

Başak Akkan · Julia Hahmann ·
Christine Hunner-Kreisel ·
Melanie Kuhn *Editors*

Overlapping Inequalities in the Welfare State

Strengths and Challenges
of Intersectionality Framework

 Springer

Overlapping Inequalities in the Welfare State

Başak Akkan • Julia Hahmann
Christine Hunner-Kreisel • Melanie Kuhn
Editors

Overlapping Inequalities in the Welfare State

Strengths and Challenges of Intersectionality
Framework

 Springer

Editors

Başak Akkan
Istanbul Bilgi University
Istanbul, Türkiye

Christine Hunner-Kreisel
University of Vechta
Vechta, Germany

Julia Hahmann
RheinMain University of Applied Sciences
Wiesbaden, Germany

Melanie Kuhn
University of Education Heidelberg
Heidelberg, Germany

ISBN 978-3-031-52226-0 ISBN 978-3-031-52227-7 (eBook)
<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-52227-7>

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s), under exclusive license to Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2024

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are solely and exclusively licensed by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors, and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, expressed or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

This Springer imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature Switzerland AG
The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

If disposing of this product, please recycle the paper.

*The volume is dedicated to our friend and
outstanding scholar Christine.*

Contents

1	Overlapping Inequalities in the Welfare State. An Introduction	1
	Başak Akkan, Julia Hahmann, and Melanie Kuhn	
Part I Methodological and Theoretical Approaches		
2	Geographical Dimensions of Intersectionality	21
	Maria Rodó-Zárate	
3	The Intersectionality of Social Exclusion and International Comparison: Rethinking the Methodological Nuances.	31
	Susanne Nef and Rajeev Kumaramkandath	
4	The Intersectional Multilevel Approach: Linking Subject, Discourse, and Social Structure in Welfare State Research	51
	Kathrin Ganz, Jette Hausotter, and Anna Köster-Eiserfunke	
5	Migrant Respectability: An Intersectional Bourdieuan Approach to Iranian Migrants' Experiences of Class and Religion	69
	Mastoureh Fathi and Atlas Torbati	
6	Childhood Studies Meets Migration Studies. The Potential of Ethnographic Research for Practices of Differentiation for Intersectional Analysis	83
	Claudia Machold	
7	Disability in Intersectionality and Vice Versa.	101
	Volkan Yılmaz	
Part II Institutionalized Inequalities in Welfare States: Care Work		
8	Contrasting Contexts: Investigating the Variations of Migrant Care Work	115
	Bernhard Weicht	

9	Migrant Care Workers in Home-Care Settings in Germany: Inequality Dynamics and Policy Interactions	129
	Hildegard Theobald	
10	Intersectional Perspective on Intergenerational Exchange of Support in the Context of Migration	145
	Elma P. Laguna	
11	Single Mothers' Subject Constructions of the "Good Mother": An Intersectional Analysis of Social Practices	163
	Julia Hahmann and Christine Hunner-Kreisel	
12	Children and Care Labor in Turkey. Intersectional Inequalities of Gender, Class, and "Age"	179
	Başak Akkan	
Part III Institutionalized Inequalities in Welfare States: Health		
13	Critical Race Studies and Intersectionality Responses to COVID-19	195
	Zuleyka Zevallos	
14	Black Women at the Intersection of Mental Health, Stigma, Genderism, Racism & Classism in Germany	219
	Felicia Boma Lazaridou and Amma Yeboah	
15	Irregular Migrants' Precarious Access to Health Care in the Norwegian Welfare State	233
	Synnøve Kristine Nepstad Bendixsen	
16	Egg Freezing Technology at the Intersection of Social Inequalities and Institutional Constraints	249
	Azer Kılıç	
Part IV Institutionalized Inequalities in Welfare States: Education		
17	Intersectionality Meets Gender and Diversity in Early Childhood Education and Care (ECEC): Scientific and Educational Policy Aspects	263
	Melanie Kubandt	
18	Schoolwork by Mothers* and Fathers* Under Conditions of Societal Inequality	275
	Stella März and Christine Hunner-Kreisel	
19	Institutional Gender Equality Work and Its Challenges: Taking the Example of Lower Saxony and the University of Vechta	295
	Christina Plath, Tanja Meyer, and Henriette Ullmann	

Part V Institutionalized Inequalities in Welfare States: Social Services

20 Unequal Paths to Clienthood: Child Protection and Domestic Bliss 315
Lars Alberth and Doris Bühler-Niederberger

21 Intersectional Perspectives on Homelessness and Social Work 331
Carole Zufferey and Chris Horsell

Part VI Institutionalized Inequalities in Welfare States: Policing

22 Intersectionality of Racial Profiling: A Call for a Broader Understanding 347
Claudia Wilopo and Tino Plümecke

23 Beyond Hate: Queer Metonymies of Crime, Pathology and Anti-Violence 365
Jin Haritaworn

About the Editors

Başak Akkan, PhD is Associate Professor of Social Policy in the Department of International Relations at Istanbul Bilgi University. Her research interests are in the theories of justice and inequality with a particular focus on intersectionality, feminist institutionalist analysis of care regimes, comparative social policy, and child well-being. She is a research partner of CUWB, an international research network on child well-being. She acts as an associate editor with the International Journal of Care and Caring. She has published in a number of scientific journals, including Child Indicators Research, Children and Youth Services, Feminist Theory, Historical Social Research, Journal of Gender Studies, Social Inclusion, and Social Politics.

Julia Hahmann, PhD is a trained sociologist and works as Professor for Social Exclusion and Participation in the Faculty of Applied Social Sciences at the RheinMain University of Applied Sciences in Wiesbaden, Germany. Her research focuses on single parenthood, alternative family concepts, friendship, caring practices, material and materialist gerontology, feminist and gender theories, as well as qualitative methods. She is a board member of the German Sociological Association and a board member of the Material Gerontology working group.

Christine Hunner-Kreisel, PhD (deceased) was Professor of Transculturality and Gender at the University of Vechta, Germany, Social Work, Faculty I of Education and Society Sciences. Her areas of expertise included childhood and youth, child well-being, education, intersectionality and the analysis of social inequalities, as well as qualitative methodologies. She had expertise in qualitative research in transnational settings, as well as in ethnographic research. Christine Hunner-Kreisel was editor-in-chief of Child Indicators Research, as well as executive board member of the International Society for Child Indicators.

Melanie Kuhn, PhD is Professor of Educational Science with a main emphasis on education and inequality at the University of Education, Heidelberg, Germany. Her primary research areas consist of differences, inequalities, and

professionalization in the educational system, as well as childhood and migration studies. She has gained expertise in qualitative and especially ethnographic methodologies.

Chapter 1

Overlapping Inequalities in the Welfare State. An Introduction



Başak Akkan, Julia Hahmann, and Melanie Kuhn

Since the 1980s, intersectionality has received significant recognition as a feminist framework with its theoretical, methodological, and political elements, offering a vigorous understanding of social inequalities that are multifaceted and overlapping in nature (Anthias 2012a; Brah and Phoenix 2004; Cho et al. 2013; Collins 1998, 2000, 2019; Collins and Bilge 2020; Crenshaw 1991; Ferree 2009; Lykke 2010; McCall 2005; Walby 2007; Walby et al. 2012; Winker and Degele 2011; Yuval-Davis 2006, 2011). By drawing upon the vast body of feminist literature and adopting a critical and process-focused approach to intersectionality, this edited book explores how the conceptual frame of intersectionality contributes to the analysis of the complex and interconnected inequalities within the welfare state, examining them on macro, meso and micro-levels, including institutions and everyday social practices. By emphasizing the recognition of selective factors of inequalities across diverse institutional domains, organizational settings, and society at large, the volume seeks to expose how multiple forms of inequalities persistently endure within the multilayered institutional boundaries, policies, and practices of modern welfare states.

While the research on the welfare state primarily concentrates on macro-level analysis, the contributions in this book, embracing an intersectional and interdisciplinary approach, provide insightful analysis at multiple levels, showing how inequalities of gender, class, race, ethnicity, age, disability and so on are

B. Akkan (✉)

Department of International Relations at Istanbul Bilgi University, Istanbul, Turkey

J. Hahmann

Faculty of Applied Social Sciences at RheinMain University of Applied Sciences, Wiesbaden, Germany

M. Kuhn

Faculty of Educational and Social Sciences at University of Education Heidelberg, Heidelberg, Germany

institutionalized in a welfare context. The contributions critically form the link between intersectionality and other theoretical frameworks and research paradigms, including Marxist social reproduction theory, critical race studies, Bourdieuan analysis of class, critical geography, childhood, queer, migration, and disability studies. They provide insights into the institutional realms of health, education, social services, and care arrangements, as well as examine state practices of racial profiling and policing. The volume illustrates the potential of intersectionality in applying empirical inquiries, while also providing critical reflections on the methodological challenges and addressing the gaps and limitations of intersectional perspectives. In this volume, some contributions apply macro-level analysis to explore institutional frameworks and organizational settings, while others adopt micro-level analysis focusing on social practices in everyday life. Yet all of the analyses are situated in the context of diverse forms of the welfare state. By facilitating the contributions of the authors across a wide array of disciplines and various geographical locations, this volume fosters an interdisciplinary, globally inclusive perspective on intersectionality.

In these introductory reflections, following an obituary for our esteemed co-editor Christine Hunner-Kreisel (1), we consider feminist scholarship on intersectionality, as well as we outline critical discussions about the methodological and political challenges of the intersectionality framework, recognizing it as a concept that is subject to debate and contention (2). We then turn our attention to the discussions surrounding the welfare state. By exploring how existing literature on the welfare state addresses inequalities and their interconnectedness, we reveal how intersectional perspectives are often overlooked in these debates (3). Following a general overview of the book's structure and subchapters, we provide concise introductions to each individual contribution (4).

1.1 To Start with: Book Dedication to our Colleague Christine Hunner-Kreisel

Regrettably, our co-editor Christine Hunner-Kreisel did not live to see the publication of the edited book. She passed away far too early in 2022 following a serious illness. This edited book is dedicated to the memory of our inspiring, supportive, and reliable friend and colleague Christine, who initiated this book project. Throughout her academic career, Christine devoted her studies to examining issues of inequality, disadvantage, and discrimination experienced by children, youth, and families, adopting an international, comparative and, notably, intersectional perspective. She studied educational sciences, ethnology, Islamic studies and Islamic theology at the Universities of Heidelberg (Germany) and Ankara (Turkey). Since 2012 she taught and researched in the educational sciences and social work fields at University of Vechta (Germany) as Professor of Transculturality and Gender. In recent years, she was able to expand the potential of intersectional perspectives in

various research projects: In a project funded by the German Research Foundation (2016 to 2019), she applied an intersectional approach to exploring the transformations of attitudes among parents over the course of their children's enrolment in school. Her ongoing collaborative project with Technische Universität Berlin (Germany) addresses questions of children's wellbeing in fields of non-formal education from an intersectional perspective (funded by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research, 2022 to 2024). Together with colleagues from Technische Universität Berlin and Macquarie University in Sydney, she founded the multinational research network "Children's Understanding of Well-Being: Global and Local Perspectives" in 2015, which has served as a platform for scholars to collaborate on qualitative, globally-oriented child wellbeing research linked to local contexts across several country projects. Both projects co-initiated by Christine are being continued by her colleagues.

Christine had a profound interest in analyzing the extent to which frameworks, regulations, institutions, and public discourses on welfare state regimes shape living conditions, life plans, and agencies of marginalized subjects and societal groups. Methodologically, she operationalized her intersectional research through the implementation of qualitative multilevel analysis. Theoretical concepts of subjectivation, power and domination, but also of resistance, empowerment and agency were crucial to her intersectional research projects.

Christine was an outstanding, internationally well-connected, passionate, and extremely committed scholar who worked not only on questions of de/privilege, discrimination, and social in/justice from an intersectional perspective in the academic arena. She also situated her subjects within societal discourses in a committed manner. The involvement of societal institutions, such as the science and education systems, in the powerful reproduction of order constituted the core object of Christine's research and teaching. As a politically engaged and inequality-conscious scholar, she also reflected upon her own involvement, positionality, privileges, and disadvantages in terms of classism, racism, sexism, ableism, and adultism. In this sense, she aimed to professionalize her students in a reflexive way and attempted to sensitize them to unequal life situations and lifestyles of children, youth, and parents. In particular, it was her passionate and knowledgeable willingness to engage in discussion, her openness and interest, her humor and friendliness, her collegiality and solidarity, as indeed her pronounced sensitivity even to the veiled forms of power within and outside the university system that made her a highly valued academic companion for her colleagues in national and international contexts. We see this anthology as an opportunity to continue the debates about the critical potentials, methodological challenges, and policy implications of intersectional perspectives honoring Christine's legacy, as well as her profound contribution to intersectionality research.

1.2 Intersectionality as a Travelling Concept

From when intersectionality was coined by Black feminist scholarship and activism as a framework to analyze the interplay of race, gender, and class as intersecting categories of inequality in the North American context (Collins 1998; Crenshaw 1991), there has been a notable expansion of academic work on intersectionality, and it has received recognition as an analytical tool of feminist knowledge production (Anthias 2012a; Lykke 2010; McCall 2005; Walby 2007; Walby et al. 2012; Winker and Degele 2011; Yuval-Davis 2006, 2011). Intersectionality as an analytical frame with its strong ties to social movements has served as a heuristic for addressing societal injustices and organizing protest and change (Mügge et al. 2018, p. 18). Beyond the academic sphere, intersectionality has been effectively integrated into political and global policy discussions, demonstrating its relevance for activists and practitioners (Yuval-Davis 2006).

The intersectionality framework's appeal and its indispensability to some extent in diverse applications in inequality studies have stemmed from its focus on complex inequalities, power dynamics and structural frameworks, revealing the mutual reinforcement of categories like gender, class, and race (Brah and Phoenix 2004; Collins 1998; Ferree 2009; Lykke 2010). The core insight gained is that categories, positions, and experiences of social differences and social inequalities are not discrete but interwoven and work together (Collins and Bilge 2020). This perspective is of compelling value for addressing, understanding, and solving social problems. Thus, the political dimension of intersectionality lies in its intention to make relations of power and hegemony visible and develop strategies to empower disadvantaged social actors (Collins and Bilge 2020). This becomes achievable when intersectional analyses identify and delineate how specific societal circumstances and the specific workings of inequality dimensions differ for varying social groups. Macro structures, such as welfare regimes, laws, relevant societal discourses or institutional aspects on the meso-level, do not occur equally for older adults or children, indigenous people, women of color, and trans people (Collins and Bilge 2020). We thus see consequences when researching on the individual level, because these intersections of inequalities influence social actors' practices, their agency, and how individuals perceive their own power to act (Choo and Ferree 2010, p. 133).

Over the last two decades, intersectionality has been considered a "travelling concept" (Bal 2002; Davis 2020; Knapp 2005; Konstantoni and Emejulu 2016; Lutz et al. 2011; Mügge et al. 2018) since it has become widely applied and moved beyond its Black feminist intellectual and political origins in North America, who created the term (Combahee River Collective 2014 [1977]). Yet intersectional approaches have an older history. The grassroots movements in the Global South since the 1970s have applied an intersectional approach that has received less recognition (Bastia et al. 2022, p. 466). Besides the concept's geographical reach with its political origins in the Global South (Collins and Bilge 2020; Walgenbach 2007), its recognition as a Black feminist concept in North America (Crenshaw 1991; Moraga and Anzaldúa 1981) and its move to Europe (Brah 1996; Davis 2020; Lutz

et al. 2011), intersectionality has found a place in several interdisciplinary studies, such as disability (Ben-Moshe and Magaña 2014; Goethals et al. 2015; Hirschmann 2012; Stienstra 2013; see Yılmaz in this volume), childhood (Alanen 2016; Qvortrup 2011; Konstantoni and Emejulu 2016; Hunner-Kreisel and März 2018, see Machold and Kubandt in this volume), and feminist geography (Mollett and Faria 2018; Vaiou 2018; Rodó-Zárate and Baylina 2018; see also Rodó-Zárate in this volume), as well as migration research (Anthias 2012b; Grosfoguel et al. 2015; Stasiulis et al. 2020). These developments are accompanied by ongoing discussions within various fields, which have expanded the focus on relevant social categories beyond gender, class, and race (Knapp 2005).

However, this successful expansion of areas of research on intersectional perspectives has also been accompanied by problematic implications. These, too, need to be reflected upon: It is important to address several methodological problems that have been widely discussed in academic debates, yet are also crucial for this volume. Ambiguity always arises about the number and nature of the differences in the meaning accorded to social inequalities in a particular location (Anthias 2012a; Bilge 2010; Erel et al. 2010). Depending on their disciplinary focus and specific research interests, the contributions to this volume certainly prioritize various lines of differences in their analyses. Closely related to this is the question of the appropriate level of analysis. With regard to the latest studies, it is noted that the concept of intersectionality has been increasingly used in recent years to examine intersecting identities and subjective experiences at the micro-level. However, the shift in emphasis from macro to micro-level analysis has faced criticism for overlooking the important aspects of power structures in research agendas (Anthias 2012a; Bilge 2010; Ferree 2009; Knapp 2005).

Bilge (2010) and Knapp (2005) thus strongly recommend linking intersectionality to social theory. It is essential to enrich it theoretically for a better understanding of the “structured subject positions” (Knapp 2005, p. 259, see Fathi and Torbati, Akkan in this volume). Furthermore, it is imperative to contemplate the historical construction of social categories, as the contemporary inequalities have been fashioned under specific historical processes of state formation in a relational manner (see Knapp 2005). Smooth (2013) draws attention to the idea that the political context could alter the social categories; the salience of categories could change from context to context: “As scholars around the world continue to contribute to the development of intersectionality as a research paradigm, we are able to develop greater specificity regarding the processes by which groups are privileged and marginalized in societies” (Smooth 2013, p. 13). In this respect, our anthology, which brings together numerous intersectional studies from different countries, contributes to an understanding of how different welfare state arrangements can produce specific relations of oppression and inequality. Secondly, recognizing the institutional framework of the welfare state seems to be crucial for the intersectional analyses of inequality regimes, as the states contextualize the articulation of social divisions (Anthias and Yuval-Davis 1983). The concept of intersectionality provides a powerful methodological framework for understanding the complexity and

interconnectedness of the multiple forms of inequalities that are being reproduced within the institutional boundaries and the policy frames of modern welfare states.

The establishment of intersectionality as an academic project in European universities has drawn criticism with claims that it is “whitening intersectionality,” resulting in the erosion of its political roots in Black feminist activism (Bastia et al. 2022; Bilge 2013; Erel et al. 2010). The origins of intersectionality as a political project, as well as its political potential as a “feminist of color tradition” (Eguchi et al. 2020) are becoming neutralized (Bilge 2013; Collins and Bilge 2020; Erel et al. 2010).

In our view, the debates about the appropriate social theoretical classification of the study of social inequalities cannot be resolved. We regard them as the continuation of specific epistemological positions, such as in the understanding of symbolic interactionism and ethnography or in the social theoretical framing of Marxist feminism. Against the background of these debates about appropriate levels of analysis, it is now considered a desirable goal to realize intersectional analyses of interwoven inequalities as multilevel analyses (Winker and Degele 2011; Yuval-Davis 2006, 2011; McCall 2005, see Ganz, Hausotter and Köster-Eiserfunke in this volume). Even if some authors conceptualize levels, dimensions or domains of multilevel analyses differently, they are united in their claim to analytically link the micro and macro-levels and to include the significance of social institutions and organizations for the reproduction of inequalities (Collins 2000, pp. 277–290; Yuval-Davis 2006, p. 198; Winker and Degele 2011, p. 54). At the same time, the requirement to conduct multilevel analyses is not feasible in all studies for a variety of reasons. Some of the contributions in this volume also exploit the potential of intersectional analytical perspectives without claiming to actually present a multilevel analysis. However, the findings generated by micro-analyses are consistently contextualized and embedded in the welfare state framework in a highly productive manner. In addition to having methodological and theoretical diversity, we also strive in the anthology to present as plural perspectives as possible on inequalities in welfare state framings, for instance via the inclusion of diverse nation states of the Global North as well as the Global South, and via international comparative studies (see Nef and Kumaramkandath in this volume). This also includes different positions on academic activism (see also Zevallos; Wilopo and Plümecke, as well as Haritaworn in this volume).

Overall, the edited volume thus addresses several of the debates mentioned. The quality and quantity of categories and difference lines, the adequate level or levels of analysis, as well as the question of the appropriate social theory are sometimes discussed specifically as a theoretical or conceptual issue, such as for example in Ganz, Köster and Eiserfunke or Alberth and Bühler-Niederberger (both contributions in this volume). Primarily, however, we are able to see how different research questions and different disciplines vary in their application of the intersectional methodology in analyzing inequalities. We therefore believe this volume to be a valuable contribution that reveals the diversity and flexibility of approaches under the umbrella term of intersectionality.

1.3 The Welfare State and the Intersectionality Approach

There are diverse approaches to welfare state analysis depending on the underlying social theoretical paradigm. In Marxist analysis, the welfare state is understood to be an inherent outcome of the capitalist mode of production, with capitalist accumulation giving rise to contradictions within the welfare state (Offe 1984; see also Ganz, Hausotter and Eiserfunke or Hahmann and Hunner-Kreisel, both contributions in this volume). Adopting a Foucauldian perspective, the welfare state is seen as a mode of governance of the modern state, identified as a distinctive array of practices in a historical context (Garland 2014). In its core definition, the welfare state entails the state's responsibility to safeguard the welfare of its citizens through redistributive politics that incorporates diverse social protection mechanisms (Esping-Andersen 1990). According to the widely accepted Marshallian (Marshall 1950) characterization, the welfare state functions as an institution that guarantees the social rights of its citizens and respectively mitigates market-driven inequalities through the practices of social citizenship. Esping-Andersen's (1990) seminal work "The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism" has demonstrated that welfare states not only serve as guarantors of social rights but also function as systems of stratification, organizing social hierarchies in society. In the early works on welfare states, the primary emphasis was on addressing class-based inequalities, recognizing class as the pivotal political agent in capitalist relations (Esping-Andersen 1990). However, several complex stratification mechanisms operate along the lines of class, gender, race, ethnicity, migration, age, and disability, as well as other relevant categories.

One of the major criticisms of the class-based analysis of the welfare state has been suggested by feminist scholars (Daly 2000; Daly and Rake 2003; Lewis 1992; Orloff 1993; Pateman 2000; among others). The gendered nature of the welfare state with its income maintenance and social protection policies targeting "men as the wage earner," which has also been addressed as "the male breadwinner model," has been the focus of the feminist analysis of the welfare state (Lewis 1992). Since the 1990s, many advanced welfare states have undergone policy transformations aimed at promoting gender equality in response to increased participation of women in the labor market, resulting in a shift from the "male breadwinner" to the "adult-worker" model (Daly 2011). Gender scholarship has not only exposed the patriarchal foundations of the welfare state development (Pateman 2000), it has also critically examined its heteronormative institutional framework (Faur 2018; Le Feuvre and Roseneil 2014). The longstanding gender critique of the welfare state has highlighted the influence of welfare policies and organizational arrangements on gender stratification, recognizing the significance of power dynamics within this context (Misra and Akins 1998).

The examination of the welfare state as a racial institution (see Nepstad Bendixen in this volume) with its mechanisms of racial profiling (see also Zevallos, as well as Wilopo and Plümecke, both contributions in this volume) and its role as a continuance of white hegemony have been the subject of critical analysis (Keskinen et al.

2009; Mulinari and Keskinen 2020). Extensive attention has been given to the racial dimension of the welfare state development in the United States (Boris 1995; Mink 1990; Ward 2006). The influx of immigrants to European countries has exerted significant pressure on welfare states, prompting inquiries into the multilayered inequalities and notions of belonging in pluralistic societies that arise from the inclusionary and exclusionary aspects of welfare states with respect to immigrants (Kymlicka and Banting 2006; Sainsbury 2006). Over the last two decades, the flow of migrant care workers from the Global South to the Global North, which is also referred to as “care chains,” emerged as a significant phenomenon within the care regimes of welfare states (Lutz 2008; Yeates 2004; Weicht 2021; see also Theobald; Weicht; Laguna, all three in this volume). Such diverse scholarship, which has provided critical analysis of the welfare states’ encompassing social categories of gender, race, disability, immigration, and so on extending beyond class-based analysis, has made significant contributions to our understanding of the processes through which modern welfare states generate and perpetuate inequalities.

In addition, critical disability studies have effectively demonstrated the inadequacies of post-war welfare states in addressing the inequalities stemming from the welfare state’s categorization of disability (Halvorsen et al. 2017; Priestley 2010; Roulstone and Prideaux 2012; see also Yilmaz in this volume).

This volume stresses the relevance of the intersectionality approach in critical welfare state analysis, as the concept offers a robust analytical framework for exploring the institutional processes that operate within a “matrix of domination” (Collins 1998). The intersectional social categories as situated are identified within the institutional boundaries and organizational processes of the modern state, emphasizing the dynamic nature of these processes and recognizing the agency of the individuals as subjects of state policies, as well as the shifting nature of the institutions that are integral aspects of the analysis (Smooth 2013). The institutional boundaries of racism, sexism, heteronormativity, and classism interplay with individuals’ choices, shaping their opportunities (Smooth 2013). By examining the policy realm and organizational structure of the welfare state, one can engage in a critical analysis of the interplay between systemic inequalities and individual agency, while also exploring the institutional spaces that foster inclusion and equality (Bassel and Emejulu 2010). Within political science scholarship, the question arises as to what extent historically entrenched inequalities rooted in capitalist, colonial, and patriarchal frameworks can be transformed by institutionalizing intersectionality within the realms of welfare state policies and organizational arrangements (Kriszan et al. 2012). This represents a call for intersectional equality politics in a particular context. The application of the intersectional approach in public policy reveals the complex ways in which the overlapping inequalities are entrenched in the processes and outcomes of diverse policy domains (Hankivsky and Jordan-Zachery 2019; Kriszan et al. 2012). Healthcare is a prime example of an area where intersectionality emerges as an important tool of analysis, as access to healthcare is determined by multiple forms of inequalities, including race, ethnicity, immigrant status, and so on (Bryant and Raphael 2018; Lopez and Gadsden 2016, see also Zevallos; Lazaridou and Yeboah; Nepstad Bendixen, as well as Kılıç, all

contributions in this volume). LGBTQ individuals are among those who encounter inequalities in accessing health services (Candrian and Hinrichs 2021). Similarly, intersectional inequalities determine access to education and even to educational success (Besic 2020; Gross et al. 2016; see Machold; Kubandt; März and Hunner-Kreisel; Plath, Meyer and Ullmann, all contributions in this volume). By creating deserving and non-deserving poor categories, welfare states also sustain overlapping inequalities in society, such as with the “welfare queen” category in the USA, where race, class, and gender interact in providing the ideological justification for social provisions (Hankivsky and Cormier, 2019). The categorization of clients as deserving and non-deserving beneficiaries of social services is a mechanism that reproduces overlapping inequalities (see Alberth and Bühler-Niederberger; Zufferey and Horsell in this volume). Hence, salient social categories could differ according to the context; as Williams (2021, p. 25) argues, “We have to understand the historical, material and cultural specificities of particular forms of social relations: to be aware of the variability in social, economic, cultural and political salience of different social relations at different times and places to the issues we are researching” (on space, see Rodó-Zárate; on international comparisons, see Nef and Kumaramkandath, both in this volume). In this context, the volume focuses on the organizational arrangements and social practices of the welfare state, including social services, care services, health and education, as well as policing, which provide insights into understanding intersectional inequalities that are historically founded within the processes of the welfare state. Yet such space-time related analysis needs to recognize that this is a dynamic process, as it is open to change due to the shifting organizational structure of the welfare state that responds to various claims of social justice and inequality.

1.4 Structure of the Book

The chapters are arranged in six sections: The first section “Methodological and Theoretical Approaches” (I) explores a range of conceptual discussions in addressing the strengths and challenges of theoretical and methodological approaches to intersectionality. The spatial and temporal dimensions of intersectional analysis, the methodological challenges of applying multilevel analysis of intersectionality in welfare state analysis, as well as challenges in applying intersectionality in comparative studies across different localities are tackled by the contributions in this section. Moreover in the first section, efforts to link intersectionality with social theory are confronted. Bourdieuan analysis of class is approached from an intersectional perspective, while intersectionality as a “travelling concept” is broached in relation to childhood, migration, and disability studies.

The contributions in the following five sections “Institutionalized Inequalities in Welfare States” address the inequalities in the institutional, organizational settings and social practices of the welfare state, with a particular emphasis on different domains: care work, health, education, social services, and policing. Adopting an

intersectional analysis, the authors conduct macro and micro-level analyses of welfare arrangements and social practices in diverse geographies and welfare state contexts. While some contributions highlight the analysis of how macro-level structures and micro-level experiences interact, the inherent connection between these two levels is evident across all the contributions, even if they are not explicitly integrated into the analyses.

In the subsection on care work (II), the contributions deal with issues of migrant care work in the context of Europe, long-term care arrangements, the intergenerational flow of support among migrant care workers and their left-behind parents, as well as the social practices of single motherhood and children's social reproductive work. In the subsection on health (III), the contributions address complex inequalities in diverse geographies within the realm of health, including the racial inequalities created by COVID-19 responses, intersectional inequalities in the mental health system, irregular migrants' precarious access to health systems, and intersectional inequalities with respect to reproductive technologies like egg-freezing. In this section, the authors apply various research methods to reveal the policy frameworks, state interventions, organizational arrangements, and social practices in the field of health that reproduce and institutionalize intersectional inequalities. In the subsection on education (IV), the contributions address how the intersectionality framework is utilized to explore complex inequalities in diverse institutional settings of education, including early childhood education and care (ECEC) services, and university education, as well as various practices of parents' engagement with schoolwork. In the subsections on social services (V), the contributions explore how the welfare states, through their social services, reproduce multiple inequalities. The analysis encompasses the organizational arrangements of welfare states in diverse settings, such as child protection systems and their exclusionary construction of clienthood in Germany, as well as the stigmatizing effects of social work on the homelessness in Australia. In the subsection on policing (VI), the contributions emphasize the need for a boarder understanding of racial profiling in public spaces, encompassing social categories that are often overlooked. The section includes the examination of a wider range of institutional settings that create policing practices, as well as a critical analysis of how the language used by social movements inadvertently perpetuates white supremacy through the adaptation of the hate-crime paradigm. A summary of each individual contribution is provided hereunder.

Maria Rodó-Zárate, in her chapter "Geographical Dimensions of Intersectionality," demonstrates that social categories not only intersect with each other but also have spatial and temporal boundaries. By adopting intersectionality in geography and by linking critical and feminist geographies to intersectionality theory, she provides a sophisticated conceptualization of the role of place in the reproduction of multiple inequalities.

Susanne Nef and Rajeev Kumaramkandath, in their chapter "The Intersectionality of Social Exclusion and International Comparison: Rethinking the Methodological Nuances," visit the methodological challenges of conducting comparative intersectional analysis. By juxtaposing the diverse experiences of migrants within the contrasting cultural, social, and institutional contexts of India and Switzerland, the

chapter reveals the methodological strengths of multilevel intersectional analysis in understanding the complex inequalities within different settings, while also highlighting the challenges inherent in conducting comparative intersectional analysis. The authors further draw our attention to the neoliberal zeitgeist that reshapes welfare states, leading to the perpetuation of intersectional inequalities on a global scale.

Kathrin Ganz, Jette Hausotter and Anna Köster-Eiserfunke, in their chapter “The Intersectional Multilevel Approach: Linking Subject, Discourse, and Social Structure in Welfare State Research,” explore the intersectional multilevel approach suggested by Winker and Degele and discuss its theoretical positionings, as well as limitations in their implications for welfare state research. The chapter presents an analysis wherein the intersectional multilevel approach encompassing social structures, symbolic representation and identities conceptualizes capitalism as a political economy logic that transforms and reproduces interconnected power dynamics of classism, heterosexism, racism, and ableism.

Mastoureh Fathi and Atlas Torbati, in their chapter “Migrant Respectability: An Intersectional Bourdieuan Approach to Iranian Migrants’ Experiences of Class and Religion,” examine the concept of respectability in relation to social class, ethnicity, and gender in the migration context of the UK. Approaching intersectionality within Bourdieu’s social theory, the authors explore how the notion of respectability is rooted in social, economic, cultural, and symbolic capital. Drawing on their micro-level analysis of Iranian migrants’ experiences, the authors show how belonging to society is an intersectional and transnational social practice for migrants that operates at different levels in society across class, religion, race, and gender in complex ways.

Claudia Machold, in her chapter “Childhood Studies meets Migration Studies. The Potential of Ethnographic Research for Practices of Differentiation for Intersectional Analysis,” locates practices of differentiation as a common object at the intersection of childhood and migration studies, outlining conceptual and object-theoretical commonalities of both research strands. The author demonstrates the epistemological potential of a practice-theoretical approach in exploring practices of differentiation in childcare centers and primary schools as educational institutions producing ethnically differentiated childhoods in a field-specific way. The author also tackles the challenging methodological question of how to gain access ethnographically to the institutional and structural dimensions.

Volkan Yılmaz, in his chapter “Disability in Intersectionality and Vice Versa,” explores the power and social structures of inequality and discrimination related to disability through a critical exploration of the intersectional paradigm. The author provides a critique of the intra-categorical approach suggested by the intersectional paradigm, arguing that it is inadequate in capturing the complexity of disability as a phenomenon that does not have a unified core. Instead, the author suggests the “radical diversity” approach and argues that it addresses the heterogeneous social positions associated with disability more adequately.

Bernhard Weicht, in his chapter “Contrasting Contexts: Investigating the Variations of Migrant Care Work,” explores the applicability and limitations of the intersectional approach in understanding the diverse and historically situated

intersectional positionalities of migrant care workers and illustrates how the macro structures and micro-level experiences interact, leading to the formation of certain categories. By addressing the inherent tension between a structural-oriented and process-oriented approach in intersectionality research, the author draws attention to the identification of the mechanisms at play and the conditions in which they operate.

Hildegard Theobald, in her chapter “Migrant Care Workers in Home-Care Settings in Germany: Inequality Dynamics and Policy Interactions,” provides an empirical analysis of the migrant care workers in home-care settings in Germany from an intersectional perspective. The author explores the care regime relationships with a particular focus on the LTC insurance policy scheme and migration politics to illustrate the intersectionality of inequalities for formal care workers in home-care settings within the triad of gender, migration status, and skill levels, taking into account the degree of professional qualification as a differentiating factor.

Elma Laguna, in her chapter “Intersectional Perspective on Intergenerational Exchange of Support in the Context of Migration,” explores the patterns of intergenerational support between children who migrate for economic reasons and their older parents who remain in the Philippines. Through the utilization of the Longitudinal Survey of Ageing and Health in the Philippines (2018) and an examination of support dynamics in a migration context, the author highlights the bidirectional flow of support wherein children predominantly provide financial support to their parents rather than receiving support from them.

Julia Hahmann and Christine Hunner-Kreisel (deceased), in their chapter “Single Mothers’ Subject Constructions of the ‘Good Mother’: An Intersectional Analysis of Social Practices,” apply an intersectional multilevel approach to analyze single mothers’ social practices in everyday life. The authors illustrate the contradictions between capital and care resulting in the “crisis of care” via an analysis of the idealized notion of a “good mother.” The authors’ analysis of the concept of the “good mother” in heteronormative societies, shown through an intersectional lens, reveals its profound relevance for social recognition, particularly when considering the significant influence of dimensions of ruling, such as classisms and bodyisms.

Başak Akkan, in her chapter “Children and Care Labor in Turkey: Intersectional Inequalities of Gender, Class, and ‘Age,’” explores the role of children in care labor within the family, which has been largely overlooked by social reproduction theory. By investigating girls’ social reproductive labor in Turkey, the author introduces the category of age that intersects with gender and class in the theory and sheds light on the complex dynamics of social reproduction.

Zuleyka Zevallos, in her chapter “Critical Race Studies and Intersectionality Responses to COVID-19,” explores the racialized interventions and practices of welfare states in navigating the challenges posed by the COVID-19 pandemic by drawing on critical race studies and intersectional approaches. Through a case study of the web series “Race in Society” featuring Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander scholars and activists, the author highlights the impact of repressive policing on working-class migrant and refugee communities in Australia, along with the state’s

failure to both safeguard vulnerable groups and involve Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people in public health planning.

Felicia Boma Lazaridou and Amma Yeboah, in their chapter “Black Women at the Intersection of Mental Health, Stigma, Genderism, Racism & Classism in Germany,” utilize a Black feminist theoretical as well conceptual framework to discuss experiences of African heritage adults in Germany. In their qualitative study with Black women, they analyze racialized and racist experiences, as well as trauma, and highlight the necessity for a specialized German mental health system.

Synnøve Kristine Nepstad Bendixsen, in her chapter “Irregular Migrants’ Precarious Access to Health Care in the Norwegian Welfare State,” incorporate perspectives from critical border studies into intersectional analyses so as to examine the insecure access of irregular migrants to the Norwegian healthcare system. The author shows how the precarious inclusion of migrants is produced by the unequal treatment of people with a variety of legal statuses in welfare state regimes.

Azer Kılıç, in her chapter “Egg Freezing Technology at the Intersection of Social Inequalities and Institutional Constraints,” explores the inequalities in accessing reproductive technologies in Turkey through an intersectional and institutional lens. The author draws on the egg-freezing experiences of women and their implications within a wider landscape of reproductive technologies, while arguing that the unequal experiences of women in accessing egg-freezing technology are determined by the institutional framework of capitalism and heteronormativity perpetuated by welfare state policies.

Melanie Kubandt, in her chapter “Intersectionality Meets Gender and Diversity in Early Childhood Education and Care (ECEC): Scientific and Educational Policy Aspects,” demonstrates that there are two distinct strands of thought in the scientific research on ECEC in Germany; one strand is characterized by a gender and difference discourse shaped by intersectional and power-critical approaches; in the other strand, educational policy discourses are characterized by an affirmative orientation of diversity pedagogy that demands recognition of social differences in educational institutions. The author critically examines the limitations of both strands and argues for a productive synthesis of affirmative and power-critical intersectional approaches in the educational policy arenas of ECEC.

Stella März and Christine Hunner-Kreisel (deceased), in their chapter “School Work by Mothers* and Fathers* under Conditions of Societal Inequality,” provide an intersectional analysis within the context of parental schooling to demonstrate that disadvantages and privileges are interconnected with unequal social power dynamics, as well as with notions of (good) parenting in the German welfare system. The authors show that the availability of time resources for parents to effectively engage in schoolwork is closely linked to the social positioning of parents in a broader social context.

Christina Plath, Tanja Meyer, and Henriette Ullmann, in their chapter “Institutional Gender Equality Work and Its Challenges – Taking the Example of Lower Saxony and the University of Vechta,” analyze gender mainstreaming and diversity management politics by using the example of a German university in Lower Saxony. They introduce various theoretical approaches, including

intersectionality, to highlight the differences in existing diversification strategies in higher education and discuss their specific challenges.

Lars Alberth and Doris Bühler-Niederberger, in their chapter “Unequal Paths to Clienthood: Child Protection and Domestic Bliss,” explore the multiple inequalities produced and reproduced in the construction of clienthood within the childhood protection system in Germany. Providing a critical view of the intersectional approach and introducing generational inequality as a framework, the authors reveal how mechanisms within the sphere of the welfare state could perpetuate unintended multiple inequalities among the groups recognized as deserving clients and so defined by the state.

Carole Zufferey and Chris Horsell, in their chapter “Intersectional Perspectives on Homelessness and Social Work,” explore the policy responses to homelessness in the context of Australia by applying a critical intersectional analysis. Drawing on Winker and Degele’s multilevel analysis, the authors reveal the symbolic and discursive construction of homelessness as a categorical group lacking an abode and as “blameworthy” within the field of social policy, which institutionalizes the barriers in the social work responses to homelessness.

Claudia Wilopo and Tino Plümecke, in their chapter “Intersectionality of Racial Profiling – A Call for a Broader Understanding,” problematize how the current debate on racial profiling has become reduced to identity checks of Black men in public spaces. They illustrate empirically that vulnerabilities and forms of resistance are intertwined with, but not solely determined by, categories of race, gender, and class. The authors show that racial profiling also takes place in institutional settings, such as job centers, semi-private areas of workplaces, or private homes, and that such intersecting institutional constellations create policing practices within the punitive state.

Jin Haritaworn, in their chapter “Beyond Hate: Queer Metonymies of Crime, Pathology and Anti-Violence,” explores hate crime as a paradigm of violence and anti-violence from a queer of color and transgender perspective. They utilize an affect framework by Sara Ahmed to address racialized violence that attaches criminality and pathology to bodies and populations that are already seen as hateful. Haritaworn argues that hate is a risky diagnosis as an organizational basis, because it is always already attached to radicalized bodies. This has implications beyond the kinds of languages we use in our organizing and political activism. The contribution then follows Angela Davis’ call for an abolitionist imagination that moves beyond both the prisons and places more often thought of as caring and benevolent, including the communities we want to build for ourselves.

As concluding remarks, we extend our heartfelt gratitude to Christine for initiating this book project. We believe that our dear friend and colleague Christine would have cherished this volume, given its invaluable contributions to the intersectionality debate. We also thank the authors for their commitment and their enriching contributions. Without further support, this anthology would not have been possible. We also express our thanks for their intensive work to Yasaman Moradi for careful formatting this volume and Finbarr Morrin for prudent proofreading of numerous contributions. The cooperation with Springer proved to be constructive and reliable

throughout the entire process. Arun Jose and Shinjini Chatterjee were always available to answer numerous questions.

References

- Alanen L (2016) Intersectionality and other challenges to theorizing childhood. *Childhood* 23(2):157–161
- Anthias F (2012a) Intersectional what? Social divisions, intersectionality and levels of analysis. *Ethnicities* 13(1):3–19
- Anthias F (2012b) Transnational mobilities, migration research and intersectionality. *Nord J Migr Res* 2(2):102–110
- Anthias F, Yuval-Davis N (1983) Contextualising feminism – Ethnic gender and class divisions. *Fem Rev* 15:62–75
- Bal M (2002) *Travelling concepts in the humanities. A rough guide*. University of Toronto Press, Toronto
- Bassel L, Emejulu A (2010) Struggles for institutional space in France and the United Kingdom: Intersectionality and the politics of policy. *Polit Gend* 6(4):517–544
- Bastia T, Datta K, Hujo K, Piper N, Walsham M (2022) Reflections on intersectionality: a journey through the worlds of migration research, policy and advocacy. *Gend Place Cult* 30(3):460–483. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0966369X.2022.2126826>
- Ben-Moshe L, Magaña S (2014) An introduction to race, gender, and disability: intersectionality, disability studies, and families of color. *Women Gender and Families of Color* 2(2):105–114
- Besic E (2020) Intersectionality: a pathway towards inclusive education? *Prospects* 49:111–122
- Bilge S (2010) Recent feminist outlooks on intersectionality. *Diogenes* 57(1):58–72
- Bilge S (2013) INTERSECTIONALITY UNDONE: saving intersectionality from feminist intersectionality studies. *Du Bois Rev Soc Sci Res Race* 10(2):405–424
- Boris E (1995) The racialized gendered state: constructions of citizenship in the United States. *Soc Polit* 2(2):160–180
- Brah A (1996) *Cartographies of the diaspora*. Routledge, London
- Brah A, Phoenix A (2004) “Ain’t I A Woman?” Revisiting intersectionality. *J Int Women's Stud* 5(3):75–86
- Bryant T, Raphael D (2018) *Welfare states, public health and health inequalities*. Oxford Bibliographies, <https://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/display/document/obo-9780199756797/obo-9780199756797-0178.xml>
- Candrian C, Hinrichs KLM (2021) The impact of intersectional stigma on health outcomes: the case of an older lesbian veteran. *J Gay Lesbian Soc Serv* 33(3):291–299
- Cho S, Crenshaw KW, McCall L (2013) Toward a field of intersectionality studies: theory, application, and praxis. *Signs J Women Cult Soc* 38(4):85–810
- Choo HY, Ferree MM (2010) Practicing intersectionality in sociological research: a critical analysis of inclusions, interactions, and institutions in the study of inequalities. *Sociological Theory* 28(2):129–149
- Collins PH (1998) *Fighting words: Black women and the search for justice*. Minnesota University Press, Minneapolis
- Collins PH (2000) *Black feminist thought: knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment* [1990]. Routledge, New York
- Collins PH (2019) *Intersectionality as critical social theory*. Duke University Press, Durham NC
- Collins PH, Bilge S (2020) *Intersectionality*. John Wiley & Sons, Hoboken
- Combahee River Collective (2014 [1977]) A Black feminist statement. *Women's Stud Q* 42(3/4):271–280

- Crenshaw K (1991) Mapping the margins: intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanf Law Rev* 43(6):1241–1299
- Daly M (2000) Comparing welfare states: towards a gender friendly approach. In: Sainsbury D (ed) *Gendering welfare states*. Sage Publications, London, pp 101–118
- Daly M (2011) What adult worker model? A critical look at recent social policy reform in Europe from a gender and family perspective. *Soc Polit* 18(1):1–23
- Daly M, Rake K (2003) *Gender and the welfare state*. Polity Press, Cambridge
- Davis K (2020) Who owns intersectionality? Some reflections on feminist debates on how theories travel. *Eur J Women's Stud* 27(2):113–127
- Eguchi S, Calafell BM, Abdi S (eds) (2020) *De-whitening intersectionality. Race, intercultural communication, and politics*. Lexington Books, Lanham/Boulder/New York/London
- Erel U, Haritaworn J, Rodríguez EG, Klesse C (2010) On the depoliticisation of intersectionality talk: conceptualising multiple oppressions in critical sexuality studies. In: Taylor Y, Hines S, Casey ME (eds) *Theorizing intersectionality and sexuality*. Palgrave Macmillan UK, London, pp 56–77
- Esping-Andersen G (1990) *The three worlds of welfare capitalism*. Polity Press, Cambridge
- Faur E (2018) Contrasting trends in gender and childcare in Argentina: family policies between LGBT rights and maternalism. *Curr Sociol* 66(4):617–628
- Ferree MM (2009) Inequality, intersectionality and the politics of discourse: framing feminist alliances. In: Lombardo E, Meier P, Verloo M (eds) *The discursive politics of gender equality: stretching, bending and policy-making*. Routledge, London, pp 84–101
- Garland D (2014) The welfare state: a fundamental dimension of modern government. *European Journal of Sociology* 55(3):327–364
- Goethals T, De Schauwer E, Van Hove G (2015) Weaving intersectionality into disability studies research: inclusion, reflexivity and anti-essentialism. *DiGeSt* 2(1–2):75–94
- Grosfoguel R, Oso L, Christou A (2015) “Racism,” intersectionality and migration studies: framing some theoretical reflections. *Identities* 22(6):635–652
- Gross C, Gottburgsen A, Phoenix A (2016) Education systems and intersectionality. In: Hadjar A, Gross C (eds) *Education systems and inequalities: international comparisons*. Bristol University Press, Bristol, pp 51–72
- Halvorsen R, Hvinden B, Bickenbach J, Ferri D, Guillén Rodríguez AM (eds) (2017) *The changing disability system*. Routledge, London
- Hankivsky O, Cormier R (2019) Intersectionality and public policy: Some lessons from existing models. In: Hankivsky O, Jordan-Zachery J (eds) *The Palgrave handbook of intersectionality in public policy*. Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke, pp 69–93
- Hirschmann NJ (2012) Disability as a new frontier for feminist intersectionality research. *Polit Gend* 8(3):396–405
- Hunner-Kreisel C, März S (2018) Children and participation: mapping social inequalities within concepts of Well-being in qualitative research. *Child Indic Res* 12:425–442
- Keskinen S, Tuori S, Irni K, Mulinari D (eds) (2009) *Complying with colonialism: gender, race and ethnicity in the Nordic region*. Routledge, London
- Knapp GA (2005) Race, class, gender: reclaiming baggage in fast travelling theories. *Eur J Women's Stud* 12(3):249–265
- Konstantoni K, Emejulu A (2016) When intersectionality met childhood studies: the dilemmas of a travelling concept. *Children's Geogr* 15(1):6–22
- Kriszan A, Hege S, Squires JA (2012) Institutionalizing intersectionality: a theoretical framework. In: Kriszan A, Skjeie H, Squires JA (eds) *Institutionalising intersectionality*. Palgrave Macmillan, London, pp 1–32
- Kymlicka W, Banting K (2006) Immigration, multiculturalism, and the welfare state. *Ethics Int Aff* 20(3):281–304
- Le Feuvre N, Roseneil S (2014) Entanglements of economic and intimate citizenship: individualization and gender (in)equality in a changing Europe. *Soc Polit* 21(4):529–561
- Lewis J (1992) Gender and the development of welfare regimes. *J Eur Soc Policy* 2(3):159–173

- Lopez N, Gadsden VL (2016) Health inequities, social determinants, and intersectionality. NAM perspectives. Discussion Paper. National Academy of Medicine, Washington, D.C
- Lutz H (ed) (2008) Migration and domestic work. Taylor & Francis, London
- Lutz H, Vivar MTH, Supik L (2011) Framing intersectionality: an introduction. In: Lutz H, Vivar MTH, Supik L (eds) Framing intersectionality: debates on a multi-faceted concept in gender studies. Routledge, London, pp 1–22
- Lykke N (2010) Feminist studies. A guide to intersectional theory, methodology and writing. Routledge, London
- Marshall TH (1950) Citizenship and social class. In: Pierson C, Castles F (eds) (2000) The welfare state reader. Polity Press, Cambridge, pp 30–39
- McCall L (2005) The complexity of intersectionality. *Signs J Women Cult Soc* 30:1771–1800
- Mink G (1990) The lady and the tramp: gender, race, and the origins of the American welfare state. In: Gordon L (ed) Women, the state, and welfare. University of Wisconsin Press, Madison, pp 92–117
- Misra J, Akins F (1998) The welfare state and women: structure. *Agency and Diversity Social Politics* 5(3):259–285
- Mollett S, Faria C (2018) The spatialities of intersectional thinking: fashioning feminist geographic futures. *Gend Place Cult* 25(4):565–577
- Moraga C, Anzaldúa GE (1981) This bridge called my back: writings by radical women of color. Persephone Press, Watertown
- Mügge L, Montoya C, Emejulu A, Weldon SL (2018) Intersectionality and the politics of knowledge production. *Eur J Polit Gender* 1(1–2):17–36
- Mulinari L, Keskinen S (2020) Racial profiling in the racial welfare state: examining the order of policing in the Nordic region. *Theor Criminol* 26(3):377–395
- Offe C (1984) Contradictions of the welfare state. MIT Press, Cambridge
- Orloff AS (1993) Gender and the social rights of citizenship: the comparative analysis of gender relations and welfare states. *Am Sociol Rev* 58(3):303–328
- Pateman C (2000) The patriarchal welfare state. In: Pierson C, Castles F (eds) The welfare state reader. Polity Press, Cambridge, pp 133–154
- Priestley M (2010) Disability. In: Castles FG, Leibfried S, Lewis J, Obinger H, Pierson C (eds) The Oxford handbook of the welfare state. Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp 406–420
- Qvortrup J (2011) Childhood as structural form. In: Qvortrup J, Corsaro W, Honig MS (eds) Palgrave handbook of childhood studies. Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke, pp 21–33
- Rodó-Zárate M, Baylina M (2018) Intersectionality in feminist geographies. *Gend Place Cult* 25(4):547–553
- Roulstone A, Prideaux S (2012) Understanding disability policy. Bristol University Press, Bristol
- Sainsbury D (2006) Immigrants' social rights in comparative perspective: welfare regimes, forms in immigration and immigration policy regimes. *J Eur Soc Policy* 16(3):229–244
- Smooth WG (2013) Intersectionality from theoretical framework to policy intervention. In: Wilson AR (ed) Situating intersectionality. The politics of intersectionality. Palgrave Macmillan, New York, pp 11–41
- Stasiulis D, Jinnah Z, Rutherford B (2020) Migration, intersectionality and social justice – Guest editors' introduction. *Stud Soc Just* 14(1):1–12
- Stienstra D (2013) Race/ethnicity and disability studies: towards an explicitly intersectional approach. In: Watson N, Roulstone A, Thomas C (eds) Routledge handbook of disability studies. Routledge, London, pp 384–397
- Vaiou D (2018) Intersectionality: old and new endeavours? *Gend Place Cult* 25(4):578–584
- Walby S (2007) Complexity theory, systems theory, and multiple intersecting social inequalities. *Philos Soc Sci* 37(4):449–470
- Walby S, Armstrong J, Strid S (2012) Intersectionality: multiple inequalities in social theory. *Sociology* 46(2):224–240

- Walgenbach K (2007) Gender als interdependente Kategorie. In: Walgenbach K, Dietze G, Hornscheidt A, Palm K (eds) *Gender als interdependente Kategorie: neue Perspektiven auf Intersektionalität, Diversität und Heterogenität*. Barbara Budrich, Opladen, pp 23–64
- Ward D (2006) *The white welfare state: racialization of the US welfare policy*. University of Michigan, Ann Arbor
- Weicht B (2021) Individual trajectories and intersecting regimes: methodological reflections on researching migrant care work. In: Horn V, Schweppe C, Böcker A, Bruquetas-Callejo M (eds) *The global old age care industry: tapping into migrants for tackling the old age care crisis*. Palgrave Macmillan, Singapore, pp 103–112
- Williams F (2021) *Social policy: a critical intersectional analysis*. Polity Press, Cambridge
- Winker G, Degele N (2011) Intersectionality as multi-level analysis: dealing with social inequality. *Eur J Women's Stud* 18(1):51–66
- Yeates N (2004) Global care chains. *Int Fem J Polit* 6(3):369–391
- Yuval-Davis N (2006) Intersectionality and feminist politics. *Eur J Women's Stud* 13:193–209
- Yuval-Davis N (2011) Beyond the recognition and re-distribution dichotomy: Intersectionality and stratification. In: Lutz H, Vivar MTH, Supik L (eds) *Framing intersectionality: debates on a multi-faceted concept in gender studies*. Routledge, London, pp 155–169

Başak Akkan PhD is Associate Professor of Social Policy in the Department of International Relations at Istanbul Bilgi University. Her research interests are in the theories of justice and inequality with a particular focus on intersectionality, feminist institutionalist analysis of care regimes, comparative social policy, and child wellbeing. She is a research partner of CUWB, an international research network on child wellbeing. She acts as an associate editor with the *International Journal of Care and Caring*. She has published in a number of scientific journals, including *Child Indicators Research*, *Children and Youth Services*, *Feminist Theory*, *Historical Social Research*, *Journal of Gender Studies*, *Social Inclusion*, and *Social Politics*.

Julia Hahmann PhD is a trained sociologist and works as Professor of Social Exclusion and Participation in the Faculty of Applied Social Sciences at the RheinMain University of Applied Sciences in Wiesbaden, Germany. Her research focuses on single parenthood, alternative family concepts, friendship, caring practices, material and materialist gerontology, feminist and gender theories, as well as qualitative methods. She is a board member of the German Sociological Association and a board member of the Material Gerontology working group.

Melanie Kuhn PhD is Professor of Educational Science with a main emphasis on education and inequality at the University of Education Heidelberg, Germany. Her primary research areas consist of differences, inequalities, and professionalization in the educational system, as well as childhood and migration studies. She has gained expertise in qualitative and especially ethnographic methodologies.

Part I
Methodological and Theoretical
Approaches

Chapter 2

Geographical Dimensions of Intersectionality



Maria Rodó-Zárate

Abstract Diverse authors have shown the relevance of place in intersectionality dynamics, revealing the importance of contextually analyzing inequalities. Here, I relate feminist and critical geographies with intersectionality theory to develop a conceptualization of the role of place in intersectional dynamics. As a way of approaching geographies of intersectionality, I propose four different dimensions to consider on this matter: the mutual constitution of place and intersectional dynamics; the relationality between places and between space and time; the different lived experiences of place depending on social positions; and the geographical hierarchies in relation to what is considered political.

Keywords Spatial perspective · Geographies · Intersectionality · Place · Politics

2.1 Introduction

The geographical dimension of intersectionality is a perspective that can potentially shed light on multiple angles of intersectional dynamics. It mainly has to do with the role of place in the articulation of social categories and its effects on lived experience, but also on issues such as the importance of context in knowledge production, understanding that producing knowledge on intersectionality theory is not a “place-less practice” (Peake 2011). The following contribution, a reprint of a paper originally written in Catalan, delves into the first topic: the role of place in intersectional dynamics.

The following text was published as a section in Rodó-Zárate (2021) “Interseccionalitat. Desigualtats, llocs i emocions” [Intersectionality. Inequalities, places and emotions], by Tigre de Paper. Translation into English by Ailish Holly.

M. Rodó-Zárate (✉)
Pompeu Fabra University, Barcelona, Spain