



Co-funded by
the European Union



BAHÇEŞEHİR UNIVERSITY
PLURIVERSAL EXCELLENCE IN EU STUDIES (PLURIEX)
JEAN MONNET CENTRE OF EXCELLENCE
PROJECT NO: 101240978



PLURIEX EARLY CAREER RESEARCHER WORKSHOP

ECRW 2025-2026

Advancing Pluriversal and Inclusive Approaches to EU Studies





ONLINE
WORKSHOP



PECHAKUCHA
FORMAT
20x20 | 6:40



INTERACTIVE
DISCUSSION



PLURIVERSAL
PERSPECTIVES

ABOUT THE WORKSHOP

The ECR Workshop brings together undergraduate and postgraduate students to present their research in a supportive, conference-like environment.

Students present their original work in PechaKucha format and receive peer feedback to advance pluriversal and inclusive EU studies scholarship.





PECHAKUCHA RESEARCH PRESENTATIONS
20 slides • 20 seconds
6:40 total

KEY FEATURES

-  Student conference simulation
-  Short, dynamic and impactful presentations
-  Peer feedback and interactive discussion
-  Pluriversal lenses on EU policy challenges
-  Inclusive and collaborative learning environment



Climate, Energy &
Green Transition



Digital Governance
& AI



Migration, Borders &
Reproductive Governance



Security, Women,
Peace & Security



Democratic Backsliding &
Anti-Gender Politics



Agriculture &
Political Economy

Event Report: 10, 17 June 2025



Co-funded by
the European Union

Funding and Disclosure

This event was supported by the European Commission's Jean Monnet Programme (PLURIEX, Project No: 101240978) and Bahçeşehir University co-funding. The views expressed in student presentations are those of the individual researchers. The European Commission's support for this workshop does not constitute an endorsement of the contents, which reflect the views only of the authors and speakers. The Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained herein.



Co-funded by
the European Union



Courses: Gender in EU Politics (POL2333) | Gender Politics in the EU (GLA5104)
Workshop Chair and Principal Investigator: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Rahime Süleymanoglu-Kürüm
10 June 2026 (POL2333 Session 1 + GLA5104) | 17 June 2026 (POL2333 Session 2)
Online, Microsoft Teams

1. Overview

The PLURIEX Early Career Researcher Workshop (ECRW) 2025–2026 was held across three sessions in June 2026, bringing together undergraduate and postgraduate students from two courses delivered under the Jean Monnet Centre of Excellence on Pluriversal Excellence in EU Studies (PLURIEX) at Bahçeşehir University: Gender in EU Politics (POL2333, undergraduate) and Gender Politics in the EU (GLA5104, MA level). The workshop constituted 20 per cent of students’ final course grade and was designed to simulate the experience of presenting at an academic conference. All sessions were chaired by Assoc. Prof. Dr. Rahime Süleymanoglu-Kürüm, Principal Investigator of the PLURIEX project.

PLURIEX ECR WORKSHOP

10–17 JUNE 2025

Snapshots from Online Sessions

The PLURIEX Early Career Researcher Workshop (ECRW) 2025 brought together doctoral and postdoctoral researchers from diverse disciplines for a series of engaging online sessions. The screenshots capture moments from presentations, discussions, and collaborative exchanges across Panels A and B.

Algorithmic Discrimination, Migration Governance and the EU AI Act

Digital Governance & AI | Pecha Kuchna

Research question: To what extent does the EU AI Act address algorithmic discrimination in migration governance — and what forms of knowledge remain marginalised?

Berkin Diriksoy

Policy Analysis 1

Why migration and border governance?

7.4M Eurodac fingerprint datasets stored in 2023

eu-USA Year in Review 2023

Global South / Non-EU Dimension

Png (2022); Moulinié, Png & Isaac (2020)

Key Finding 1

DIGITAL GOVERNANCE & ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

How does the EU AI Act address gender bias in artificial intelligence systems from a feminist technology perspective?

DURU MELİKOĞLU
POL2333 – GENDER IN EU POLITICS

Bias in AI Systems

Feminist and intersectional perspectives help reveal hidden inequalities inside artificial intelligence systems.

Policy Analysis 1

3 Sessions

30+ ECR Participants

18+ Presentations

Rich Discussions & Peer Exchange

Interdisciplinary Perspectives on EU Governance



2.2. Pedagogical Framework and Student Preparation

The workshop was the culmination of a staged research development process built into both courses across the Spring 2025–2026 semester. Students arrived at the ECRW having completed two prior assessed stages.

Assignment 1 (Sector-Based Annotated Bibliography, 20%): Students selected one of six EU policy sectors: Migration, Borders and Reproductive Governance; Climate, Energy and Green Transition; Agriculture and Political Economy (CAP); Digital Governance and AI; Security, Women, Peace and Security and External Action; or Democratic Backsliding and Anti-Gender Politics, and produced a structured annotated bibliography of at least eight academic sources. Each annotation required analysis of the source's core argument, methodological approach, scholarly contribution, limitations, and relevance to the student's research focus. The bibliography concluded with a 500-word Pluriversal Positioning synthesis section in which students identified dominant and marginal knowledge traditions in their chosen sector and selected one of the three PLURIEX analytical lenses (disciplinary framing, geo-epistemic positioning, or knowledge production and representation) for their subsequent paper.

















































Assignment 2 (Pluriversal Policy Analysis Paper, 20%): Students transformed their annotated bibliography into a 4,000-word research paper structured around an introduction, a synthesised literature review, a theoretical framework, a sectoral policy analysis, a mandatory Pluriversal Lens section of approximately 500 words, and a conclusion. Students also submitted a Response to Instructor Feedback of approximately 300 words and a Knowledge Translation Output (either a policy brief or an op-ed) demonstrating the ability to communicate research for non-academic audiences.

ECRW Presentation (20%): Students condensed and visualised their written work in PechaKucha format: 20 slides advancing automatically at 20-second intervals, for a total speaking time of six minutes and forty seconds. A detailed slide-by-slide PechaKucha Guide and a briefing session were provided in advance. A Peer Feedback Form was distributed to all participants, directing attention to the clarity of the research question, identification of dominant knowledge patterns, application of the chosen lens, the strongest element of the argument, and one constructive suggestion.

3. POL2333 — Gender in EU Politics: Session 1

10 June 2026 | 08:30–11:20 | Online, Microsoft Teams
Session theme: Material & Regulatory Governance Arenas

3.1. Program

 08:30–08:45		Welcome & Workshop Briefing Assoc. Prof. Rahime Süleymanoğlu-Kürüm, Jean Monnet Chair (FEJUST), PI (PLURIEX)																																		
<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div style="width: 45%;"> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">  PANEL A Climate, Energy & Green Transition </th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>08:45–08:52</td> <td>  Yiğit Balcı <i>The Epistemic Gender of European Energy Policies</i> </td> </tr> <tr> <td>08:52–08:59</td> <td>  Mohammad Omer Inam Kayani <i>Green Transition or Green Colonialism? A Pluriversal Analysis</i> </td> </tr> <tr> <td>08:59–09:06</td> <td>  Tamer Kırklar <i>Renewable Energy Policies and Economic Impacts in the EU</i> </td> </tr> <tr> <td>09:06–09:13</td> <td>  Umut Kocaman <i>The EU CBAM and Its Unequal Impacts on Global South Countries</i> </td> </tr> <tr> <td>09:13–09:20</td> <td>  Sara Dif <i>EU CBAM and Global Climate Governance: A Critical Geo-Epistemic Analysis</i> </td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">  09:20–10:00 </td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2"> Panel A Discussion </td> </tr> </tbody> </table> </div> <div style="width: 10%; text-align: center;">  10:00–10:15 Break Time </div> <div style="width: 45%;"> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">  PANEL B Digital Governance & AI </th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>10:15–10:22</td> <td>  Hamra Ahmad <i>Gender Bias and Accountability in the EU AI Act</i> </td> </tr> <tr> <td>10:22–10:29</td> <td>  Alaa Adel Hasan Alashhab <i>The EU AI Act and the Regulation of High-Risk AI Systems</i> </td> </tr> <tr> <td>10:29–10:36</td> <td>  Berkin Diriksoy <i>Algorithmic Discrimination and the EU AI Act: A Pluriversal Analysis</i> </td> </tr> <tr> <td>10:36–10:43</td> <td>  Duru Melioğlu <i>Digital Governance and AI: Gender Bias in Algorithmic Systems</i> </td> </tr> <tr> <td>10:43–10:50</td> <td>  Latife Turganer <i>Digital Governance and AI: Gender Dimensions in EU Regulatory Frameworks</i> </td> </tr> <tr> <td>10:50–10:57</td> <td>  Majd Dader <i>Algorithmic Bias and Digital Governance: Intersectional Perspectives</i> </td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">  10:57–11:20 </td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2"> Panel B Discussion & Cross-Panel Closing </td> </tr> </tbody> </table> </div> </div>			 PANEL A Climate, Energy & Green Transition		08:45–08:52	 Yiğit Balcı <i>The Epistemic Gender of European Energy Policies</i>	08:52–08:59	 Mohammad Omer Inam Kayani <i>Green Transition or Green Colonialism? A Pluriversal Analysis</i>	08:59–09:06	 Tamer Kırklar <i>Renewable Energy Policies and Economic Impacts in the EU</i>	09:06–09:13	 Umut Kocaman <i>The EU CBAM and Its Unequal Impacts on Global South Countries</i>	09:13–09:20	 Sara Dif <i>EU CBAM and Global Climate Governance: A Critical Geo-Epistemic Analysis</i>	 09:20–10:00		Panel A Discussion		 PANEL B Digital Governance & AI		10:15–10:22	 Hamra Ahmad <i>Gender Bias and Accountability in the EU AI Act</i>	10:22–10:29	 Alaa Adel Hasan Alashhab <i>The EU AI Act and the Regulation of High-Risk AI Systems</i>	10:29–10:36	 Berkin Diriksoy <i>Algorithmic Discrimination and the EU AI Act: A Pluriversal Analysis</i>	10:36–10:43	 Duru Melioğlu <i>Digital Governance and AI: Gender Bias in Algorithmic Systems</i>	10:43–10:50	 Latife Turganer <i>Digital Governance and AI: Gender Dimensions in EU Regulatory Frameworks</i>	10:50–10:57	 Majd Dader <i>Algorithmic Bias and Digital Governance: Intersectional Perspectives</i>	 10:57–11:20		Panel B Discussion & Cross-Panel Closing	
 PANEL A Climate, Energy & Green Transition																																				
08:45–08:52	 Yiğit Balcı <i>The Epistemic Gender of European Energy Policies</i>																																			
08:52–08:59	 Mohammad Omer Inam Kayani <i>Green Transition or Green Colonialism? A Pluriversal Analysis</i>																																			
08:59–09:06	 Tamer Kırklar <i>Renewable Energy Policies and Economic Impacts in the EU</i>																																			
09:06–09:13	 Umut Kocaman <i>The EU CBAM and Its Unequal Impacts on Global South Countries</i>																																			
09:13–09:20	 Sara Dif <i>EU CBAM and Global Climate Governance: A Critical Geo-Epistemic Analysis</i>																																			
 09:20–10:00																																				
Panel A Discussion																																				
 PANEL B Digital Governance & AI																																				
10:15–10:22	 Hamra Ahmad <i>Gender Bias and Accountability in the EU AI Act</i>																																			
10:22–10:29	 Alaa Adel Hasan Alashhab <i>The EU AI Act and the Regulation of High-Risk AI Systems</i>																																			
10:29–10:36	 Berkin Diriksoy <i>Algorithmic Discrimination and the EU AI Act: A Pluriversal Analysis</i>																																			
10:36–10:43	 Duru Melioğlu <i>Digital Governance and AI: Gender Bias in Algorithmic Systems</i>																																			
10:43–10:50	 Latife Turganer <i>Digital Governance and AI: Gender Dimensions in EU Regulatory Frameworks</i>																																			
10:50–10:57	 Majd Dader <i>Algorithmic Bias and Digital Governance: Intersectional Perspectives</i>																																			
 10:57–11:20																																				
Panel B Discussion & Cross-Panel Closing																																				
 Note: Some presentations were deferred to Session 2 due to scheduling and attendance considerations.																																				



3.2 Presentation Summaries — Panel A: Climate, Energy & Green Transition

Yiğit Balcı | Climate, Energy & Green Transition

The Epistemic Gender of European Energy Policies

Balcı examined how the European Green Deal (EGD) marginalises women's knowledge and non-Western epistemologies in EU energy governance. Drawing on the concepts of epistemic justice and energy justice, and applying a geo-epistemic positioning lens, he argued that the EGD's technically framed and male-coded discourse, embedded in instruments such as the Smart and Sustainable Mobility Strategy and the Renovation Wave, renders women in energy poverty, single-parent households, and Sub-Saharan African communities invisible before policy delivery begins. The presentation was positively received for its policy focus and analytical clarity. Feedback noted that the paper should clarify how a non-Eurocentric reading list had been assembled and address the omission of Miranda Fricker, whose work is the foundational reference for epistemic injustice in the field.

Mohammad Omer Inam Kayani | Climate, Energy & Green Transition

Green Transition or Green Colonialism? A Pluriversal Analysis

Kayani examined the extent to which the EGD's critical minerals and renewable energy governance reproduces gendered and colonial power relations. Focusing on lithium and cobalt extraction economies in Namibia, he combined feminist political ecology with a geo-epistemic positioning lens to show that Europe's green future is built on the environmental and social costs borne by extraction communities, costs that fall disproportionately on women who are excluded from decision-making. Feedback drew attention to the need to show concretely how the geo-epistemic lens had diversified the sources used and to avoid AI-generated images in future presentations.

Tamer Kirklar | Climate, Energy & Green Transition

Renewable Energy Policies and Economic Impacts in the EU

Kirklar analysed the gendered impacts of the European Green Deal on women's employment and energy poverty within the EU. Using gender mainstreaming and intersectionality as theoretical concepts alongside a geo-epistemic lens, he argued that the EGD only partially addresses gender inequality, supporting inclusion in principle while providing limited gender-specific measures. Women remain underrepresented in renewable energy technical and leadership positions, and energy poverty affects women, particularly elderly women and single-parent households, disproportionately. The presentation was well received for visual design and image-argument alignment. Feedback noted that timing could be improved and that some images were too indirect to carry the analytical argument.

Umut Kocaman and Sara Dif — did not present in this session.

3.3 Presentation Summaries — Panel B: Digital Governance & AI

Hamra Ahmad | Digital Governance & AI

Gender Bias and Accountability in the EU AI Act

Ahmad examined why the EU AI Act's framing of algorithmic fairness as a technical compliance problem is inadequate from a feminist and decolonial perspective. Combining feminist theory and decolonial AI scholarship, she argued that the Act asks only whether AI is compliant, not who it serves, and that this framing leaves marginalised groups, particularly women from the Global South, most exposed to systemic discrimination yet structurally outside the protective frame. Feedback noted that the use of AI-generated images across all slides meant the presentation lost the experience of selecting authentic visuals, and that some slides contained too much text for the format.

Alaa Adel Hasan Alashhab — did not present

Berkin Diriksoy | Digital Governance & AI

Algorithmic Discrimination and the EU AI Act: A Pluriversal Analysis

Diriksoy examined how immigration-related AI systems under the EU AI Act constitute migrants as data categories and risk profiles rather than as subjects with rights. Using knowledge production and representation as his primary lens, he drew on a figure of approximately 7.4 million biometric border records to show that algorithmic discrimination often begins before any final automated decision, at the stages of data collection, labelling, and risk categorisation. Proxy variables such as nationality, travel history, and administrative status become the mechanisms through which suspicion is encoded. Feedback noted that the slide-heavy text load worked against the PechaKucha format's purpose.



Duru Melioğlu | Digital Governance & AI

Digital Governance and AI: Gender Bias in Algorithmic Systems

Melioğlu examined the EU AI Act from a feminist technology studies perspective, analysing how the Act's treatment of gender bias as a technical defect fails to address the structural roots of algorithmic discrimination. She showed how AI systems trained on historically unequal datasets reproduce rather than reduce existing gender inequalities, and argued that the Act's regulatory architecture does not systematically integrate gender as a category. Content was considered substantive; feedback focused on the need to reduce text density on slides, improve synchronisation between speech and slide transitions, and develop a more consistent pace across the presentation.

Latife Turganer — did not present in this session

Majd Dader | Democratic Backsliding & Anti-Gender Politics

















Algorithmic Bias and Digital Governance: Intersectional Perspectives [presented in Session 2]

Dader presented in Session 2 having been unable to present in Session 1. His paper examined how authoritarian regimes in Turkey, Hungary, and Poland use anti-gender discourse, nationalism, and knowledge control as instruments of political consolidation, applying critical discourse analysis as his method. Feedback noted that the presentation did not follow the structural guidance set out in the PechaKucha briefing, specifically the required sequence of findings, literature engagement, and argument development, and that anti-gender politics, authoritarianism, and knowledge production appeared as parallel themes rather than elements of a unified analytical argument. The paper was encouraged to engage more substantively with the question of whether anti-gender politics is essential to democratic backsliding or merely coincident with it.

4. POL2333 — Gender in EU Politics: Session 2

17 June 2026 | 08:30–11:20 | Online, Microsoft Teams

Session theme: Power, Security & Political Contestation

 08:30–08:40	Welcome & Session 1 Recap Assoc. Prof. Rahime Süleymanoğlu-Kürüm, Jean Monnet Chair (FEJUST), PI (PLURIEX)
 PANEL A Migration, Borders & Reproductive Governance	 PANEL B Democratic Backsliding, Anti-Gender Politics & WPS
08:40–08:47  Maïa Briand <i>Reproductive Governance in the Migration Crisis: Germany and Italy Compared</i>	10:15–10:22  Mohammadhossein Akbari <i>Democratic Backsliding and Anti-Gender Politics: A Comparative EU Analysis</i>
08:47–08:54  Elif Su Efendioğlu <i>Gender, Migration and Reproductive Governance at EU Borders</i>	10:22–10:29  Gvantsa Varshalomidze <i>Democratic Backsliding and Anti-Gender Politics: Georgia and Turkey Compared</i>
08:54–09:01  Askar Kurmangaliyev <i>EU Border Externalisation and Reproductive Autonomy of Migrant Women</i>	10:29–10:36  Laila Ali <i>The WPS Implementation Gap in the Gaza Strip: A Geo-Epistemic Critique</i>
09:01–09:08  Oğuzhan Türköne <i>Border Regimes and Reproductive Governance in the European Migration Crisis</i>	10:36–10:43  Maya Çınar <i>Gender Representation in the EU Women, Peace and Security Action Plan</i>
09:08–09:15  Baran Taşkiran <i>Migration, Borders and Reproductive Governance: Gendered Dimensions of EU External Policy</i>	10:43–10:50  Sara Dif <i>EU CBAM and Global Climate Governance</i>
 09:15–10:00 Panel A Discussion	10:50–10:57  Majd Dader <i>Algorithmic Bias and Digital Governance</i>
	 10:57–11:20 Cross-Panel Discussion & ECRW Closing



4.2 Presentation Summaries — Panel A: Migration, Borders & Reproductive Governance

Maia Briand | Migration, Borders & Reproductive Governance

Reproductive Governance in the Migration Crisis: Germany and Italy Compared

Briand offered a comparative analysis of how the Common European Asylum System (CEAS) through the Dublin Regulation, Reception Directive, and Asylum Procedures Directive, restricts migrant women's reproductive autonomy across Germany and Italy. Drawing on Levinex's reproductive governance framework and feminist institutional analysis, she argued that despite their structural differences the two systems produce convergent outcomes: Germany restricts reproductive autonomy through bureaucratic barriers, Italy through precarious living conditions. Evidence included a 2020 study finding maternal mortality among migrant women in Italy twice that of the general population, and interview data on gender-based violence in German reception centres. A Global South perspective was introduced through Perinea's argument that the EU asylum system is part of a wider global pattern in which the Global North relies on migrant women's labour while systematically denying them rights. Feedback noted the need to sharpen the conceptual boundaries of reproductive governance and to anchor the Germany–Italy comparison with more concrete examples and statistics.

Elif Su Efendioğlu | Migration, Borders & Reproductive Governance

Gender, Migration and Reproductive Governance at EU Borders

Efendioğlu reframed the 2016 EU–Turkey Statement not as a border management instrument but as a mechanism of reproductive governance. Her research question asked how border regimes shape reproductive rights and bodily autonomy, and what a geo-epistemic lens adds to understanding this process. She showed that by restricting mobility the Statement creates barriers to reproductive healthcare and that displacement-era childbirth experiences, theorised through Begum's concept of 'constructing reproductive geographies', reflect the compounded pressures of borders and precarious citizenship. Feedback noted a mismatch between the problem identified in the literature, described alternately as disciplinary dominance and Eurocentrism, and the lens applied, and encouraged the paper to clarify whether the dominant knowledge problem is geo-epistemic or disciplinary, as these are distinct claims.

Askar Kurmangaliyev | Migration, Borders & Reproductive Governance

EU Border Externalisation and Reproductive Autonomy of Migrant Women

Kurmangaliyev examined the impact of EU border externalisation on the reproductive autonomy and health rights of migrant women in North African transit zones, focusing on the 2020 New Pact on Migration and Asylum. Applying reproductive justice alongside a geo-epistemic lens, he positioned the border not only as a geographical but as an epistemological weapon: the EU's refusal to acknowledge reproductive violence in transit zones constitutes an active epistemic erasure. He cited evidence that in the Netherlands in 2023 some 910,000 Dublin transfer records were issued with only 1.2 per cent prioritising family unity, and that in Greece medical reports attributed 94 per cent of violence incidents against women in transit facilities to sexual assault. Feedback acknowledged strong timing and noted that the paper should address what the geo-epistemic lens adds concretely to the argument beyond simply selecting a non-European case study.

Oğuzhan Türköne — did not present

Baran Taşkiran | Migration, Borders & Reproductive Governance

Migration, Borders and Reproductive Governance: Gendered Dimensions of EU External Policy

Taşkiran analysed the Dublin III Regulation as an instrument of structural violence and reproductive governance against migrant women from the Global South. Combining Lynn Morgan and Elizabeth Roberts's reproductive governance framework with Johan Galtung's structural violence and applied migration scholarship, he argued that Dublin III is not a neutral administrative tool but a punitive mechanism that nullifies migrant women's personhood by imposing a permanent state of deportability. Knowledge production and representation served as the primary lens, with geo-epistemic positioning as a secondary frame. The paper was commended for connecting reproductive governance, structural violence, and asylum policy, a link identified as a genuine gap in the literature, and for demonstrating clear development from Assignment 1. Feedback noted a risk of conceptual overloading given the simultaneous mobilisation of reproductive governance, structural violence, epistemic violence, and colonial maternalism, and encouraged the paper to address whether Dublin III itself produces these outcomes or whether it is one instrument within a broader European migration regime.



4.3 Presentation Summaries — Panel B: Democratic Backsliding, Anti-Gender Politics & WPS

Mohammadhossein Akbari | Democratic Backsliding & Anti-Gender Politics

Democratic Backsliding and Anti-Gender Politics: A Comparative EU Analysis

Akbari argued that anti-gender politics in Hungary and Poland is not merely a cultural backlash but a core mechanism of democratic erosion, operating through what he termed a 'gender power triangle' in which governments simultaneously target feminist civil society, state equality institutions, and executive legitimacy. Analysing the withdrawal from the Istanbul Convention and the banning of LGBTQ content in schools, he applied a geo-epistemic lens to show that Global South feminist movements in Latin America, Africa, and Asia have long engaged with organised anti-gender politics and developed stronger responses, resources that EU-focused scholarship largely ignores. The paper's most distinctive argument is that EU conditionality creates structural conditions for anti-gender mobilisation. Feedback encouraged the paper to provide clearer evidence for this causal claim and to distinguish between the EU creating opportunities for backlash and anti-gender actors strategically using the EU as a political scapegoat.

Gvantsa Varshalomidze | Democratic Backsliding & Anti-Gender Politics

Democratic Backsliding and Anti-Gender Politics: Georgia and Turkey Compared

Varshalomidze examined how anti-gender discourse functions as a governance mechanism, rather than a cultural values dispute, in Turkey and Georgia, where political actors use it to consolidate authority, shape public opinion, and build coalitions among religious organisations, nationalist groups, and political elites. Using the Istanbul Convention as a central case and executive aggrandisement as a theoretical concept, she applied a geo-epistemic lens to reveal how scholarship privileges Western European cases and marginalises insights from Georgia and Turkey. Feedback clarified an important distinction: geo-epistemic positioning is not achieved by selecting a non-European case study but by drawing on knowledge produced from outside dominant knowledge centres. The paper was encouraged to verify that its non-European sources are genuinely non-Eurocentric in their analytical framing rather than simply geographically located outside Western Europe.

Laila Ali | Security, WPS & External Action

The WPS Implementation Gap in the Gaza Strip: A Geo-Epistemic Critique

Ali reframed the WPS implementation gap not as a technical failure but as an epistemic mismatch: the UN Security Council Resolution 1325 framework assumes conditions, stable governance, state authority, and institutional delivery, that do not exist in Gaza. Rather than asking why WPS is not implemented effectively, she asked whether implementation itself is the wrong starting point. Using postcolonial feminism and a geo-epistemic lens, she positioned Palestinian women as knowledge producers rather than policy recipients and introduced the concept of the 'implementation paradox': international actors can formally promote women's participation and rights while operating in contexts where the political conditions required to achieve those goals are structurally absent. The presentation drew the chair's full attention from the opening and was commended for the precision and originality of the epistemic mismatch framework. Feedback asked that the paper address whether the implementation paradox is specific to Gaza or whether it points to a broader structural problem within the WPS agenda.

Maya Çınar — did not present

Sara Dif | Climate, Energy & Green Transition

EU CBAM and Global Climate Governance: A Critical Geo-Epistemic Analysis [carried from Session 1]

Dif analysed the Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism (CBAM) as not merely a climate instrument but a geopolitical mechanism that produces gendered inequalities in Global South economies. Combining feminist political economy, intersectionality, and geo-epistemic positioning into a triangulated analytical framework, she argued that CBAM was designed within a geo-epistemic centre and imposed on peripheries, and that its revenue accrues entirely to the EU budget with no redistribution mechanism. Evidence included UN and South Centre documentation of Global South exclusion from the CBAM's design process, and feminist scholarship on women workers in feminised export sectors, garments, ceramics, processed food, where women constitute 60–80 per cent of the workforce. The exclusion of gender from CBAM design was characterised as structural rather than incidental. Feedback raised the need to explain abbreviations clearly, to distinguish feminist political economy analytically from general economics, and to align slides more closely with the PechaKucha format's visual requirements.


















5. GLA5104 — Gender Politics in the EU: MA Session

10 June 2026 | 19:00–21:50 | Online, Microsoft Teams

Session theme: Gender, Power & Knowledge in EU Governance

5.1. Programme

 19:00–19:15		Welcome & Workshop Briefing Assoc. Prof. Rahime Süleymanoğlu-Kürüm, Jean Monnet Chair (FEJUST), PI (PLURIEX)
 20:25–20:40 Break		
 PANEL A Material & Regulatory Governance Arenas		 PANEL B Power, Security & Political Contestation
19:15–19:22	 Murad Mammadzade <i>Gender, Climate & Energy Transition in EU Governance</i>	20:40–20:47  Mahmoud Shaban <i>Migration Governance, Reproductive Rights, and Gendered Inequalities in EU Policy</i>
19:22–19:29	 Malaika Abdullah <i>Green Transition, Global Energy Governance, and Political Economy</i>	20:47–20:54  Urva Shahnawaz <i>The Impact of EU Migration Policies on Migrant Women's Access to Reproductive Healthcare</i>
19:29–19:36	 Nodirjon Murodov <i>Germany's Energy Transition in a Pluriversal Perspective</i>	20:54–21:01  Yasmine Adama Ibrahim Issa <i>Reproductive Governance at EU External Borders: A Feminist and Postcolonial Analysis</i>
19:36–19:43	 Vahap Mert Nacar <i>EU Digital Sovereignty Discourse as a Gendered Construct</i>	21:01–21:08  Chieh Cheng <i>Anti-Gender Politics, the Istanbul Convention, and Epistemic Challenges to EU Gender Governance</i>
 19:43–20:25	Panel A Discussion	
20:25–20:40	Break	
21:08–21:15	 Rija Batool <i>Anti-Gender Politics as a Tool of Democratic Backsliding in Hungary</i>	21:15–21:50  Cross-Panel Discussion & Closing

5.2 Presentation Summaries — Panel A: Material & Regulatory Governance Arenas

Murad Mammadzade | Climate, Energy & Green Transition **Gender, Climate & Energy Transition in EU Governance**

Mammadzade examined how the EU Just Transition Fund (JTF, €17.5 billion, 2021–2027) produces a particular form of gender knowledge, and what feminist climate scholarship is lost in translation when it enters the fund's institutional architecture. Using feminist political ecology, care ethics, and a knowledge production and representation lens, he argued that the JTF's allocation logic, built on emissions intensity and jobs-at-risk metrics, generates a gendered category of worker coded as male, formal, and industrial. The care and informal economies surrounding coal communities, constituting the majority of the indirect, largely female workforce that sustains mining towns, are structurally invisible before mainstreaming begins. He further argued that Europe's green future depends on lithium from Chile, cobalt from the DRC, and nickel from Indonesia, and that these extraction chains carry gendered costs born by women the JTF will never reach. The presentation was considered the most analytically focused and policy-relevant of the evening. Feedback asked that the paper address how domestication occurs institutionally, through funding design, monitoring indicators, or bureaucratic categorisation — rather than asserting the correlation between mainstreaming and epistemic domestication.



Malaika Abdullah | Climate, Energy & Green Transition

Green Transition, Global Energy Governance, and Political Economy

Abdullah asked how feminist political ecology frameworks reveal the gendered dimensions of EU climate governance that market-based approaches obscure. The presentation was clearly structured with a strong research question and good policy relevance. The key feedback question was: what specific conclusions does feminist political ecology make possible that conventional political economy cannot reach? The paper was encouraged to move beyond demonstrating that gender is underrepresented in the European Green Deal and to specify what feminist political ecology reveals about the governance model itself, rather than treating the addition of more women in decision-making as the analytical endpoint.

Nodirjon Murodov | Climate, Energy & Green Transition

Germany's Energy Transition in a Pluriversal Perspective

Murodov analysed how EU climate governance shapes gendered outcomes in Germany's energy transition (Energiewende), using feminist political economy alongside an EU climate governance framework to show that energy transition is not only a technical but a social process structured by inequality and power relations. The presentation was well organised and timed. The chair's main feedback concerned the need for greater concreteness: the paper makes general claims that outcomes are unequal without identifying specific mechanisms, energy costs, labour market restructuring, household burdens, or exclusion from decision-making, or grounding these claims in evidence. Germany's 2023 closure of all nuclear plants and the resulting approximate doubling of household energy costs was noted as an entry point for gender-disaggregated empirical analysis. The paper was also cautioned against invoking biological explanations for women's labour market disadvantage in the energy sector.

Vahap Mert Nacar | Digital Governance & AI

EU Digital Sovereignty Discourse as a Gendered Construct

Nacar argued that the EU AI Act functions as a sovereignty narrative in which gender equality is included as a marker of European values rather than built as a mechanism of protection, appearing in binding form only three times across the legislation and framing bias as a technical glitch rather than a relation of power. His central theoretical contribution is the concept of double gendering: gender is absent twice, once in the text, where the language is hollow, and again in the geography of knowledge production, where Brussels authors the norm and peripheral actors such as Turkey receive it without authorship. Turkey is positioned not as a policy laggard but as a vantage point from which the geographic structure of the norm becomes visible. Evidence included the Dutch welfare fraud algorithm that disproportionately flagged residents of Turkish and Moroccan origin, and analysis of how Brazil adopted the AI Act essentially wholesale. The presentation was considered the most intellectually original contribution of the session. Feedback asked that the paper address empirically how symbolic inclusion might be distinguished from meaningful protection, and raised the question of whether the AI Act's protection narrative, produced in a context of poly-crisis, reinforces patriarchal nationalism at the institutional level.

5.3 Presentation Summaries — Panel B: Power, Security & Political Contestation

Mahmoud Shaban | Migration, Borders & Reproductive Governance

Migration Governance, Reproductive Rights, and Gendered Inequalities in EU Policy

Shaban examined how EU migration governance, including externalisation policies, produces gendered and racialised inequalities, focusing on the differential treatment of Syrian and Ukrainian refugees as a key empirical entry point. Using intersectionality and feminist migration governance frameworks alongside a pluriversal lens, he argued that disparities in protection are not only implementation failures but reflect deeper structural patterns rooted in racialised assumptions about cultural proximity and deservingness. Discussion in the panel engaged the question of whether externalisation is inherently gendered or whether it produces gendered outcomes by reproducing existing inequalities. Feedback pushed back on the framing of EU policy design as fundamentally sound but poorly implemented, arguing that silence on gender in policy architecture is itself a design choice and that the paper should engage more directly with the concept of wilful ignorance, the idea that not seeing harm, when the harm is foreseeable, is not the same as innocence.

Urva Shahnawaz | Migration, Borders & Reproductive Governance

The Impact of EU Migration Policies on Migrant Women's Access to Reproductive Healthcare

Shahnawaz took the Temporary Protection Directive (TPD) as her primary policy object, arguing that EU migration policies function as reproductive governance by systematically excluding migrant women from reproductive healthcare. Drawing on Morgan and Roberts's reproductive governance framework and Andrew's citizen–migrant binary, she applied a geo-epistemic lens to show how knowledge about migrant women's experiences is marginalised by EU institutional frameworks. Her central evidence: of 4.7 million temporary protection registrations in the Ukrainian crisis, 86 per cent were women and children, yet no tailored reproductive health services were designed for this population. Feedback raised two substantive points: the need to distinguish specifically reproductive inequalities from broader healthcare access inequalities; and the importance of framing migrant women not only as marginalised recipients but as political actors whose knowledge and agency resist reduction to vulnerability narratives.

Yasmine Adama Ibrahim Issa — did not present



Chieh Cheng | Democratic Backsliding & Anti-Gender Politics

Anti-Gender Politics, the Istanbul Convention, and Epistemic Challenges to EU Gender Governance

Cheng analysed opposition to the Istanbul Convention as a case of policy meaning contestation: opponents do not reject the Convention's anti-violence goals but its diagnosis, the claim that violence is rooted in unequal social norms and gender roles, reframing this diagnostic layer as 'gender ideology' and 'social engineering'. Through a knowledge production and representation lens, the presentation asked where the authority to name and legitimise the problem is located and how the norm is translated, resisted, and renamed locally. A Latin American comparative dimension showed that anti-gender politics is a global rather than a European pattern, with populist regimes across different religious and secular contexts converging on a shared opposition to international human rights frameworks. The presentation was evaluated as the strongest of the evening in terms of delivery, timing, image-argument alignment, and spoken fluency, and the chair's sole substantive feedback was that the paper should address what alternative diagnosis anti-gender actors offer of the causes of violence against women.

Rija Batool | Democratic Backsliding & Anti-Gender Politics

Anti-Gender Politics as a Tool of Democratic Backsliding in Hungary

Batool argued that anti-gender policies under Viktor Orbán are not a superficial culture war but calculated instruments of authoritarian state-building, used to override constitutional checks, normalise emergency governance, and capture independent public institutions. She analysed three specific policy instruments: the 2018 deaccreditation of gender studies MA programmes, which set a precedent for direct executive intervention in higher education; the 2020 legal gender recognition ban, passed under pandemic emergency powers, which decoupled citizenship from international human rights standards; and the 2021 Child Protection Act, which effectively centralised the school system and purged independent NGOs from the educational sector. A geo-epistemic lens grounded in transnational feminist theory positioned Hungary not as a passive adopter of Western institutional design but as an active innovator and exporter of contemporary illiberal governance. The presentation's most original contribution, the distinction between an overt culture-war narrative and a hidden administrative agenda, was highlighted as a key strength. Feedback noted that the rapid pace and heavy reliance on notes detracted from the delivery, and raised the analytical question of whether anti-gender politics is an indispensable component of the Orbán project or one of several available mobilisation resources.

6. The PechaKucha Format: Implementation and Observations

The PechaKucha format was a first experience for the large majority of students across both cohorts. Across three sessions the format proved both demanding and instructive. Technical difficulties with slide auto-advance settings, particularly the timing of transitions in Microsoft Teams' presentation mode, were a recurring issue, especially in Session 1, and in some cases disrupted the flow of individual presentations. Students reported a range of experiences. Several noted that the 20-second constraint required a form of analytical discipline they had not previously encountered: it demanded that they internalise rather than read their argument, prioritise single ideas over comprehensive summaries, and think carefully about which visual, an image, a statistic, a quotation, a diagram, could carry an analytical point without the support of dense text. A number of students described finding authentic image selection unexpectedly difficult, both technically (sourcing licensed, copyright-free images) and intellectually (identifying a visual that genuinely illustrates an analytical claim rather than simply decorating the slide). The use of AI-generated images by some students was noted and addressed by the chair. Common issues observed across presentations included use of bullet-point text on slides contrary to the format's design; slides failing to advance automatically due to incorrect PowerPoint transition settings; images that did not clearly connect to the spoken argument; and an uneven pace leaving some slides underused and others rushed. Notwithstanding these difficulties, the format was broadly successful in encouraging students to distil and focus their arguments, and students themselves reflected, when invited to do so, that the exercise had helped them identify which parts of their argument were genuinely strong and which required further development.

7. Conclusion

The PLURIEX Early Career Researcher Workshop 2025–2026 was a substantial and well-structured academic event, bringing together more than twenty undergraduate and postgraduate researchers across three sessions in June 2026. The workshop represented the culmination of a scaffolded research process developed across the full semester and served simultaneously as an assessed component of both courses and as a PLURIEX project event committed to cultivating the next generation of pluriversal EU Studies scholars. The presentations demonstrated the breadth of what students had achieved: from identifying gaps in dominated literatures to applying feminist political economy, reproductive governance theory, decolonial critique, and geo-epistemic positioning to specific EU policy instruments. Across all three sessions students showed evidence of genuine intellectual development from Assignment 1 to Assignment 2 and from written paper to presentation. Students who successfully completed the course received a digital certificate acknowledging their participation in the PLURIEX PechaKucha Research Workshop.