texts, are the ones not primarily concerned with GBV. These are documents with a gender perspective on for instance disability, Roma inclusion, and undocumented migrants, which also include considerations or separate sections on violence against women.

In the period 2009-2014, three reports stand out as being very intersectional, with explicit mentions of this approach. These are the Report on women with disabilities (categories of gender, age and disability), the Report on gender aspects of the European Framework of National Roma Inclusion Strategies (gender, age, class and ethnicity) and the Report on undocumented women migrants in the European Union (gender, ethnicity, citizenship status and class). The Report on women with disabilities (GBV2.14) argues, for instance, that women and girls with disabilities suffer from greater risk of falling victims to GBV and that the risk increases in ‘patriarchy oriented societies’. Prognostically the report calls for support services, gender disaggregated statistics, training courses, and information campaigns, stating explicitly that ‘detailed and reliable genderdisaggregated statistics for targeted research on the true situation facing people with disabilities (is) imperative for efficient policy design in order to address the intersectionality between gender, disability and violence’. Thus, intersectionality is explicitly mentioned twice, once in relation to gender and disability, and another time in relation to gender, disability, and violence; and multiple

---

6 In comparison none of the documents analyzed from the 2000-2008 period include explicit references to ‘intersectionality’. One civil society text (GBV13) talks about women as ‘multiple victims’ of trafficking but does not refer to intersectional concerns as such.

7 Beyond the specific issue of violence, the report also recommends that: ‘disability policies should be gender mainstreamed and underlines the importance of mainstreaming gender disability in gender policies, programmes and measures to strengthen the recognition and understanding of the intersectionality of gender and disability in the EU and in the Member States’ legislation and policy’ (GBV2.14)
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discrimination is explicitly mentioned five times, thus showing that it is not an occasional reference but rather a conscious attention for intersectional concerns. Similarly, the Report on gender aspects of the European Framework of National Roma Inclusion Strategies (GBV2.15) states that ‘extreme poverty, gender inequality and internal discrimination expose Roma women to a higher risk of trafficking, prostitution, domestic violence and exploitation’ and that member states should ‘set up empowerment strategies that recognise their intersectional identity and promote activities that counteract stereotypes’. The report explicitly refers to intersectionality four times, three times with the argument that that Roma women often face ‘multiple and intersectional discriminations on the grounds of gender and ethnic origins’, and once when urging EU institutions to ensure that ‘intersectional discrimination’ is included in the Equal treatment directive (2000/78/EC) to ensure that ‘all grounds of discrimination and multiple discrimination are made illegal in all spheres of life’. Moreover, several examples of a mutually constitutive approach to the intersections can be found, that put in relation gender, ethnicity, class, and age. The Report on undocumented women migrants in the European Union (GBV2.12) is the text that reflects the most developed approach to intersectionality (many of the ‘mutually constitutive’ coding on relations between inequalities can be found in this text), by showing awareness of how the inequalities suffered by undocumented migrant women are interconnected. In relation to violence this is articulated as more vulnerability in relation to prostitution and abuse by landlords: ‘Migrant women are more vulnerable to physical abuse in general, but undocumented ones are even more so because their legal status puts them in such a position where they cannot reach to the police or hospitals or shelters for help and their abuser knows this and exploits this situation’. The text refers explicitly to the ‘double discrimination of race and gender’ (two times), the ‘double discrimination of gender and legal status’ (once) and the ‘triple discrimination’ of gender, race and legal status (once).

The Report on the impact of the economic crisis on gender equality and women’s rights (GBV2.11) and the Report on the face of female poverty in the European Union (GBV2.13) also show intersectional elements but less so than the previously mentioned reports. In the first case it is argued that the economic crisis and austerity measures increase male violence against women and reduce public services for women victims; in the second, that GBV impacts women’s poverty and that female poverty likewise increases the risk of suffering GBV but without the relation between the inequalities being further articulated. Few explicit mentions to ‘multiple discrimination’ are present in these two reports, once in the crisis report and two times in the poverty one.

In the reports from the 2009-2014 period that are not specifically on GBV, then, there is some articulation of intersectionality, and, in some cases (GBV2.12 on migrant women; GBV2.14 on disabled women), there is even some understanding of how the structural causes of inequalities relate to one another in the diagnosis of the problem.

---

8 A similar framing is used on the FEMM Committee report on gender aspects of the economic downturn and financial crisis (2010/0155); the report was not included in the document selection for this analysis as it contains very few references to violence but it nevertheless confirms the findings presented here.
One example is the already mentioned vulnerability to GBV of undocumented migrant women with respect to housing\(^9\) and domestic work\(^10\). The report on Sexual and Reproductive Health Rights shows awareness of ‘structural discrimination’ but only in relation to gender inequalities. In the EU documents from the 2000-2008 period, the presence of a structural understanding of dimensions of inequality is not such a widespread trend, except for texts on trafficking, that discuss causes of inequality more explicitly in the diagnosis of the problem (GBV11, GBV12, GBV13).

However, considering the 2009-2014 texts, whilst reports that are not specifically on GBV show some articulation of intersectionality, the reports that deal with violence as their main theme are generally not very intersectional in their approach. This concerns: the Report on the draft directive on the European Protection Order (GBV2.4), where intersectionality is inexistent and explicitly stated not to apply to victims of gender violence; the Resolution on ending female genital mutilation (GBV2.7), mentioning only (young) girls as particularly affected; as well as the Report (GBV2.8) and the Directive (GBV2.9) on preventing and combating trafficking in human beings and protecting its victims, with hardly any intersectional concerns (‘particular vulnerability’ is used but only in relation to children) and very general phrasings (‘human beings’, ‘victims of trafficking, ‘trafficked persons’, etc). Only one of the documents specifically focusing on GBV—the Report with recommendations to the EC on combating violence (GBV2.3)- explicitly mentions ‘multiple discriminations’ three times. The other nine texts that are specifically focusing on GBV make no explicit mention of intersectionality or multiple discrimination.

When intersectional dimensions are articulated in the reports that are specifically on GBV they typically relate to economy, poverty, and class as in the case of the Report on the Daphne programme: achievements and future prospects (GBV2.5 economic crisis and social exclusion/marginalisation contributes to vulnerability in terms of violence) and the Report with recommendations to the Commission on combating violence against women (GBV2.3 ‘extreme poverty increases the risk of violence’ and greater social and economic independence for women reduces risk and vulnerability). This also occurs in more elaborate intersectional approaches, in the Report on priorities and outline of a new EU policy framework to fight VAW (GBV2.6), which states that ‘economic distress often leads to more frequent, more violent and more dangerous abuse; (…) studies have shown that violence against women intensifies when men experience displacement and dispossession as a result of the economic crisis’. A similar interpretation can be made of the Report on sexual exploitation and prostitution and its

---

\(^9\) As usual, the situation of undocumented migrant women is direr than that of men. They face a double discrimination due to their gender and legal status (or even a triple discrimination if one counts race). (…) For example, there have been cases where unscrupulous landlords have exploited this vulnerability of undocumented migrant women and have physically and sexually abused them in exchange for providing them with a place to live. Undocumented migrant women who find themselves in an abusive situation cannot even readily access women’s shelters. Most state-run women’s shelters require some form of identification in order to receive the person, so the victims are left with the awful choice between remaining in the abusive situation or becoming homeless.’ (GBV2.12)

\(^10\) ‘[U]ndocumented women working in this sector [domestic and care work] are most vulnerable to low pay, mental abuse, withholding of wages and passports and sometimes even physical abuse at the hands of their employers; whereas undocumented women are unlikely to seek redress in court; R. whereas employed undocumented migrant women have hardly any remedies available for claiming fair working conditions and wages, owing to their economic and social isolation, ignorance of their basic rights and fear of deportation’ (GBV2.12)
impact on gender equality (GBV2.10), which includes gender-age as its most prominent intersection and furthermore makes a few references to migrant status, disability as well as economic crisis and class, separately and in conjunction, e.g. by stating that: ‘economic problems and poverty are major causes of prostitution among young women and under-age females, and (...) gender-specific prevention strategies, national and Europe-wide campaigns specially targeted at socially excluded communities and those in situations of increased vulnerability (such as persons with disabilities and youth in the child protection system), measures to reduce poverty and to raise awareness among both the purchasers and suppliers of sex, and the sharing of best practices are all key to combating the sexual exploitation of women and under-age females, especially among migrants’.

Two significant novelties are also present in the material analyzed. First, in the Resolution on ending female genital mutilation (GBV2.7) cultural and religious dimensions to the problem are mentioned but they are not at the forefront, thus showing a significant difference in the way in which the problem is articulated in comparison to previous policies’ signs of culturalization and stigmatization (Montoya and Rolandsen Agustín 2013). This is also reflected in the fact that structural gender inequality is implied by defining female genital mutilation in the resolution as ‘an expression of unequal power relations and a form of violence against women, alongside other serious forms of gender-based violence’.11 Secondly, the Directive establishing minimum standards on the rights, support and protection of victims of crime (GBV2.2), for the first time in EU directives, defines GBV as also including gender identity and expression: ‘Violence that is directed against a person because of that person’s gender, gender identity or gender expression or that affects persons of a particular gender disproportionately, is understood as gender-based violence’. This is a significant step forward in the recognition not just of the interrelations between gender, sexuality and violence but also in the understanding of gender in itself within EU policies.

Conclusions

The analysis of intersectionality in EU policy documents on gender based violence in two different periods allows us to observe policy shifts in the framing and articulation of intersectionality in the sampled documents. These indicate, first, developments in the range of intersecting inequalities –from gender-age, gender-class, gender-citizenship-ethnicity-regional belonging-marital status of the 2000-2008 period to embryonic inclusiveness of sexuality, gender identity and expression, and disability, apart from the maintenance of the combination gender-class-ethnicity-citizenship-age in the 2009-2014 period. Second, while in most cases the relationship between inequalities is not

---

11 The framing is partly confirmed by the FEMM Committee report on social integration of women belonging to ethnic minority groups (2010/0221), which was not included in this analysis because violence is a very minor aspect of the report. Here references are made both to structural and cultural explanations of certain forms of violence and the report calls for the EC and the member states to ‘combat discriminatory cultural habits and patriarchal role models, to prevent polarisation and tackle the prevalent sexist stereotypes and social stigmatisation which underpin violence against women’.
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explained, policy documents of the most recent period 2009-2014 that are not specifically on GBV show greater articulation of intersecting inequalities, especially when references to class and the economy domain are included. Findings on the greater articulation of intersections with class can depend on different factors, such as the selection of documents, the mobilization of the FEMM parliamentary Committee during the economic crisis period to denounce both the gender impact of the crisis and the EU policy responses to it recommending member states cuts in their public budgets (which implied from FEMM making an effort in articulating the interaction between different inequalities, for persuasion purposes), or the institutional consultation of women’s NGOs and gender experts (still to research).

In general, findings of the analysis of policy documents from the two periods show: an increasing attention for intersectional inequalities in EU texts; less culturalization of types of GBV such as female genital mutilation, which in more recent texts tends to be understood in terms of structural power inequality between women and men; novel conceptualizations of GBV as including gender identity and expression; and the return of class and the economy back on the EU policy stage. Yet, findings from the 2009-2014 period tell us that the most intersectional documents analysed are FEMM reports that are not specifically on GBV, thus showing that intersectionality is not consistently incorporated in EU gender equality policies. Its integration in policymaking seems more easily done when contextual events or phenomena, such as migration or the economic crisis, or specific social groups such as Roma women, force European policymakers to face intersectionality issues, thus creating a spill-over effect whereby also GBV is seen in a more complex way than what GBV policy documents would imply when the outset is a gender+ perspective. This shows that there is still a need for establishing policy mechanisms and procedures –such as participatory democracy and equality mainstreaming discussed by Verloo (2013)- that could allow to systematically incorporate intersectionality in the making of EU GBV policies.

The active role of the European Parliament’s Committee on Women’s Rights and Gender Equality (FEMM) in promoting more intersectional readings of GBV is worth noting as a factor of change. The backlash of the economic crisis and EU policy responses to it on gender equality (e.g. no gender mainstreaming in EU policy responses to the crisis, lack of prioritization of gender equality in EU macroeconomic policies) seems to have mobilized greater attention and motivation in the policymaking around class and the articulation of its intersections with gender and other inequalities in the parliamentary committee. In general there also seems to be an effect of increased awareness around multiple inequalities in the sense that intersectionality as a concept is increasingly incorporated into the vocabulary of the FEMM Committee policy documents; whether articulated (as mutually constituted) or not, intersectionality and intersectional concerns are explicitly mentioned in several of the policy texts.

Further research (that could not be performed for this paper), including selection of other texts (e.g. from institutional and civil society actors for the 2009-2014 period), interviews with policy actors, and analysis of the institutional dynamics (such as the move of gender competence from DG Employment to DG Justice, the relations of EC gender units and FEMM with other equality agencies such as FRA, EC Unit on
antidiscrimination, and EIGE, and of EU institutions working with civil society organisations working on GBV such as WAVE and EWL), is needed to scrutinize the reasons for these recent developments in the intersectional framing of GBV policies in the EU. This will enable us to observe institutional opportunities and constraints for doing intersectionality in the EU, and the extent to which the policymaking process includes or excludes multiple inequalities and the articulation of their intersections.
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**Appendix 1**

**Table 1: Intersectional code, inequality, and relation between inequality occurrences in 2000-2008 and 2009-2014 texts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Coded texts</th>
<th>Intersectional code occurrences (number of texts)</th>
<th>Inequality occurrences (number of texts)</th>
<th>Relation between inequalities occurrences (number of texts)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Diagnosis Prognosis</td>
<td>Diagnosis Prognosis</td>
<td>Diagnosis Prognosis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2008</td>
<td>23 CS 4</td>
<td>39 (12) 23 (8)</td>
<td>Disability 1 (1) Sexuality 3 (2)</td>
<td>Additive 1 (1); Separate 3 (2); Mutually constitutive 12 (2); Inarticulate 4 (11);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Citizenship status 4 (4) Regional 10 (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Class 12 (7) Marital status 9 (8) Gender 53 (18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Age 12 (10) Gender 71 (22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Race/ethnicity 1 (1) Regional 3 (3) Class 5 (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Citizenship status 5 (4) Marital status 7 (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Age 9 (5) Gender 43 (18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2014</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>99 (13) 131 (12)</td>
<td>Disability 25 (4) Sexuality 9 (4)</td>
<td>Additive 4 (3); Separate 4 (3); Mutually constitutive 20 (7); Inarticulate 72 (12); Hierarchical 2 (2);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Citizenship status 17 (6) Regional 1 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Class 49 (10) Marital status 7 (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disability 74 (7) Sexuality 11 (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Citizenship status 19 (8) Class 34 (9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marital status 6 (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Coded texts</th>
<th>Intersectional code occurrences (number of texts)</th>
<th>Inequality occurrences (number of texts)</th>
<th>Relation between inequalities occurrences (number of texts)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Table 2: Intersectional code, inequality, and relation between inequality occurrences in 2009-2014 texts
Appendix 2: List of EU-analyzed Documents on Gender based violence policies

2000-2008: thirteen selected documents; twenty-three coded texts (three directives, three policy plans, thirteen voices in parliamentary debates, four civil society texts).

2009-2014: sixteen selected documents; sixteen coded texts (three directives, thirteen policy reports).

2000-2008

Domestic violence


GBV2 Policy plan: FEMM Committee report on the current situation in combating violence against women and any future action (2004/2220(INI)).


GBV5 Civil society text additional: Blueprint of the CoE Campaign to Combat Violence against women, including domestic violence, 21 June 2006.

Sexual harassment


GBV7 Policy plan: EC Communication of 24 July 1996 concerning the consultation of management and labor on the prevention of sexual harassment at work (COM (96) 373 final).


GBV9 Civil society text: Joint letter from ETUC and EWL to Social Affairs Commissioner Diamantopoulou on the proposal for a Directive to amend Directive 76/207 to include a reference to sexual harassment, 15 May 2000.
 Trafficking


GBV11 Policy plan: FEMM Committee report of 14 December 2005 on strategies to prevent the trafficking of women and children who are vulnerable to sexual exploitation (2004/2216(INI)).

GBV12 Parliamentary debate: EP debate on trafficking in women, 18 May 2000

GBV13 Civil society text: WAVE Fempower Magazine on the theme of trafficking in women, n8 1 (1/2001).

2009-2014

Domestic violence


GBV2.3 Policy plan: FEMM Report with recommendations to the Commission on combating Violence Against Women A7-0075/2014.


GBV2.6 Policy plan: FEMM Report on priorities and outline of a new EU policy framework to fight violence against women A7-2011/0065.

FGM

GBV2.7 Policy plan: European Parliament resolution of 14 June 2012 on ending female genital mutilation.

Trafficking


GBV2.9 Policy plan: FEMM Report on the proposal for a directive of the EP and of the


Texts that are not specifically on GBV, but that include parts on GBV:


GBV2.16 (2 texts coded together because they are almost identical) Policy plan: 2 FEMM Reports on sexual and reproductive health and rights A7-2013/0306 and A7-2013/0426.