

Gendered Innovation for Inclusion

by

Riccardo Pozzo

(Department of Human Sciences, University of Verona)

Liebe Bürgerinnen, liebe Bürger, meine Damen, meine Herren, Clara Mavellia danke ich vom Herzen für die wunderbare Organisation dieser Versammlung, an der Sie teilnehmen. In den nächsten fünf Minuten werde ich auf Punkt vier jenes hier am Brandenburger Tor heute verteilten Flugblattes eingehen, nämlich »**Ausbau feministischer Forschung statt Vernunglimpfung oder Abschaffung der Genderstudies**«. Leider sind alle meine Notizen auf English, so dass ich nichts anders kann, als auf English fortzusetzen.

Abstract. The gender composition of scientific endeavours must be balanced. In the following, I am reporting arguments on gender budgeting (section two) and on gendered innovation (section three) made by my colleague Professor Sigrídur Thorgeirsdóttir of the University of Iceland, whom I thank for her participation in the project we wrote together in 2017 on *Co-creation fostering Responsible Research and Innovation*, a project, let it be noted, to which 26 women and 24 men contributed. I shall conclude with some remarks on inclusion as the general issue we need to solve during this century. (1) New Narratives, (2) Gender Budgeting, (3) Gendered Innovation, (4) Inclusion.

1 New Narratives

We need **new narratives** for establishing a cross-border and multidisciplinary open innovation environment for research data, knowledge and services with engaged stakeholders and organisations. These narratives are expected to trigger a mindset change as regards inclusion and reflection

At the basis lies cultural innovation (Pozzo and Virgili, 2017), which tops up social and technological innovation by providing society with spaces of exchange in which citizens engage in the process of sharing their experiences while appropriating common goods content. We are talking of public spaces such as universities, academies, libraries, museums, science-centres, but also of any place in which co-creation activities may occur, e.g. research infrastructures such as DARIAH-Digital Research Infrastructure for the Arts and the Humanities. When social innovation becomes reflective, it generates cultural innovation.

2. Gender Budgeting

The Directorate General for Research and Innovation of the European Commission has allocated substantial funds for the programs Science in Society (FP6), Science and Society (FP7), Science with and for Society (H2020) under the general heading of Responsible Research and Innovation. All research actions have turned around six keys, namely: public engagement, open access, gender, ethics, science education.

Let me expose an argument made by Sigríður Thorgeirsdóttir, who is professor of philosophy at the University of Iceland and one of the founders of the United Nations University GEST-Gender Equality Studies and Training Program, a joint project of the United Nations University, University of Iceland and the Ministry for Foreign Affairs.

Gender plays a prominent role, and especially gender budgeting, which is «**a gender-based assessment of budgets, incorporating a gender perspective at all levels of the budgetary process and restructuring revenues and expenditures in order to promote gender equality**» (*Final Report of the Group of Specialists on Gender Budgeting*, Council of Europe, 2005). Gender budgeting is a tool to increase the awareness of gender and diversity in procedures and processes of resource allocation in order to improve the outcomes for women and men (O'Hagan, 2017; Quinn, 2009).

The Parliament of Berlin initiated the implementation of gender budgeting in the City State and its districts through a comprehensive resolution passed in 2003. This shows how gender budgeting can be integrated into the annual budget production process under the aegis of the Berlin Budget Department. This also highlights how strong parliamentary engagement together with a clear, practical and pragmatic approach has helped achieve good practices. (Expert Meeting on Gender Budgeting, Reykjavík, 18-19 May 2017).

Gender issues are addressed in as far as they contribute to organisational innovations within firms. Thorgeirsdóttir points out that gender budgeting analysis makes it clear how within science, research and higher learning institutions public management features are currently **asking for gender equality and cultural diversity** (Einarsdóttir/Pétursdóttir, 2016).

3. Gendered Innovation

In mainstream economics, human nature is assumed to refer to a free rational and autonomous individual. **That such an individual ought to be physically, psychologically and socially independent** (Nelson, 1996) is a **masculine delusion**, as Thorgeirsdóttir makes it clear. Due to the persistence of this model to the extent that the economy determines laws and politics, it is necessary to implement gender equality measures that modify or diversify this model. The objective is gender equality as well as harbouring all potential of gendered innovation for the new economy of the Industry 4.0 (Schwab, 2017).

Feminists and feminist economists have criticized the notion of *homo oeconomicus*, the subject of neoclassical economics that is the dominant model for economic development and new public management (Fineman/Dougherty, 2005).

We need to take up the challenge, concludes Thorgeirsdóttir, of redefining the notion of *homo oeconomicus* in the co-creation context of open innovation that results from the introduction of gender budgeting practices. The open innovation process and the democratizing of science require the participation of all actors, governmental agencies, the private and public sector.

We need micro and macro level practices of gender budgeting, which generate a diversified idea of the *homo oeconomicus* that are productive for a more sustainable and liveable economy, and for a more equal, more thriving and a more prosperous world. Gender budgeting has been formally adopted in Iceland, most recently by the

government's covenant to take leadership in OECD policy networks and dialogue opportunities on gender budgeting (Icelandic Ministry of Finance, 2017).

In sum, the criticism of the term *homo oeconomicus* makes it possible to fight for a more gender sensitive idea of agency in ethics.

4. Inclusion

Inclusion is the social process of sharing one's own reflection in participatory co-creation processes.

In this context, the objective is to enhance social, economic and political inclusion, combat poverty, enhance human rights, digital and educational inclusiveness, equality, solidarity, cultural diversity and inter-cultural dialogue by supporting interdisciplinary research, indicators development, technological advances, organisational solutions and new forms of collaboration and co-creation. (Societal Challenge 6, Horizon 2020)

«A concrete living person is made of a multidimensional complex of relationships» (Tu Weiming, 2018). We expect philosophy to trigger a change in the mind-set as regards locating culture (anthropology of space and place) for inclusion and reflection in education, life-long learning, healthcare, urban development and regeneration.

Let me close with a few words on migration, which accompanies the whole history of civilization, while involving continuous relations and reciprocal exchanges among diverse cultures, and thus translations of texts and modules from one to another context, be it linguistic, economic, political, or cultural, which appears with full evidence, if we take the narrower perspective of Mediterranean and European cultures.

In her recent *Stranieri residenti: Per una filosofia della migrazione* (2017) Donatella Di Cesare has argued that accepting that borders determine spaces and places might eventually involve a dead-end of democracy.

The continent of migrants scattered all over the world is enormous and many more people are getting ready to leave. Against migrants rise the States: hence the conflict between sovereignty and the right to mobility. Investigating, discussing, reflecting: migration asks for a careful consideration, concludes Di Cesare, of momentous ethical and political implications, first and foremost in connection with personal identity, **gender**, religious and cultural diversity.

If we look at civil society groups that take part in co-creation processes, we see that there is still a number of social groups that are excluded or avoid engaging in participatory and co-creation activities in spaces of exchange. **Male 25-35 is the biggest (self)excluded group**. For this reason, we must consider the specificity of (self)excluded individuals and groups together with the causes of (self)exclusion.

Diversity has become a structural element of European societies. It is at the core of generative dynamics of our social, economic and political texture. Migration produces change and fosters innovation.

Culture cannot be but plural, changing, adaptable, constructed. Inclusion and reflection are constructed whenever we are in contact with other human beings, regardless where they come from. This we have to learn.